Empire to the West:
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Rich in social significance, Red River is as teeming with messages as it is with meat on the hoof. The inevitable encounter between Tom Dunson (John Wayne) and Matthew Garth (Montgomery Clift) as the cattle drive is completed.
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Red River is one of the curiosities in American film history. Nearly everyone pays homage to it, almost no one pays attention to it. Howard Hawks's first Western—incredibly, after two decades of directing and nearly thirty films, this was his first Western—was hailed on its release in September 1948 as an archetypal Western, the quintessential Western, the kind that tangles all the nerve endings but never touches the brain. A rattling good outdoor adventure movie, was Time magazine's assessment. Peter Bogdanovich in The Last Picture Show caught the core of its iconographic value by showing the commencment of the cattle drive on a small-town Texas theater screen. "Take 'em to Missouri, Matt," crusty Tom Dunson says, the music flares, and we see that classic sequence of cowboys in closeup yelling, "Ya hoo. Hi yaa. Ya hoo. Whoopee. Yaa. Ya hoo. Ya Ya Ya." A magnificent horse opera, Pauline Kael called Red River, and there is no denying that a chorus of "ya hoos" does not address the deeper issues of that time, our time, or any time.

"When things get tough in Hollywood they start the horses galloping," wrote Kyle Crichton, in the midst of the backlash from the blacklist, in his 1948 Collier's review of Red River. "Nobody can yell 'propaganda' at a motion picture full of cows, horses, gun play, brave women and daring men." It became the central theme of Red River criticism, that here was a motion picture happily innocent of ideology, and the great French critic André Bazin a few years later gave this attitude toward Red River its definitive expression.

"Howard Hawks, indeed," Bazin wrote, "at the height of the vogue of the superwestern should be credited with having demonstrated that it had always been possible to turn out a genuine western based on the old dramatic and spectacle themes, without distracting our attention with some social thesis, or, what would amount to the same thing, by the form given the production. Red River (1948) and The Big Sky (1952) are western masterpieces but there is nothing baroque or decadent about them."

Ultimately the critical consensus on Red River succeeded too well. It enshrined the film on a pedestal, a masterpiece of old-fashioned movie entertainment, a spectacle without, thankfully, social significance; it rendered the film irrelevant. Some of the most penetrating interpretations of Hawks's career ignore Red River completely. Those who aspire to complete coverage generally notice Red River for its mise-en-scène, its spectacular (what else?) set-pieces, the stampede, the river crossing, the final confrontation between Dunson and Matt.

No one noticed that there might have been a motive in the dual gesture of honoring and dismissing Red River, that there is a curious note of overkill in Bazin's and the reviewers' remarks—that they protest a little too much Red River's mindlessness, as if trying too hard to keep us from seeing some things they prefer us not to see. No one noted that film criticism as much as any other intellectual or artistic pursuit has its ideological foundation, even when its ideological project is to deny the presence of ideology. No one observed the most obvious fact of all: that Red River is rich in social significance, is as teeming with messages as it is with meat on the hoof.

Red River announces itself, in fact, boldly. It is a film about the issues of empire. It is a film about the territorial expansion of one society by the usurpation of land from others, and the consequences arising therefrom—in the relations between men and women, in the relations between men and other men, in the social compact that binds people together for a common purpose. And these human themes, important as they are, are subordinate to even more fundamental issues of economic survival, of commodity production, above all of the need to find a market for one's goods. Red River is a film about cows, horses, gun play, brave women, daring men—and capitalism.

When Matthew Garth brings Tom Dunson's herd into Abilene, opening the Chisholm Trail route for Texas cattle to reach a Kansas railhead, Chicago stockyards, and distant consumers, the Red River dialogue continuity script has a voiceover line (later eliminated from the completed film) spoken by Groot the cook: "It was just the first of thousands of such drives bringin' beef to the world." That the issues Red River raises of empire and markets were also central issues of American economic power and expansion after World War II
should come as no surprise to anyone, except those film critics who prefer their masterpieces to be meaningless.

Red River is not only about capitalism; its form and its destiny were also the products of capitalism, specifically of the changing economic structure of the Hollywood film industry in the postwar years. The film’s director and producer, Howard Hawks, was a man not unlike its hero Thomas Dunson, a man with a vision, a man leaving the ordinary ways and trying to establish himself independently, struggling to find a market and gain a return on his investment of time and toil. He was to face as many challenges as Tom Dunson in reaching his goal.

