

Oliver Stone's Nixon: Politics on the Edge of Darkness

IAN SCOTT

In the introduction to his controversial book, *The Ends of Power*, former White House Chief of Staff, H.R. Haldeman describes Watergate as being an expression «of the dark side of President Nixon»¹. Later in the book Haldeman cites former Special Counsel Charles Colson as a key man who «encouraged the dark impulses in Nixon's mind»². Stephen Ambrose has written that Nixon «never abandoned his black impulses to lash out at the world...», while Henry Kissinger offered the view that «the thoughtful analytical side of Nixon was most in evidence during crises, while periods of calm seemed to unleash the darker passions of his nature»³. Christopher Wilkinson -talking directly about Oliver Stone's film-has focused on the movie's analogy of a «beast» that «also became a metaphor for the dark side of Nixon himself»⁴.

Wherever you look in the vast array of literature on the life and times of President Richard Nixon, as sure as you are to hear the description «Shakespearean tragedy», so the notions of dark and brooding forces are never far away, following in the shadows of the man. As many have pointed out, however, Nixon's unknown blacker side was not merely a temperamental reaction, not only a protective camouflage to deflect from the poor boy made good syndrome that he was proud about and talked a great deal of, but always remained an Achilles heel in his own mind; no the concealment of emotional energy was tied up in the fascination with life and beyond. The more personally reproachful Nixon was consumed by the human condition and it made him humble in the presence of those he felt were sainted -his mother Hannah and wife Pat- but with an irresistible urge to associate himself with those less morally centred, more daring, closer to the boundaries of right and wrong, a place he found all too tempting to visit.

Richard Nixon himself did more than anyone to cultivate a tragic and oppositional form to his life and work. Even in retreat he questioned morality and his own personal standing in what were to prove his final two reminiscences from the press conference on the day he left office. One referred to the inner strength that former president Theodore Roosevelt had gleaned from the death of his first wife, and other was summarized in Nixon's famous parting quote:

«Always remember, others may hate you -but those who hate you don't win unless you hate them, and then you destroy yourself»⁵.

The personal and professional isolation was thus endemic to his life in many respects and Nixon was no different from many other public figures who were touched by the fear of loathing and death. Yet he somehow allowed his feelings to overwhelm him, to dictate his actions and to govern his personal relations and political style. A man so aware of his fallibilities was also the one who allowed the wild impulses of greed, deception, and power to drag him down. These are the issues, together with his discrediting of the office of the president itself, that are themes at the root core of Oliver Stone's biopic on Nixon.

What Stone produced with *Nixon* was not a film about Watergate or Vietnam, about conspiracy theories or even a strictly biographical portrayal of the man: it is a film about the relationships and falsities of power. Although having blithely taken on surprise at the mention of a connection, Stone's film does bear cinematic comparison in this respect with *Citizen Kane*⁶.

It is not just the resemblance through scenes such as the long-table separation at dinner, when Nixon calls for his manservant Manolo to come and remove his wife's plate that makes the connection, but that thematically the film follows similar literary sources of self-delusional psychosis that interested Orson Welles as much as it has done Stone⁷.

In addition, from the opening camera pan -after the break- in scene over the introductory credits-that glides through the White House gates, just as Welles does in leading us into *Xanadu*, to the use of newsreel as a «march of time» parody telling the story of each life, both *Kane* and *Nixon* also use comparable cinematic motifs to relay a classical fall from grace. In his own work on Welles, Joseph McBride details the technique of the director, just as appropriate to *Nixon* as it is to *Kane*:

«...he will go so far as to construct a geometrical pattern of counterpoints and visual ironies, in *Kane*, to bind his hero into a system which makes him seem powerless.

...in most of his films he distorts chronological structure, beginning the film with scenes which depict or imply the hero's destruction, thus placing his subsequent actions in ironic parenthesis»⁸.

The analysis is just as pertinent to Stone's style as it is to Welles' for we approach Nixon's inevitable doom in the same manner that Stone positioned Kennedy's assassination and the subsequent background story in *JFK*. Not unlike the mood of *Citizen Kane*, Stone argues for the Nixon story as Greek tragedy because his relationship to power -almost like his relationship to his family- was illusional⁹. This paradigm within the film is one that is well documented in Jonathan Schell's book, *The Time of Illusion*. He describes the president as a man in «apparent isolation from the world around him», and constructing what amounted to a «private reality»¹⁰. More than this, Stone strikes at the heart of any understanding of this complex leader and nails the philosophical tenets behind his interpretation of Nixon's life:

«In the end. ...it's tough not to feel some compassion for a guy who just never though he was good enough to join the establishment, even when he emblemised that very entity»¹¹.

