Introduction to Screenplay’s Gone with the Wind

Walter KLINGER

Gone with the Wind (1939) is a landmark and a legend of the Golden Age of Hollywood. The film amazes and seduces “by force of color and music, by the dynamics of movement and incident, and by the beauty of movie stars” (Pierpont 1992:101); Andrew Sarris (1973) called it the “moviest of all movies.” Scarlett’s adventures and misadventures are at times dramatic and sympathetic; over-the-top and hilarious; nasty and repellant. Vivien Leigh is hypnotic to watch; her acting is inspired.

Using movies and TV shows, by reading the scripts and listening and watching the media, is an enjoyable and fairly effective way to learn languages, as the target language appears in realistic and interesting contexts. The language material is typically delivered as conversations, so movies are especially useful for learning spoken forms and styles. I have discussed this topic more fully in Klinger (2005). Gone with the Wind is quite a “talky” film with a lot of extended conversations, and, while the speaking speed is often quite fast, I think it may be good for English studies.

I am particularly fond of the frequent lines and scenes that Pierpont (1992:94) describes as having “a lightness and a barely transplanted ‘jazz age’ fizziness that manage to lift the text briefly on little gusts of social comedy,” as in “the crossed signals of Charles Hamilton’s warm proposal of love and Scarlett’s frosty response.” Margaret Mitchell’s 1936 novel reflects the writing styles and lifestyles of the Roaring Twenties. No woman like Scarlett really lived in the 1860s; “nothing on record supports her Reconstruction-era feminist heroics” of “trading with carpetbaggers and running a sawmill” (Dickey 2007:57). Scarlett’s adventures in love and marriage also belong more to a Jazz Age woman, rather like Mitchell herself, than to a woman of the 1860s.¹ “But even from the start,” Pierpont (1992:94)

¹ Pierpont (1992:94) notes Mitchell’s admiration for F. Scott Fitzgerald’s writing style. Newspapers reported that Mitchell did not attend the Atlanta Junior League Ball the evening before the premiere of the movie because of “illness,” but more probably it was because the Junior League had snubbed her years before, and she was snubbing them in return, --a very Scarlett-like move. She had earlier “scandalized the Junior League by performing, at a charity ball, an Apache dance, complete with clinch, adapted from a Valentino movie” (Pierpont
continues, “these patches of light are heavily overshadowed, and are finally blotted out entirely, by the inescapable grimness of Mitchell’s racial politics.” Objections have been raised by many critics and commentators concerning, especially the novel, but also the film script (largely written by Sidney Howard), about their depictions of interracial relationships and events in the American Civil War and Reconstruction period. In particular, the novel and the film portray slavery as an “essentially humane” (Vials 2006), “benevolent and harmonious system” (Sinha 2000:222).

For this reason, I am hesitant to use the film in EFL classes without providing students with a lot of information and commentary about the story and its historical setting. Screenplay Publishers of Nagoya this year published a bilingual reference book (Toyoizumi 2009), containing the film dialogue, short descriptions of screen actions, translations of the dialogue and the actions into Japanese, and notes in Japanese explaining English vocabulary and usage. This article discusses some of the admirable, dubious, and repellant themes of Gone with the Wind (GWTW), as a supplement to the Screenplay book.

The introductory section of the Screenplay book presents information about the production of the film and its commercial success, bios of the major stars, and information about English usage. There were great problems with taking the book, at 1,035 pages, 460,000 words, and, when read aloud, 50 hours long, and condensing it into a movie of just under 4 hours; there was a highly publicized search for an actress to play Scarlett; directors, scriptwriters and crew were hired and fired and quit. Ron Hutchinson’s 2005 slapstick stage play, Moonlight and Magnolias, has fun with some of these well-known details. There are grim facts about the movie; particularly that Hattie McDaniel and the other black cast members were not welcome to attend the gala premiere in segregated Atlanta in December 1939. McDaniel’s photo was also removed from the premiere souvenir booklet; a photo of

---

1992:94). This scene is depicted in the TV movie, The Margaret Mitchell Story (1976). Rhett Butler is also quite a modern character. Rhett, says Pierpont (1992:98), is modeled “above all” on Rudolf Valentino, the biggest male movie star when Mitchell wrote her book. Mitchell had seen Valentino’s hit film, The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse (1921), “often enough to derive her scandalous charity-ball Apache dance from it, and in 1924 she had interviewed the Latin actor for the Atlanta Journal.” Clark Gable inherited Valentino’s sex symbol status, which explains why fans demanded Gable and no other actor to play Rhett. There are also parallels in Scarlett and Rhett’s tempestuous relationship with that of Mitchell and her first husband, Red Upshaw. See also Ebert (2007) for the influence of vampy movie stars on Mitchell.