Hawks was among the half dozen or so long-time studio directors—Frank Capra, William Wyler, Leo McCarey, Preston Sturges, and George Stevens were others—who aspired after World War II to work independently of the Hollywood factory system. They wanted to break away from assembly-line studio production methods, to develop their own properties, and maintain control of the filmmaking process from beginning to end. What they wanted was soon to be commonplace in posttelevision Hollywood, but for some of them the desire was a few years premature. Hawks was actually one of the few to accomplish what he set out to do.

In December 1945 Hawks took part in establishing a corporation, Monterey Productions, Inc., with himself as president. Red River was Monterey Productions’ only product. The last one hears about Monterey Productions is some six years later, when Pathé Labs tries to sell the negative and sound track of Red River to recover four thousand dollars it claims Monterey still owes them. The intervening years are replete, as Hawks himself delicately put it, with “unforeseen production difficulties.”

The genesis of Red River was an original story by Borden Chase, later published in Saturday Evening Post as a serial, “The Chisholm Trail.” Chase wrote the first Red River screenplay and Charles Schnee was called in to tighten Chase’s somewhat unwieldy and rambling narrative. The story of Tom Dunson and his cattle drive seems straightforward enough, but Hawks obviously came to feel the plot needed more explanation than the shot continuity provided. At some point in postproduction he added a voiceover narration, and as late as the dialogue continuity script those lines were to be spoken by Groot. The cutting continuity script, however, dated the same time as the dialogue script, lists the shots of the “Early Tales of Texas” manuscript, the narrative backbone Hawks finally chose to use.

There may be no such source with the precise title “Early Tales of Texas,” but at least one of many first-hand accounts of cattle drives was almost surely used by Chase in developing his story. Joseph G. McCoy was an Illinois businessman who set up a shipping center for Texas cattle in Abilene in 1867 and wrote Historic Sketches of the Cattle Trade of the West and the Southwest, published in 1874. McCoy seems clearly to have been the model for Melville, who greets Matthew Garth in Abilene with the words, “Matt, I’m the Greenwood Trading Company of Illinois.” Around the basic economic tale of a commodity finding its outlet to markets, the screenwriters and director wove their stories of men with and without women, of tyranny and rebellion and reconciliation, of a man and a boy grown up.

Hawks cast John Wayne as Dunson, Walter Brennan as Groot, and a young New York stage actor, Montgomery Clift, as Matthew Garth. Joanne Dru replaced Margaret Sheridan in the role of Tess Millay at the last minute when the latter actress became pregnant and left the cast. Location shooting began early in September 1946 at Rain Valley Ranch and other ranches south of Tucson, Arizona, and production ended in December 1946 after more than seventy shooting days. Red River was budgeted at approximately 2.4 million dollars, much of it provided as a production loan by Motion Picture Investors Corporation, a firm established to channel funds from individual investors into independent productions.

Rain Valley Ranch unfortunately lived up to its name, and bad weather was the first of the “unforeseen production difficulties” to beset Red River. Extra location days began to drive up the picture’s cost, and years later an outfit called the Arizona Wranglers, the men who cared for the cattle, was still trying to collect 32,000 dollars in wages from Monterey Productions for the additional days. “As you know,” Hawks wrote to Donald Nelson, president of the Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers, in May 1947, “unforeseen production difficulties have caused this picture to cost far beyond what was originally intended,” and there were “difficulties which still have to be met in finishing this picture.” Ultimately Red River
was estimated to cost 4.1 million dollars, including prints and
advertising.

Hawks's letter to Nelson may have had something to do with his
efforts to get out of his distribution deal with United Artists and
seek a distributor who would guarantee him a larger minimum
return, to compensate for the additional production costs. *Red River*
was completed by October 1947 but it sat on the shelf for nearly a
year while Hawks wrangled and finagled. At one point there was
talk of having the Motion Picture Investors Corporation foreclose
on Monterey Productions and have its assets placed in the hands of
a trustee; the trustee, in turn, would be free to find a new distri-
butor.

United Artists succeeded in holding on to *Red River* through an
arbitration hearing. It was the only picture that troubled company
had at the time that was believed capable of realizing substantial
profits. Hawks continued to balk, however. He resisted UA's plan
to open the picture at its four Los Angeles Music Hall theaters, then
acquiesced when Fox West Coast theaters rejected UA's offer to turn
over the picture for a fifty-fifty split of the box office (*Red River*
also opened at 265 theaters affiliated with the Interstate Circuit in
Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas—Chisholm Trail country).