Stone, in effect, questions rather than condemns the nightmare journey that Nixon followed until August 1974, and leaves open the questions of why he would leave public life with the abiding desire to find «peace at the centre», an echo of his Quaker past that arises more than once in the film. A fear of failure is certainly one explanation that the film posits, perhaps even a fear of an establishment backlash - that could slay Nixon in the same manner that it did Kennedy- which is the controversial undercurrent of Stone's conspirational thesis in *Nixon*.

Yet, overall, Stone confines Nixon's psychosis to an enveloping darkness that is largely a metaphysical abstraction, the result of an increasingly lonely man wandering the halls of a dimly lit and brooding White House. Stone's Nixon is a more compassionate examination of the man on his descent into public and private hell than any critic might have thought possible, but nevertheless Stone rarely hesitates in revealing Nixon's fall to be darker, further and deeper than almost any other political figure. Claims that this is a whitewashed Nixon, newly reconstructed for historical examination and largely blameless for his actions in the face of the force of the *beast*, should remain spurious at best¹². In keeping with the portraits conceived by the likes of Stanley Kutler and of course Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein, Nixon's downfall in this film may still be perceived as a prevailing justice, even retribution, for his deviant and deceitful behaviour¹³.

Stone described in interview how he attempted to visualize the bleak isolation of the man, the semi-detachment in his persona, and then transplant this into the mood of the film. He explained to Peter Biskind how he tried to capture the aura and style by recounting the work of Sergei Eisenstein¹⁴. Indeed Stone's trademark jump-cut technique, which he uses to much effect in *Nixon* as a framing device for the passage of time as history, has its origins within Eisenstein's classic works, such as *Battleship Potemkin*, and with much of the innovative directing of Orson Welles again¹⁵.

The tone of *Nixon* does indeed blacken as the picture progresses with a stylised framing of Anthony Hopkins in the title role lending itself to madness and desolation. The key scenes all begin to take place at night -including the resignation when the paper was in actual fact signed early in the morning- and the light of the days begins to dissolve away as the film moves towards a climax. The literal and metaphorical darkness allow the demons that have tormented Nixon's very being to finally culminate in the ghostly figure of Hannah Nixon (Mary Steenbergen) appearing with, and almost as, Pat Nixon (Joan Allen) in the Lincoln room. The two women who have guided his life can no longer save Nixon from himself. The self-destructive side of his personality has won over by the conclusion and, in Stone's interpretation of events, the potentially catastrophic secrets he hides-most notably the « Track 2» plot-brings the whole cover-up of Watergate crashing in on him¹⁶.

Yet Stone imploringly argues for another key aspect of the Nixon story that he correctly feels was equally as devastating to the American polity in the early seventies. This was that Richard Nixon's strange psychological disposition made him a leader who sometimes railed his staff, and yet at other times blindly trusted them, certainly with a degree of faith that was unwarranted; and this Stone argues contributed to his being marginalized, corrupted, and ultimately betrayed by his underlings. As Theodore White says in his book, *Breach of Faith*: «the villains were clear-cut Haldeman and Mitchell and Magruder and Dean, and the lesser hustlers of the underground»¹⁷.

The critical moment of the Nixon presidency in 1972, the June 23rd conversation between the President and Haldeman, displayed the depth of this . blind loyalty and the darker concealment of secrets

that Nixon constantly fought with throughout his administration. Haldeman expressed the opinion at the meeting that former Attorney-General and Nixon campaign manager John Mitchell must have known something of the break-in at the Watergate complex only a few weeks before. This confrontation takes place despite a conversation on June 20th between the two when Mitchell had flatly denied to Haldeman that he had ordered any break-in¹⁸.