2 Rather like the attitude of the novel and the film, slavery seems to be a non-issue here. Perhaps slavery is not discussed because it is a difficult subject to deal with; it is easier to write cheery, up-beat stories about the glamour of the film. My participation in the Screenplay book was to transcribe the dialogue, write the descriptions of the actions, advise the translators, and contribute a short article dealing with the various films, stage plays and books that continued or retold the story. I was thinking about contributing an article about slavery and the war, but I felt I couldn’t compose a satisfactory account in just a few paragraphs.
McDaniel dressed in character as Mammy apparently would have been acceptable, but not one of McDaniel as herself. McDaniel did, however, go on to receive the Oscar for Best Supporting Actress; the first African American to win an Academy Award.

One remarkable bit of film lore is that ten-year-old Martin Luther King Jr. sang in the Ebenezer Baptist Church choir at the Junior League costume ball the evening before the premiere. The event recaptured, in the words of a local paper, “the days at Tara Hall, when every man was a master and every man had a slave” (Pierpont 1992:101). The Margaret Mitchell House and Museum has a photo of King in the choir at the event, in slave attire before a plantation backdrop (Richardson 2008). The Atlanta Daily World, one of the city’s black newspapers, reported that the choir “drew long rounds of applause” for their performance of four religious numbers, each of which “swelled the hearts of the hundreds of lucky white persons attending the gala affair” (Dickey 2007:35).

GWTW was first shown on television over two evenings, Nov. 7 and 8, 1976, and seen by 47.5 percent of American households and 65 percent of television viewers. The two parts rank #8 and #9 on a Wikipedia list of The Most-Watched TV Broadcasts of All Time. The movie ranked #1 on the American Film Institute (AFI, http://www.afi.com/)’s 1977 list of the Greatest American Films of All Time, as voted by 35,000 members. In the AFI’s 1998 list, it had fallen to #4, after Citizen Kane (1941), Casablanca (1942), and The Godfather (1972). On the AFI’s 2007 list, GWTW dropped two more places, after Citizen Kane, The Godfather, Casablanca, Raging Bull (1980), and Singin’ in the Rain (1952). These high rankings may reflect the value people place on the film for its technical production qualities and acting talent; the drop in ranking may reflect an increasing understanding and conviction that its depiction of race relationships and history is deceptive and wrong.

GWTW receives high rankings for its tale of romantic relationships, although (or perhaps because) Scarlett’s relationships all seem to have failed. The movie is #2 on AFI’s list of America’s Greatest Love Stories, behind Casablanca and ahead of West Side Story (1961). Scarlett’s rather destructive relationships with the three men who she marries and

---

3 The Carol Burnett Show presented the parody, Went with the Wind, a few days later, on Nov. 13. The final episode of Roots: the Saga of an American Family, the 12-hour miniseries shown over eight consecutive nights in 1977, and which provided a truer, if grimmer, description of slavery than GWTW, ranks #3. A 14-hour sequel to Roots was broadcast in 1979, Roots: the Next Generations, featuring Olivia de Havilland (GWTW’s Melanie) as a Southerner in the years after the Civil War. Her son marries a black woman and is ostracized; de Havilland’s character cannot tell her grandchild that she is his grandmother and is pained that she cannot have a warm relationship with the child.

4 For other comments about changes in the AFI’s list, see Ebert (2007) and Kirschling (2007).
with the fourth who she can’t, but who is the only one she loves, at least until the last few minutes of the film, make for an engrossing story. They provide an aspect of the story that can be appreciated and enjoyed without having to think about the morbid historical setting. Says film critic Roger Ebert (2007), “The most thrilling struggle in GWTW is not between North and South, but between Scarlett’s lust and her vanity.” Posters advertising the film often show Scarlett and Rhett in a romantic clinch, as does the cover of the Screenplay book. It is of course not only the characters that are being advertised, but the stars as well: Clark Gable is #7 on the AFI list of the Top 25 Male Screen Legends, and Vivien Leigh #16 on the Top 25 Female Legends.\(^5\)