Then *Red River* was hit with an unforeseen postproduction
difficulty. In August 1948, a few weeks before the picture's sched-
uled opening, Howard Hughes, through the Hughes Tool Company,
 sued Monterey Productions for plagiarism. Hughes maintained that
the climactic battle between Dunson and Matt had been copied from
his controversial Western, *The Outlaw* (1943), where Billy the Kid
refuses to reach for his gun though he is nicked in the ear by a shot
fired by his one-time friend Doc Holliday. It so happened that
Hawks had developed *The Outlaw* for Hughes and had directed at
least part of the film, receiving, however, no screen credit. Within
a week a settlement was reached: twenty-four seconds were cut from
the *Red River* fight scene.

At last *Red River* made it to market. United Artists promoted it
by a perhaps unfortunate comparison to two earlier historical epics
of the West, *The Covered Wagon* (1923) and *Cimarron* (1931),
dull, earnest films, much honored but quickly forgotten. Reviews
were generally strong but box office was soft. *Variety*, reporting
the final 4.1-million-dollar total cost for the picture, set a figure of
5 million dollars gross as its break-even point. The trade paper
predicted a gross of between 4.5 and 5 million dollars from domestic
box office and 2 million dollars from overseas bookings (the term
"gross" in the language of motion picture economics generally
refers to rentals paid to the distributor, not total ticket sales).

Though information about actual motion picture revenues is notori-
ously unreliable, it is estimated that *Red River* earned just under
4.5 million dollars domestically; foreign revenues are not recorded.

Monterey Productions disappeared—leaving behind, as noted, several
disgruntled creditors—but Hawks's "unforeseen production diffi-
culties" on *Red River* did not deter him from further capitalist
ventures. He was to produce, through his own companies, nearly
two-thirds of the dozen or so films he directed during the remainder
of his career.

Themes of contract and compact are central to *Red River*. The
social use of contracts goes back a long way, of course, but in
modern society contracts denote economic relationships, exchanges,
promises, or commitments enforceable by law; they are how business
gets done in a capitalist economy. Compact, though sometimes a
synonym for contract, generally has a wider meaning, as in May-
flower Compact: an agreement among many to pursue a common
purpose, a tacit community of shared goals enforceable more by
moral or social suasion than by law. In Hawks's visual style contract
relationships are presented in closeups and two-shots, compact
situations in medium and long shot, panoramas not of spectacular
events but of men in groups, standing or sitting horse, talking or
silently observing. On one fundamental level *Red River* is a film that
asserts the superiority of compact over contract in the achievement
of economic and social goals.

Tom Dunson is a man who believes in contract. The opening shots
of the film define him. He is leaving the wagon train. The colonel
rides up and says, "You can't do that. You signed on. You agreed
with the others." Dunson replies, "I signed nothing. If I had, I'd stay.
(Emphasis added.) If you'll remember, I joined your train after you
left Saint Louis." In Borden Chase's original script Dunson *had*
signed a contract and broke it to set off on his own, but Hawks and
Charles Schnee wisely changed that because it destroys the grounds
for his later actions.
The sanctity of contract animates Dunson's behavior throughout *Red River*. He makes his cowboys sign a contract and is willing to kill those who break it. He makes a contract with Matt to add the boy's initial to the cattle brand when he has earned it. And he contracts with Fen to come and get her. The climactic conflict in *Red River* is ultimately founded not only on the opposition between contract and compact, but between two kinds of contracts Dunson and Matt have made—one between each other and one that each of them has with a woman.

The role of women in *Red River* disconcerted many of the film's contemporary reviewers. "This is a movie about men, and for men," *Time* magazine insisted, and both the *New Yorker* and the *New York Times* complained that the film was spoiled by Tess Millay's intervention in the fight between Dunson and Matt. For some spectators, the final scene of Millay stopping the fight does not seem to work; in fact, however, without that scene *Red River* would not hold together as it does. Instead of spoiling the film, Millay's act serves to unite its many themes.