Nixon needed Mitchell, as his political ally, but also as his friend. He had been «on board» for a long time, he had to be protected, and this act of faith, from a president seemingly oblivious to his friend's actions, helped in part to seal Nixon's fate¹⁹. Stone though chose a structure that defied locating the film around the political epicentre of the narrative, the June 23rd meeting, and opted instead for Oval office scenes that are «composites» of meetings that took place at the approximate period. The first major White House ensemble includes snippets of Nixon's «June 23rd comments» about Howard Hunt -one of the White House «plumbers»- and the dangers he posed and what he tracked back to, in the Bay of Pigs. A series of events and meetings are placed around the critical moment and the non-appearance of the key defining moment of Nixon's duplicity forms a vital rejoinder to the film as a whole: the debate about lawlessness, about misleading the American people, and importantly the debate about Nixon's own misconstrued use of power. Just as Nixon himself is the non-figured component in Alan J. Pakula's *All the President's Men*, so Watergate is the (almost) unidentified virus that eats away at the administration in *Nixon*. Stone enhances this theme by conveying an impression of the work of government continuing apace whilst knowing glances and hushed conversations hint at the lower levels of deception being played out, even in the Oval Office itself.

Stone consciously avoids honing the film into the bunker mentality of those final few months in the White House preferring instead to pore over the tribulations of *realpolitik* and the extrication from Vietnam. In foreign policy, as the famous bloodied steak scene on his private yacht is meant to demonstrate, Nixon rarely sought a means to an end; the ends were always sought by any means. The invasion of Cambodia, the Christmas bombing campaign against North Vietnam in 1972, these and similar such policies all ultimately achieved their aims, in *his* mind. The lone prevaricator in him, as John Sears has revealed, was, however, further unleashed by a wave of discontent at these actions that Stone dramatizes in the heart of the picture²⁰.

The pivotal moment of Nixon is the confrontation with student protestors on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial one night in 1970, a scene where Stone determines who -or what- is at the heart of the institutional agenda controlling American actions at home and abroad²¹. A female protestor conjures up the notion of a wild animal, *the beast*, a primeval force that has shadowed those who have gone before Nixon and is now on his tail. «you can't control it can you?», she berates him as he's whisked away down the steps suddenly alive to the forces that are lined up against him, as Stone would have us believe.

Along with the two «Jack Jones» sequences, the first of which takes place rather obviously on November 21st, 1963, this metaphoresis of institutional domination is the closest Stone comes to making the movie *JFK 2*, and stretching the conspiratorial agenda of the Military Industrial Complex beyond the Kennedy years. One might be tempted to read a little too much into Stone's inclusion of Nixon's flight from Love Field on the morning of November 22nd, complete with the pathetic fallacy of storm clouds approaching. But rather than asking us to make a wild leap of faith into accepting Nixon's part in the events at Dallas-a dovetail to Stone's accusation against Lyndon Johnson in *JFK*- this is better considered as a further outline to the Kennedy fixation that Stone has explored before, and which he almost inevitably continues to develop in this film.

As I have already stated, power, leadership, and a sense of destiny, of history, are all very much alive and part of the Nixon critique for Stone. Leadership was a defining force for Richard Nixon in the political system, to the point where he discarded any constitutional principles that underwrote the responsibilities of the Chief Executive. He liked to convey a sense of the dramatic and his idea «of leading the nation out of the darkness», as he said at the Democratic Convention in 1968, was what he equated with the epic dimensions of the office and the responsibilities he personally forswore. It comes as little surprise to us then that not only Kennedy, but the greatest of all American «leaders», Abraham Lincoln, should become a well guarded icon of *Nixon* as well. One is reminded in the way that Stone constructs the flashback of Nixon's life, of John Ford's *Young Mr. Lincoln*. In a similar way to Stone's Nixon growing up as a child in the last frontier of California, aware of the harsh responsibilities of his existence, and the expectations being placed upon him as his two brothers fall prey to tuberculosis - though Nixon actually gave different accounts through his life of the death of his younger brother Arthur- so the young Abe -played by Henry Fonda- is a man staring out at the defining moments of America's early history preparing to write the next chapter himself²². The reality of Ford's biopic, made at the end of

the depression and on the edge of World War Two, is a reminder of the defining characteristics that make great men great Americans, and of course great presidents.

Stone too has Nixon grappling with these problems throughout his film, but finally resolves that he, Nixon, cannot avoid the conclusion that death pervades the office, and that the greatness that he seeks lies in martyrdom. In looking at a portrait of Lincoln, Nixon sees only finality and questions «where would we be without death?»²³. I would argue that comparison abound here with another major political biography, namely Henry King's sprawling but lush biopic of Woodrow Wilson, *Wilson* (1944).