GWTW ranks #1 in a 2008 Harris Poll online survey of 2,279 American adults (Harris Poll 2008) on their favorite films. More specifically, it is #1 among women, #2 among men after Star Wars (1977), and #1 among Baby Boomers (ages 44-62) and Matures (ages 63 and older). Echo Boomers (ages 18-31) and Gen X (ages 32-43) rank Star Wars #1, and African Americans Casablanca. It ranks #4 on the AFI list of Epic Films (“large-scale films set in a cinematic interpretation of the past”), after Lawrence of Arabia (1962), Ben-Hur (1959), and Schindler’s List (1993). It rates 3 entries in AFI’s list of Memorable Movie Quotes: #1 Frankly, my dear, I don’t give a damn., #31 After all, tomorrow is another day!, and #59 As God is my witness; I’ll never be hungry again. The soundtrack ranks #2 on the AFI list of 100 Years of Film Scores, between Star Wars and Lawrence of Arabia (1962). The film is #8 on Entertainment Weekly’s 1999 list of the 100 Greatest Movies of All Time, and #23 on The Writers Guild of America list of 101 Screenplays.

GWTW does not appear at all on Time Magazine’s 2005 list of The All-Time 100 Films. Film critic Richard Corliss (2005) explains, “Here’s why this is not on our All-Time 100 Movies List: It is indefensible as social history; it lags in its second half; it lacks a strong directorial signature.” Corliss does continue with the film’s good points: “All that leaves is the film’s epic ambition, its steam train of story propulsion, a ravishing visual design and performances of glamour and power. Which makes this super-production of the Margaret Mitchell best-seller the ultimate Hollywood movie.” While Corliss says he would have

---

\(^5\) GWTW is also interesting for its depictions about mother-daughter relationships and relationships between women. As for the content of the love story, Cascio & Gasker (2003) suggest that the relationships in GWTW can help certain people deal with their own relationship problems. Cascio & Gasker say that finding the perfect life partner is the “ultimate impossible dream,” and that Scarlett’s “prototype of the sufferer of unrequited love” is characterized by “supreme wishful thinking, lack of self-reflection, obsession, and repeating mother’s history.” Repeating her mother’s history in unattainable love is a feature of the novel not explained in the film.
included GWTW in the *Time Magazine* list, his partner, Richard Schickel, vetoed his choice, saying,

I thought the picture was OK. But no more than that. Why? Well, frankly, my dear, I didn’t (and don’t) give a damn about the South’s yokel notion that it once supported a new age of chivalry and grace. The historical evidence for that contention is slight, and even if such an age had actually flowered, it had no place in America. (Schickel 1973)

Historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. (1973) described the movie: “It has an epic theme: the downfall of a brave, haughty, and obtuse ruling class against a backdrop of war and social upheaval. But it loses the theme in a morass of unconvincing sentimentality. It aspires to opera and achieves soap opera.” DeWees (2004) asks, “How can a film actually invite us to root for Confederates?” Herrington (1998) says that, in GWTW, “the suffering of the master class is the only suffering that matters.” The film, Herrington continues, “should be seen as entertainment and as cultural history. But perhaps it can be seen not as it was intended, as a monument to our lost glory, but as a Technicolor tombstone to a culture we’ve overcome.”

*Premiere Magazine* ranked GWTW “#1 on its list of Top Over-rated Films of All Time. Hoiberman (2009) draws a parallel with the fading reputation of the 1970 music documentary *Woodstock*: “Once upon a time, this ultimate rock doc seemed like a hippie *Triumph of the Will*; now it’s more like the boomer *Gone with the Wind*, long, quaint, and terminally over-mythologized.”

GWTW played continuously in movie theaters in London for four years during World War 2, during the Blitz when the Nazis were bombing the city relentlessly. Scarlett’s story provided Britons with an “encouraging message” of “spiritual survival at any cost” (Campbell 1981). GWTW ranks #34 on British film magazine *Empire*’s 2008 readers’ poll of the 500 Greatest Movies of All Time, and #80 on British film guide Halliwell’s 2005 list of Top 1,000 Movies.