For *Red River* also asserts the importance of women to the society and economy of the expanding American empire. After Dunson has announced his intention to leave the wagon train, he must tell Fen that he does not want to take her with him. "Oh, you'll need me!" she argues, in her desire to go along. "You'll need a woman. Need what a woman can give you. To do what you have to do!" Much of this scene of parting is shot so that we see only the back of Dunson's head, hiding his emotions from us. "But you're wrong," Fen cries, the first of many times Dunson is told that. He puts the snake bracelet on her wrist, a gift that binds him to her, emblem of his promise someday to rejoin her.

The next time Dunson sees that bracelet it is on the wrist of an Indian he has just fought and killed. "Oh, I wish..." he whispers to himself, and we can complete the sentence for ourselves. The Indian raid that took Fen's life had broken Dunson's contract with her, but the snake bracelet continues to embody that obligation. The shot of the bracelet on Fen's wrist is duplicated three more times in the film—Dunson's shock of recognition exemplified in the gesture of his hand grasping another person's wrist: once it is the dead Indian's, once it is Matt's, the last time it is Millay's. This final view of the bracelet reveals a contract between Matt and Millay with which Dunson, with his views on the sanctity of contract, must come to terms.

Fen had insisted on the importance of a woman in Dunson's life. After seeing the bracelet on the Indian's wrist his face contorts momentarily, on the verge of tears. That is the first and almost the only expression of emotional vulnerability John Wayne portrays. Otherwise he plays Dunson as cold, hard, stone-faced. The second time he breaks this mask comes after Dan Latimer is trampled to death in the stampede. With his wages from the cattle drive Dan was planning to buy presents for his wife, including the red shoes she always wanted. After Dan's burial, Dunson makes arrangements for the widow. "And...uh...get her...ah, anything you can think of," he instructs Matt. "Like a pair of red shoes, maybe?" Matt replies. Dunson blinks, as if again about to cry. He turns his back to the camera and says, "That's the way he wanted it, wasn't it?"

Dunson's separation from the company of women also separates him from the company of men. Perhaps he would not have been so ruthless and successful a rancher and empire-builder if Fen had been along to divert and restrain him; but his human feelings would not have so atrophied that he becomes a tyrant, believing only in contractual relations, with himself as their enforcer. Yet *Red River* makes clear that even without a woman Dunson is dependent on the feminine for his achievements. In the Indian attack on Dunson and Groot the bull is spared but both his cows are slain. No cows, no herd, no ranch—a blasted dream. Before this fact has time to register on the spectator, however, the boy Matthew Garth appears with a cow; the cow had strayed and Matthew had gone searching for it, and thus escaped the slaughter of the wagon train. Matthew restores to Dunson the indispensable feminine.

Matthew serves as bearer of the feminine principle in a society of men without women. This is one of the most subtle aspects of *Red River*, brilliantly achieved by the choice of Montgomery Clift to play Matthew, and by Clift's performance. But Clift did not completely create the ambiguous elements of Matthew's character; some of those elements are even stronger in Borden Chase's original script than in the film itself. There, Cherry Valance several times tells Matthew he has the look of a man who needs a woman. He also tells him he's "as tender as a mother and child."
How are we to understand Matthew Garth? On one side he is a superb gunfighter, and he went off to fight in the Civil War. The boy Matthew shows his toughness when Dunson confronts Don Diego's men after crossing the Red River into Texas. Knowing a gunfight is at hand, Dunson waves the boy to step back. Matt shakes his head, no. Dunson says, "Get away, Matt." The boy remains by Dunson's side, and draws his gun when Dunson does.

But on the other side is the Matthew who is sensitive, virginal, soft. One of the film's most revealing moments is the first shot when Wayne and Clift appear together. Dunson has been sitting, Matt standing with one knee bent. Preparing to rise, Dunson puts his hand on Matt's knee, Matt reaches out to help Dunson straighten up. Then he rolls a cigarette, lights it, and hands it to Dunson. This is no longer the hard, slightly-crazed, boy Matthew; as Clift plays him, he is more like an androgynous Matthew.

It is the "feminine" side of Matthew that supports Dunson, literally and figuratively, in Dunson's rise to become a powerful rancher. It is this "soft" side that reluctantly drives Matthew to side with the cowboys against Dunson, to preserve the compact that is their hope for survival, as Dunson insists ever more cruelly on enforcing the terms of contract. But after Matthew becomes a leader of men, he must become fully a man. Hence the appearance of Millay and her seduction of him, hence the need to fight it out physically with Dunson.