Certainly lacking the same kind of certain historical destiny that Stone's film incorporates -one of the early scenes in *Wilson* sees the principal of Princeton having to be coaxed into a run for the governorship of New Jersey -the film takes up its subject from these salad days in academia just prior to his successful campaign of 1910. Its running agenda is the «futility of war» paradigm that has often seen it equated with Olivier's wartime production of *Henry V*. With this in the forefront of the ideological prognosis of conflict, King inexorably draws out Wilson's feud with Congress, and the senate in particular, over the ratification of the League of Nations, leading almost inevitably to the demise of his health and the downbeat closure that offers us a «dying king» scenario. The similarities to Stone's ending in *Nixon*, where he includes actual footage of the president's funeral in 1994, and thus closes in the historical timescale post-1974, is a modest underscoring of the notion that, as in *Wilson*, the conjecture of history could always allow for an alternative epilogue.

By contrast, the Kennedy fixation in the film offers varying interpretations of the relationship between the two men, and there are certainly some controversial elements. On the one hand the historically dubious nature of Kennedy's 1960 election victory always did prey on Nixon's mind, and it confirmed everything he expected about the Ivy League, east coast, liberal establishment. On the other hand, the famous television debate of that campaign is an unfair representation of Nixon's performance in Stone's hands, and only serves as a dramatic plot device for James Woods -as Haldeman- to say «that's it, it's over» towards the end of the scene, as if some pre-destined conviction of defeat to the power of the Camelot era were at work. The margin of victory on election night for Kennedy makes this a rather unconvincing set-up of the «image problem» that mythically cost Nixon campaign victory.

The extremities of admiration on the one hand, and blind hate on the other may be difficult to convincingly sustain in the film, but the tone of Stone's relationship has recently been given additional kudos in a new book by Christopher Matthews. In *Kennedy & Nixon*, he argues for a rather closer personal acknowledgement than history has hitherto afforded; and whether this is exaggerated or not, the dilemma for Nixon, in deciding whether to emulate or reject the style of leadership that Kennedy portrayed, is an important citation in Stone's characterization²⁴. Probably the most affecting moment in the entire film comes at the end when Nixon confronts the elegiac, stooped, and shadowy portrait of Kennedy in the White House lobby²⁵. Nixon's quote, «when they look at you, they see what they want to be, when they look at me, they see what they are...» is his prophetic conclusion about a contemporary who would be forever feted for mere image and rhetoric, something Nixon knew he could only aspire to²⁶.

Stone's film succeeds in showing a man who wanted to make history, and thought he was, but who really only ended up documenting it. The structure of the film is excellent in pinpointing Nixon's obsession with the public record. His memoirs reveal that he was quite unequivocal about wanting to document everything that went on in the White House. This despite the fact that he was certainly not prepared to tell everyone -as Stone shows in the scene with Pat sitting watching the Senate hearings as the existence of the taping system is revealed- about the recordings²⁷. His fight for the tapes in general, and Stone's scene where Nixon questions whether he ever approved of the raid on the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist in particular, display perfectly a man who was collecting oral evidence with historical revisionism already on his mind²⁸.

There are certainly some dubious passages in the picture (a number of scenes with Pat and for sure the «Jack Jones» meetings) and Stone once again challenges historical convention in certain areas of Nixon's life. In his efforts to reveal the depth of malfeasance going on in the White House Stone includes a concocted scene between John Dean and Howard Hunt on a Washington bridge when the two in actual fact rarely talked let alone met²⁹. The confrontation is again used as a device by the director to reveal the allegorical motif of the film with Hunt warning Dean that «...he's the darkness reaching out for the darkness. Your grave is dug John.»³⁰

It might be easy to posit the notion that by jumping between the present and the past, by inserting 16mm with black and white film, reconstructed documentary with actual footage, that Stone is only covering his tracks in a similar manner to JFK. The film is certainly part myth, but then so is the tragic and discredited figure of Richard Nixon. His brothers Arthur and Harold, his mother Hannah, the Bay of Pigs, JFK and Dallas; all that he was a part of succumbed to tragedy and destruction. The key point is that the

film offers an interpretation of Nixon that is wary and suspicious of all the rancour that surrounds him, but who is too fascinated by the resting places of power, by the office itself, to care about the lies and deceit that have emasculated that power.