The novel was tremendous popular throughout Europe before and during WW2. A translator said “it does not contain any ideas which could displease the Hitler government” (Pierpont 1992:101). 6 In Germany, 276,900 copies of *Vom Winde Verweht* had been printed by July 1941; a German newspaper reviewer praised Mitchell’s depiction of life in the antebellum South, “a wonderful, strictly regulated life,” with “patriarchal, well-defined relationships between black and white” (Haag 1989:282). The Nazis allowed Mitchell’s

---

6 Hitler apparently was disappointed by the Confederate defeat in the Civil War, saying, “The beginnings of a great new social order based on the principle of slavery and inequality were destroyed by that war, and with them the embryo of a future truly great America that would not have been ruled by a corrupt class of tradesmen, but by a real Herren-class (master class) that would have swept away all the falsities of liberty and equality” (Haag 1989:29; see also Bonner 2007).
novel to be sold in the countries they conquered and occupied, until “its message was revealed to the Nazi government as so mercurial, its value as propaganda so unreliable, that it was suddenly banned” (Pierpont 1992:101). The Nazis came to the realization that they were “not the only ones to identify with the rebels in gray who would not accept defeat” (Pierpont 1992:101). The Nazis came to the realization that they were “not the only ones to identify with the rebels in gray who would not accept defeat” (Pierpont 1992:101). The New York Journal-American reported in 1944 that

bootlegged copies of the book were selling for sixty dollars in France and for nearly as much in Holland, Norway, and Belgium. According to the report, orders to seize all such copies had gone out, and people caught with the book in their possession were being shot. (Pierpont 1992:101)

The novel sold in the millions in Russia when it became legally available after 1982; it was praised as people’s literature by Chinese authorities during the trial of the Gang of Four; Vietnamese identified with the story of people suffering in a nation divided and battered (Stewart 2005). Americans struggling during the Great Depression of the 1930s empathized with Scarlett’s determination to survive.7

Perhaps the most inspiring moment in the movie is Scarlett’s oath, “As God is my witness, they’re not going to lick me.” In the novel, “they” is identified as “the Yankees;” but the movie’s vague “they” could be taken by people around the world, in completely different circumstances, to mean “anyone who tries to beat me down.” Scarlett, her fellow suffering white Southerners, and, by extension, the entire suffering Confederacy, became identified to fans around the world as representing endurance during wartime, and, with various interpretations, resistance to conquerors.

However, some people are amazed, even angry, that Scarlett should receive such praise for her struggles. Alice Walker, author of The Color Purple (1982), said, “It is a film in which one spoiled white woman’s summer of picking cotton is deemed more important than the work, under the lash, of twenty generations of my ancestors” (quoted in Donaldson 2008). After a period of toil in the Tara fields, Scarlett marries a prosperous businessman who sets her up in her own business; later, she marries a very rich man and returns to her pre-war life of idle leisure. It seems that Scarlett’s hardship was soon resolved. There is no acknowledgement, let alone sympathy, in either novel or film, that the slaves, as Walker pointed out, suffered and struggled for generations. Roger Ebert (1998) similarly notes,

7 Fans would perhaps hesitate to lie, steal, cheat, kill, and offer to sell sex to the extent that Scarlett did. Scarlett’s determination to survive could be admired to a certain degree, but it seems that women often identified more with Melanie. Pierpont (1992:91) says that, in 1957, “a survey of a class of American high-school girls, noted by Helen Taylor in the book Scarlett’s Women, found that all but one of the girls identified with docile Melanie, or claimed to; and that in a similar survey of 1970, also mentioned by Taylor, three-quarters of the girls firmly aligned themselves with Scarlett.” Mitchell herself thought that Melanie was “the heroine of the book” (Pierpont 1992:91).
“The movie sidesteps the inconvenient fact that plantation gentility was purchased with the sweat of slaves (there is more sympathy for Scarlett getting calluses on her pretty little hands than for all the crimes of slavery).” For a number of reasons, then, GWTW ranks a respectable, though much lower relative to its other high ratings, #43 on the American Film Institute’s list of “100 Years…100 Cheers: America’s Most Inspiring Movies.”