"It's gonna be all right," Groot cries when Matt at last fights back. "For fourteen years I've been scared . . . but it's gonna be all right." Was Groot scared that Matthew's androgyhy was going to tip to the feminine side? Perhaps part of Dunson's pleasure at Matt's violent manhood, as well, is relief, a release of sexual tension aroused by the youth's feminine role in his life. Finally, with Matt fully a man, and Dunson and Matt able to express an asexual love for each other, Millay assumes the feminine influence and imposes part of what a woman, in the terms of Red River, can give—reconciliation between men and the promise of a normal social order.

The taming of Tom Dunson's tyranny, the proving of Matthew Garth's manhood, the assertion of Tess Millay's feminine will: these are the human elements that critics refer to, along with the spectacular scenes of the cattle drive, of course, when they speak of Red River as a magnificent horse opera, as a "genuine" Western without "some social thesis" to bother our minds. But these human struggles and events take up only the foreground of Red River's larger canvas, only part of the foreground at that, and the film's critics have rarely stepped back for a wider look, for a complete view of Red River, seeing the human stories and the spectacle within their given frame. That frame, as Red River insists we recognize, is the history of American westward expansion. But many critics and spectators find it hard to recognize, because we have learned to accept the westward movement as, well, a darn good excuse for a movie, in the same class with a haunted house.

The westward movement was, of course, a series of historical events: the Indians actually were defeated and driven onto reservations, Texas actually was wrested from Mexico, Texas cattle actually did meet the railhead at Abilene. But we know all this already. That is one of the reasons we pay attention to the human and not the historical drama; the individual's destiny appears more contingent, more open, more uncertain, than the national destiny. Hawks in Red River is interested, however, in more than individual destiny. One of his major themes is the values and behavior of men in groups. His human concerns in Red River are as often social as they are individual, and the social theme inevitably links men to the process, to the contingency, to the actual events of history.

First and foremost in the historical process of the westward movement was the taking of the land. Red River, typical of its time and genre, could not care less about the Indians' claim to the land. The Indians appear as no more than cruel savages, obstacles to be overcome. But the Spanish-Mexican claim to the land is something else: a European title, a legal document. How can Dunson, the believer in contract, usurp the land from Don Diego, who holds land grants from a Spanish king? Groot supplies the justification: "That's too much land for one man. Why, it ain't decent. Here's all this land aching to be used and never has been! I tell you, it ain't decent."

The seizure of the land has a larger social purpose than personal wealth or aggrandizement: morality and utility are invoked. Dunson endorses these wider aims in his narration behind the montage sequence depicting the building of his personal empire: "Wherever they go, they'll be on my land. My land! I'll have the brand on enough beef to . . . to feed the whole . . . country. Good beef for..."
hungry people. Beef to make 'em strong...make 'em grow.' The hesitation in his voice suggests he is just discovering, indeed creating, the link between his personal empire and the nation's imperial future. It is one of the classic American visions—to do good by doing well.

And we in the audience learn that our own fates are linked with Dunson's: it was his beef, or beef from someone like him, that fed our forebears. When historical forces intervene, clouding Dunson's dream, we know that more than one man's success hangs in the balance. The Civil War impoverishes the South, leaving Texas rich in commodities—cattle—but poor in capital. Without a market, all of that meat on the hoof is not worth a cent. "He learned that a ranch ain't only beef, but it's money," says Groot of Dunson. "But the war took all the money out of the South. He never knew about money, Matt, he never had none. He...he didn't know what to do." Dunson begins to realize that his personal destiny is linked not only to hungry consumers, but also to Northern and Eastern capital.

Matthew makes a significant reply to Groot's explanation. "You mean," Matthew says, "he just doesn't know who to fight." Dunson's skill is as a fighter—he fought the Indians, he fought Don Diego's emissaries, he fought the men who lie in seven graves on his ranch. He never knew about money, because he never had money. He is a feudal lord, and Texas is preparing to undergo the transition from feudalism to capitalism. His cowboys are not mere hired hands. They are, or once were, landowners and cattle ranchers too, though their properties were destroyed, scattered, or stolen by war and postwar "carpetbaggers." For them the cattle drive is not simply a way to earn a living, it is their opportunity to accumulate capital, to qualify for full participation in the rewards of the new capitalist era. Their need for solidarity, for an effective working compact, is no abstract or sentimental thing, it is essential for their economic advancement.