Nixon then, does not offer us a wildly revisionist account, cinematically, of the foibles of the man, in the way that Robert Altman's 1985 film, *Secret Honor*, gave us Phillip Baker Hall as a tyrannical version of the president. Nor does it make any grandiose attempt to reconstruct Nixon's ideological outlook in the way that, for instance, Joan Hoff Wilson's book *Nixon Reconsidered*, presented itself³¹. Most commentators have identified the film as largely uncontroversial and the only severe backlash (outside of Nixon personnel themselves) was mounted by the Nixon library at Yorba Linda, as Karen Dean's article on the film recounts³². What we get, therefore, is a portrait of a man forever haunted by the darkness that tormented his soul. When Stone talks of the inevitability of Nixon's downfall, he is echoing the thoughts of Henry Kissinger who thought that Nixon subconsciously wanted to reveal the tapes, that he desired a public purge as a means to confront his own morality and mortality. It then provided a challenge to the rest of his life, a challenge to re-write history, a chance to, in his own words, get back into the arena. In conclusion, Stone comes close to admitting triumph for Nixon in this feat.

The final clip of Nixon's funeral in April 1994 found all the living presidents in attendance and the eulogies confirmed the repatriation of the cold war warrior to the cause of American democracy. Stone argues for a man who knew what politics was all about but just couldn't get a handle on life, or perhaps more specifically people. As Howard Baker of Tennessee famously said in the Senate hearings, Nixon was undone by two simple questions: «What did the president know and when did he know it?» Stone's Nixon is really asking the alternative, more personal questions: «Who did the president know and why did he know them?»

The administration's key personnel worked in the nethermost worlds. A political landscape of gloom inhabited by shadowy forces. Matters of reliability, honour, and truth, were only distant cousins to the ideology Nixon allowed some people to operate under. Stone presents this picture of disintegration like John Dean's «cancer», as slowly but inexorably spreading through the White House. If, however, he has chosen to be oblique in his interpretation, it is because personal and political relations with Richard Nixon were never straightforward. Friends tended to be mere colleagues and acquaintances were, more often than not, transformed into enemies. Nixon's acerbity could be equally matched by kind gestures, but devilish intentions lurked around every corner. It is not a question of what we believe about Richard Nixon so much as what he believed about himself. Karen Dean's criticism that the darker and troubled psychosis of Nixon is allowed to be played off in greater scale than his presentation of facade and false pretence in the second half of the picture is valid I think³³. But Stone still persists to remind us that by the end what Nixon didn't know, couldn't see, or wouldn't accept, were the lengths people were prepared to go to in conducting business under his name.

Stone's parable is ultimately an uncomplicated reading of the dilemma of leadership, and the personality traits that can make power so treacherous to those who lose the ascendancy. It is a notion best expressed in his classic text, *Presidential Power*, where political theorist Richard Neustadt confirms the validity of the Stone thesis with a simple, conclusive observation.

«Nixon was remarkably inept about a key aspect of power and that the most concrete of all, whom to trust.»³⁴

NOTES AND REFERENCES:

- (1) HALDEMAN, H.R. *The Ends of Power*. London: Book Club Associates, 1978. p. xii.
- (2) *Ibid.*, p. 59.
- (3) See AMBROSE, Stephen. *Nixon: Ruin and Recovery, 1973-90*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991. p. 587. KISSINGER, Henry: *Years of Upheaval*. Boston: Little Brown, 1982. p. 74.
- (4) WILKINSON, Christopher. «The Year of the Beast» in HAMBURG, Eric (ed.) *Nixon: An Oliver Stone Film*. London: Bloomsbury, 1996. p. 59.
- (5) WOODWARD, Bob; BERNSTEIN, Carl. *The Final Days*. London: Coronel, 1988 (Fifth Impression, First published in 1976), p. 498.