A scene often seen in documentaries about the fall of communism is a man standing on the Berlin Wall when it came down in 1989, waving a large Confederate flag. We must assume that the flag-bearer did not mean to proclaim that his cause was freedom to own slaves. The Confederate flag has become for some people a symbol of rebellion in general; Kaufman (2006:80-84), for example, describes how it is waved at concerts of some southern white male rock musicians. The meaning of the flag continues to stimulate heated arguments; it provokes opposing reactions, typically either pride in a southern white heritage or way of life, or revulsion for the cause whose battle flag it was. It seems that the enormous popularity of Mitchell’s book when it was first published might have had something to do with stimulating enthusiasm to display the flag in segregated Atlanta:

On the seventy-third anniversary of the Battle of Atlanta, in July of 1937, a Confederate flag was flown over the old city center at Five Points for the first time in general memory; it was the beginning of a new—or renewed—tradition. In a letter written that November, Mitchell reported to her publisher that “the book is on the required collateral reading lists of many high schools in the South, and even a number of junior high schools and grammar schools are using it.” (Pierpont 1992:100)

“Neo-Confederates, that is, the Southern diehards who still think the Rebels should have won” (Wyatt-Brown 2006:23) are even today trying “to find new ways of securing the meaning of white southern identity” (McPherson 2003:112). They wish to honor their heritage of “Southern language, speech, manners, music, literature, tradition, thought, custom, and faith,” and are angry when the Confederate flag is treated as a “ridiculed and despised” symbol (McPherson 2003:112). McPherson says that such neo-Confederates “don’t acknowledge shared racial traditions:”

To acknowledge the biracial nature of many regional traditions would require a recognition that

---

8 The last words in the film ranked #7, *The Grapes of Wrath* (1940), is quite similar to GWTW’s final message: “We’re the people that live. They can’t wipe us out, they can’t lick us. We’ll go on forever, Pa, ’cause we’re the people.” The last line of the #26 most inspiring film, *The Wizard of Oz* (1939), also shows a parallel: “There’s no place like home.”

9 The Georgia state flag between 1956 and 2001 featured a large Confederate cross; apparently it was chosen by the Georgia General Assembly to symbolize their opposition to the 1954 Supreme Court decision that schools must be desegregated (Graham 2000:332). During the 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games, the flag was not displayed in Olympic sites because only national flags can be displayed there. Dickey (2007:5) notes that when Atlanta was preparing its bid to host the Games, it worried that Mitchell and Selznick’s “ode to the majesty of the Old South and slavery . . . might present a politically incorrect image,” so, in the end, a film clip of GWTW “was edited out of Atlanta’s video presentation to the IOC.”
symbols like the Confederate flag do not represent a southern heritage that black southerners want to embrace. A southern heritage that does not reflect the histories and desires of black southerners is finally no southern heritage at all. (McPherson 2003:112)

McPherson finds in Mitchell’s GWTW a “latent and suppressed desire for cross-racial alliance” (McPherson 2003:71), but that “Mitchell’s text countered its own desires for racial union via a fierce and overt racism, actively suppressing its ache for union” (McPherson 2003:223).10

The leaders of the two sides that flew different flags in the Civil War unequivocally stated what they were fighting for. President Abraham Lincoln, in his Message to Congress on 4 July 1861, at the start of the War, said:

This is essentially a people’s contest. On the side of the Union it is a struggle for maintaining in the world that form and substance of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men; to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all; to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life.

This was a cause that inspired many Unionists, no matter how appealing “Dixie,” the theme song of the Rebels, might be. The cause of the Republican government against the rebel states was not at first to end slavery, though that ideal may be implied in Lincoln’s message; Lincoln’s immediate stated goal was to preserve the Union, even if it meant that slavery would continue in the states where it was legal. On 1 January 1863, Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, declaring “all persons held as slaves” in the rebel areas to be “forever free.” The Proclamation was a military order based on his authority as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, as the rebel states were using slaves for military purposes to carry on their war effort. The Emancipation Proclamation changed the character of the war and of the nation.11

Alexander H. Stephens, Vice-President of the Confederate States of America (CSA),

10 In her study of Southern literature, McPherson proposes “to understand how re-spinning southern feeling might help us to reconstruct the South’s history of commonality across racial lines, a commonality that has structured both the South’s obsession with separating black from white and its long legacy of interwoven traditions, an interweaving characterized by both disgust and desire” (McPherson 2003:18). McPherson calls for more “cross-racial alliances” in Southern literary and reflective writings: “We lack compelling narratives or theorizations of successful union (between North and South and between races)” (McPherson 2003:114). Kaufman (2006:82-84) discusses Elvis Presley’s song An American Trilogy, which acknowledges the three groups involved the Civil War, as it combines Dixie, The Battle Hymn of the Republic, and the black spiritual All My Trials. E. L. Doctorow’s novel, The March (2005), about Sherman’s march through the South, also tries to create a thoughtful and compassionate picture of the three groups caught up in the war.