Nowhere in Red River is this theme presented more vividly than in the shot that precedes the stampede. In the background of the frame, in deep focus, stands Buck Keneally, the sugar thief, pots falling all around him. In the foreground are six men in closeup, expectation and fear on their faces, looking not toward Buck but away from him and off screen, looking toward the herd. This economic theme also gives meaning to the many shots in Red River of men in groups, standing around, looking and listening as other men talk. Hawks in fact frames many shots with men in profile on both sides of the frame, witnessing conversations or confrontations. They are not casual observers, they are part of the compact, their futures are involved.

Far more is at stake here, for example, than a husband's wish to buy a present for his wife, "a pair of red shoes." Dunson's sentimentiality over Dan Latimer's widow is a welcome sign of humanity but it also reveals his limitations. The loss of his woman seems in fact at times so to control his feelings that he cannot even recognize the larger issues at stake for his men. Perhaps he thinks all they want to do with their earnings is buy presents for their families, rather than what they actually do want—land, cattle, income-producing property. "I'll do the thinking," Dunson says, but it becomes clearer and clearer that his mode of thinking is inadequate. "Don't tell me what to think," Matthew at last tells him. "I'll take your orders about work but not about what to think."

The critical turning point comes after Teeler, Laredo, and Bill Kelsey run off. Estranged from Matt, completely drained of human feelings for his men, Dunson sends Cherry Valance to bring them back. He returns with Teeler and Laredo, having killed Kelsey. "I'm the law," Dunson says, preparing to hang them, marking the extreme point of his tyranny. Teeler then speaks for the compact among the men. "You're crazy...This herd don't belong to you. It belongs to every poor hopin', pravin' settler in the whole wide State. I shouldn't have run away. I should have stayed and put a bullet in you. I signed a pledge, sure. But you ain't the man I signed it with."

As Teeler speaks, Matt edges slowly away from Dunson's side—the opposite of the boy Matthew's behavior when Dunson tried to wave him off in the confrontation with Don Diego's men. Matthew rebels against Dunson, and Cherry Valance, the gunfighter whose last name means an ornamental piece of drapery, sides with Matthew. Ornamental Cherry may be, particularly for his taunting of Matt and his threat to get Matt's gun (symbol-readers may do what they will with the fact that a man named Cherry wants another man's "gun"); but he understands the capitalist imperatives as well as any other of the men.
The cattle get to Abilene, Northern capitalism makes its appearance ("I'm the Greenwood Trading Company of Illinois"), and Thomas Dunson, by proxy, is introduced to capitalism by means of a bank check for his cattle. The heroes and heroines of the American West have suffered their struggles and tribulations, have made their legends, in service of a larger social purpose. Texas beef will make Americans strong in body; sold to the world, it will make America strong in balance of payments.

Red River was an imperialist film for an imperialist era in American life. That it ends with a woman firing a gun at two brawling Texas gunmen, who, it turns out, are expressing their love for each other, only serves to remind us, after all, how benign the behavior and purposes of Americans really are.

NOTES

The Howard Hawks Collection in the Arts and Communications Archives, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, contains considerable material on Red River, including the original Borden Chase script, final dialogue continuity and cutting continuity scripts, and files pertaining to production, advertising copy and strategy, correspondence, and newspaper reviews. I wish to express my thanks to James V. D'Arc, Curator, Arts and Communications Archives, for his aid in my use of this material. A useful file of materials on Red River, mainly clippings, is in the Margaret Herrick Library of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Los Angeles.

Red River dialogue quotations are taken from the dialogue continuity script in the Harold B. Lee Library and checked against the actual film.

Information on Red River reviews comes from the Academy files. Dates of cited reviews are as follows: Time, October 11, 1948; Colliers, October 9, 1948; New Yorker, October 9, 1948; New York Times, October 10, 1948.

Information on Red River production and postproduction, as well as financial data, comes from the Production and Correspondence files in the Howard Hawks Collection, and from clippings in the Academy file, including the following: Variety, July 30, August 16, August 23, and December 7, 1948; Daily Variety, August 3, 1948; Hollywood Reporter, August 16, 1948; Los Angeles Times, August 20, 1948; New York Times, February 2, 1948; Hollywood Citizen-News, August 18, 1952.

Hawks's letter to Donald Nelson, May 9, 1947, is in the Correspondence file of the Howard Hawks Collection.