- (6) Stone admitted up to some similarities to *Citizen Kane* in interviews for the film. See ANDREW, Anthony. «All the Director's Men», *The Observer Preview*, March 17th, 1996, pp. 6-9. For reviews that included references to *Citizen Kane*, see CORLISS, Richard. «Death of a Salesman», *Time Magazine*, January 15th, 1996. ERRIGO, Angie. "Nixon», *Premiere*, March 1996.
- (7) Stone's admiration for Welles' cinematic style dates back to his time at the NYU Film School in the early 1970' s. See RIODAN, James. *Stone. The Controversies, Excesses and Expleits of a Radical Filmmaker*. London: Aurum Press, 1996, pp. 534-35.
- (8) McBRIDE, Joseph. *Orson Welles*. New York: De Capo, 1996 (Press, first published in 1972, this edition Revised and updated, 1996), p. 32.
- (9) SINGER, Michael. "Interview with Oliver Stone», HAMBURG, Eric (ed.) *Op. cit.*, p. xvii.
- (10) SCHELL, Jonathan. *The Time of Illusion*. New York: Alfred K. Knopf, 1975, p. 374.
- (11) SINGER, Michael. "Interview with Oliver Stone», HAMBURG, Eric (ed.) *Op. cit.*, p. xvii.
- (12) Two highly critical articles that appeared in the British press at the time of the film's release were AMIEL, Barbara. "How Hopkins saved Nixon from being Stoned to Death», *The Times*, January 18th, 1996; GOLWAY, Terry. "Enslaved by the Beast», *The Guardian*, December 14th, 1995.
- (13) KUTLER, Stanley. *The Wars of Watergate: The Last Crisis of Richard Nixon*. London: Norton, 1992.
- (14) BISKIND, Peter. "Rolling with Stone», *Premiere*, March 1996, pp. 76-85. Two films of most interest to Stone seem to have been *Ivan the Terrible* and *Alexander Nevsky*.
- (15) RIODAN, James. *Op. cit.*, p. 536.
- (16) Stone cites a number of sources for the "Track 2» plot, including Fawn BRODIE (*Richard Nixon: The Shaping of his Character*) and Peter Dale SCOTT (*Deep Politics and the death of J.F.K.*). This was a conspiracy to assassinate Fidel Castro with links to the Bay of Pigs invasion and the death of J.F.K.. He has admitted, however, to *Newsweek* magazine that he is speculating in this area. See THOMAS, Evan. "Whose Obsession is it Anyway?», *Newsweek*, January 8th, 1996.
- (17) WHITE, Theodore. *Breach of Faith: The Fall of Richard Nixon*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1975. p. 34.
- (18) EMERY, Fred. *Watergate: The Corruption and Fall of Richard Nixon*. London: Pimlico, 1994, p. 171. Emery also reveals that Mitchell had given away some of his cover only a week before by revealing to Colson that he had, and could, bug the rooms of certain people, in this case fundraiser Dwayne Andreas. pp. 126-27.
- (19) WHITE, Theodore. *Op. cit.*, p. 164.
- (20) SEARS, John. "Richard Nixon: The Loner», HAMBURG, Eric (ed.) *Op. cit.*, pp. 50-55.
- (21) There is film of one of Nixon's trips to the Lincoln Memorial, but also see AMBROSE, Stephen. *Nixon: The Triumph of a Politician 1962-72*, pp. 355-356; WICKER, Tom. *One of Us: Richard Nixon and the American Dream*. New York: Random House, 1991.
- (22) For further descriptions and thoughts of Ford on the making of the film see SHINDLER, Colin. *Hollywood in Crisis: Cinema and American Society 1929-39*. London: Routledge, 1996, p. 80.
- (23) STONE, Oliver; WILKINSON, Christopher; RIVELE, J. «Nixon: The Original Annotated Screenplay», HAMBURG, Eric (ed.): *Op. cit.*, p. 184.
- (24) MATTHEWS, Christopher. *Kennedy & Nixon*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- (25) The portrait Nixon speaks to in the White House lobby makes a prominent appearance in Rob Reiner's film, *The American President*. Shooting at roughly the same time, and even allowing for the fact that Stone had a \$43 million budget, he borrowed Reiner's sets for the White House interior placing this particular picture in a different location.
- (26) STONE; WILKINSON; RIVELE. «Nixon: The Original Annotated Screenplay», HAMBURG, Eric (ed.) *Op. cit.*, p. 303.
- (27) There is an interesting scene cut from the wedding moments in the film, but restored to the American video release where J. Edgar Hoover (Bob Hoskins) suggests that Nixon should install a taping system in the Oval Office.
- (28) STONE; WILKINSON; RIVELE. *Op. cit.*, p. 112.
- (29) *Ibid.*, The scene featuring Hunt and Dean on the bridge. Dialogue slightly amended in the Film itself. pp 261-63.
- (30) *Ibid.*, Quote from Hunt p. 263. Final dialogue amended in film.
- (31) WILSON, Joan Hoff. *Nixon Reconsidered*. New York: Basic Books, 1994.
- (32). DEAN, Karen. «Citizen Dick, Nobody's Nixon», *Metro*, Vol. 19 (1997): 28-31.
- (33) *Ibid.*, p. 31.
- (34) NEUSTADT, Richard E. *Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents: The Politics of Leadership from Roosevelt to Reagan*. New York: Macmillan, 1990, pp. 213-214.

IAN SCOTT is Lecturer in American Studies, Faculty of Arts at The University of Manchester (UK).

© *Film-Historia*, Vol. IX, No.1 (1999): 35-45