11 Lincoln, despite his personal hatred of slavery, had no constitutional right as President to free any slaves in the states and areas not in rebellion; they were freed by the actions of the individual states’ and by the 13th Amendment to the Constitution. In reply to a letter in 1862 that warned him of “the dangers and evils of Emancipation,” Lincoln apparently wrote, “You must not expect me to give up this Government without playing my last card” (Browne 1887:431; Logan 1886:Chapter 20). Some 200,000 African American served in the Union Army; Glory (1989), starring Matthew Broderick and Denzel Washington, tells the story of the 54th Massachusetts Infantry, an all-black regiment formed in 1863.
in his Cornerstone Speech of 21 March 1861 in Savannah, Georgia, laid out the Southern cause:

Our new government is founded upon exactly the opposite idea; its foundations are laid, its corner-stone rests, upon the great truth that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery subordination to the superior race is his natural and normal condition. This, our new government, is the first, in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth.\(^\text{12}\)

The leader of the Union army, General Ulysses S. Grant, described his feelings when he met with the leader of the Confederate army, General Robert E. Lee, to accept Lee’s formal surrender at the Appomattox Court House on 9 April 1865:

I felt like anything rather than rejoicing at the downfall of a foe who had fought so long and valiantly, and had suffered so much for a cause, though that cause was, I believe, one of the worst for which a people ever fought, and one for which there was the least excuse.  (Grant 1885:Chapter 67)

After the war, Stephens confirmed slavery as the reason for the war:

Slavery was without doubt the occasion of secession; out of it rose the breach of compact, for instance, on the part of several Northern States in refusing to comply with Constitutional obligations as to rendition of fugitives from service. (Avary 1910:173)

Stephens is referring to the Fugitive Slave Clause of the American Constitution at the time, which said, “No Person held to Service or Labour in one State, under the Laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labour, but shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labour may be due.” Thus Slave states could claim their states’ right to permit slavery, and at the same time insist that Free states must ignore their own states’ rights of making slavery illegal, and return escaped slaves.  Stephens after the war continued:

My own opinion of slavery, as often expressed, was that if the institution was not the best, or could not be made the best, for both races, looking to the advancement and progress of both, physically and morally, it ought to be abolished. It was far from being what it might and ought to have been. Education was denied. This was wrong. I ever condemned the wrong. Marriage was not recognized. This was a wrong that I condemned. ... Great improvements were, however, going on in the condition of blacks in the South. Their general physical condition not only as to necessaries but as to comforts was better in my own neighbourhood in 1860, than was that of the whites when I can first recollect, say 1820. Much greater would have been made, I verily believe, but for outside agitation. I have but small doubt that education would have been allowed long ago in Georgia, except for outside pressure which stopped internal reform. (Avary 1910:174)

Stephens apparently means that Northerners calling for an end to slavery made Southerners so angry that they went the other way and made the conditions of slavery even more severe, so the Northerners were to blame.\(^\text{13}\) Conditions of slavery did become more severe before the

---

\(^{12}\) The full speech can be seen at http://civilwarcauses.org/corner.htm and other sites. Stephens was elected Governor of Georgia in 1882, after white Southerners forced African Americans out of the voting process. Most African Americans in the South did not regain voting rights until after the 1965 National Voting Rights Act.

\(^{13}\) The complaint is as disingenuous as the claim of slave-owners, who were making fortunes built on slave labor, that it was only Yankees who were interested in money. In his Cooper Union Address of 27 February 1860, before his election as President, Lincoln was puzzled by the logic of Southerners: “But you will not abide the election of a Republican president! In that supposed event, you say, you will destroy the Union; and then, you say, the great crime of having destroyed it will be upon us! That is cool. A highwayman holds a pistol to my ear, and mutters through his teeth, ‘Stand and deliver, or I shall kill you, and then you will be a murderer!'”
start of the fighting. McArthur & Burton noticed that, in the 1850 slave census in South Carolina,

many of the slaves appear to follow what would logically be a family order of a father, mother, children. Some of these listings, however, look like groupings of mother and children only. Church records also substantiate family relationships; members were listed as father, mother, wife, brother, and so on. (McArthur & Burton 1996:27)

Then, in the 1860 census, they noticed that “slaves were listed generally by age, and did not appear to follow any other groupings” (McArthur & Burton 1996:27). Also beginning in 1860, church records

stopped referring to slaves in quasi-familial terms, that is, “James Griffins Bob” or “Griffins boy Peter,” and used designations such as “Kizziah the property of Mrs. Eliza Harrington.” The escalating sectional tension may have encouraged a more legalistic view of relationships between masters and slaves. (McArthur & Burton 1996:28)

The white folks around Tara, on the other hand, seem to have enjoyed and kept family-like relationships with their slaves; Scarlett even knows the names of the “field hands” she runs into on the street in Atlanta. Ashley after the war tells Scarlett he would have freed his slaves after the death of his father, “if the war hadn’t already freed them” (Toyoizumi 2009:178). However, Ashley probably would not have been allowed to. A Georgia law of 1859 made it illegal to grant freedom to slaves on the death of their owner (Georgia Legislative Documents 1859). Section 46 from A Digest of the Statute Laws of the State of Georgia, Athens, 1851, said that slaves could only be manumitted (i.e., freed) by the Georgia Legislature, not by the individual owners, and that the “manumitted slave shall be liable to arrest, conviction, and re-enslavement” (quoted in Daniels 2009). Fields (2004) similarly notes the Georgia law of 1801 that banned manumission of slaves except by a Legislative Act. Some Southern states prohibited manumission entirely (Morris 1999:440, Wahl 2008). Ashley’s neighbors also would surely object to his freeing his Twelve Oaks slaves.  

The Constitution of the Confederate States made it unlikely that slavery could ever legally end. The constitution was similar to the constitution of the USA, though individual states lost their freedom to outlaw slavery within their own borders, and any future anti-slave

---

14 Perhaps he planned to take his slaves to a free state and help them start up a business there. Some states did forbid free black people from entering; but, Birney (1840:3) reasoned, “these obstructions are not insurmountable, and if the validity of the laws should be tried in the tribunals, it would be found they are unconstitutional.” It should be noted that African Americans faced racial discrimination and violence not only in the slave states but in the free-labor states as well, and throughout the nation well into the 1960s. Native Americans, Chinese, Jews, Catholics, Irish, etc., etc., also did, at various times and places. One of Mitchell’s diatribes is that Northerners “did not know that negroes had to be handled gently, as though they were children, directed, praised, petted, scolded” (Mitchell 1936). Van Deburg (1984:68) says, “Postwar historians continued to see blacks as children, uniquely susceptible to coercion and manipulation by wily northerners,” until mid-1960s research and the changing social climate acknowledged the “self-direction” and “practical intelligence” of the African Americans held as slaves and during the Reconstruction period.
law or policy would be unconstitutional. The constitution moreover declared that it was “permanent,” so no state could ever claim the right to secede. The USA Constitution did not mention a state’s right to leave the union; the rebel states claimed they had the right to leave. Gerald O’Hara in GWTW claims this supposed right for Georgia: “’Twas the sovereign right of the state of Georgia to secede from the Union” (Toyoizumi 2009:46); Ulysses S. Grant, however, made a strong argument against such a right.15

Ashley says, “I hope that the Yankees let us leave the Union in peace” (Toyoizumi 2009:48); but, the Midwestern states of the USA could not allow a foreign power to control the Mississippi River, and the two budding imperialistic nations would inevitably have come to bloody blows as they expanded. In his Second Inaugural Address on 4 March 1865, Lincoln looked back to the start of the war:

One eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the Southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was somehow, the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union, even by war; while the government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it.

Lincoln here affirms that the intention of his government at first was not to free the slaves, but to stop slavery from expanding into any new states that would be created in the West. The slave states could not accept this; they had to expand or die. Provisional President Jefferson Davis, in his First Message to the Provisional Congress of the CSA in Montgomery, Alabama, on 29 April 1861, complained of Lincoln’s policy to forbid the spread of slavery. Davis famously said, “All we ask is, to be let alone,” though he and other southern politicians were eager to gain control of Cuba, the West Indies, and Mexico, for the profits to be made from slave labor there (see McPherson 1988:104-106). Senator Toombs of Georgia, in a speech in October 1860, pointed out,

15 See McCullough (2009) and Johnston (1899) for comparisons of the two constitutions. Grant commented that the original states of the USA might have had a right to secede, but that later states, such as Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas, Florida, and Texas, never did: “Doubtless the founders of our government, the majority of them at least, regarded the confederation of the colonies as an experiment. Each colony considered itself a separate government; that the confederation was for mutual protection against a foreign foe, and the prevention of strife and war among themselves. If there had been a desire on the part of any single State to withdraw from the compact at any time while the number of States was limited to the original thirteen, I do not suppose there would have been any to contest the right, no matter how much the determination might have been regretted. The problem changed on the ratification of the Constitution by all the colonies: it changed still more when amendments were added; and if the right of any one State to withdraw continued to exist at all after the ratification of the Constitution, it certainly ceased on the formation of new States, at least so far as the new States themselves were concerned. It was never possessed at all by Florida or the States west of the Mississippi, all of which were purchased by the treasury of the entire nation. Texas and the territory brought into the Union in consequence of annexation, were purchased with both blood and treasure; and Texas, with a domain greater than that of any European state except Russia, was permitted to retain as state property all the public lands within its borders” (Grant 1885:Chapter 16. This Chapter is also excerpted in Finseth 2006:28-34).
In a few more years our slave population will have increased from the eight thousand of the Revolution to twelve millions. If, then, the slave territory remains the same, either the blacks must run away from the whites, or the whites will run from the blacks. The South, therefore, must, whether she will or no, take Mexico, Central America, the isles of the sea. (Breck 1860)

Karl Marx was observing from London:

The whole movement was and is based, as one sees, on the slave question. Not in the sense of whether the slaves within the existing slave states should be emancipated outright or not, but whether the twenty million free men of the North should submit any longer to an oligarchy of three hundred thousand slaveholders; whether the vast Territories of the republic should be nurseries for free states or for slavery; finally, whether the national policy of the Union should take armed spreading of slavery in Mexico, Central and South America as its device. (Marx 1861)

The CSA was established with little regard for democratic processes and free votes. Through intimidation and violence, 360,000 white slaveholders suppressed any voices of opposition to leaving the Union from 3 million white non-slaveholders and 4 million black slaves. Individual voters in South Carolina were not permitted to vote for President in 1860; the state legislature simply handed the state’s electoral votes to pro-slavery presidential candidate John Breckinridge (Sinha 2000:236). Sinha describes the scene in South Carolina just before the war:

Random and planned acts of violence against anyone suspected of hostility to slavery punctuated the two years before disunion. … British consul Robert Bunch, who sympathized with the secessionists, reported on the “reign of terror.” He wrote, “Persons are torn away from their residences and pursuits; sometimes ‘tarred and feathered’; ‘ridden upon rails,’ or cruelly whipped; letters are opened at the Post Offices; discussion upon slavery is entirely prohibited under penalty of expulsion, with or without violence, from the country.” (Sinha 2000:211)

An atmosphere of terror and vigilantism limited the scope of political dissent and helped propel the secession movement. News of the Texas slave panic of 1860 and reports that most of the slaves were convinced that Lincoln’s election meant emancipation made Carolinian slaveholders edgy. … Governor Gist asked for the “enactment of a law, punishing summarily and severely, if not with death, any person that circulates incendiary documents, avows himself an abolitionist, or in any way attempts to create insubordination or insurrection among the slaves.” (Sinha 2000:214-215)

Many issues concerning slavery inflamed passions in the northern and southern states, among them, the 1857 Supreme Court “Dred Scott” ruling that slaveholders had the right to bring their property, i.e., their slaves, into any Western territory; John Brown’s raid in Virginia, hoping to incite a slave rebellion; the beating in the Senate Hall of abolitionist Senator Sumner by a slave state congressman. Some of these passions can be seen in the comments of the Southern Gentlemen at Twelve Oaks. Gerald O’Hara says, “We’ll keep our slaves with or without their approval” (Toyoizumi 2009:46). However, southern gentlemen were typically loath to admit their cause was directly based on slavery, especially after the war, saying instead that they left the Union because of constitutional conflicts and states’ rights issues, as discussed above, and were fighting for their “honor” or “freedom” (Wyatt-Brown 2001 and 2006; Berry 2003).

Scarlett O’Hara, “founding mother of the Me Generation” (Bates 2008), does not
support the Confederate cause, or any cause besides her own. If she had indeed spoken out in support of slavery, she would surely not be the beloved fictional character that she has become. When she loses her life of leisure, Scarlett of the novel does becomes strident in scorn and hatred towards blacks and northerners: “How dared they laugh, the black apes! How dared they grin at her, Scarlett O’Hara of Tara! She’d like to have them all whipped until the blood ran down their backs. What devils the Yankees were to set them free, free to jeer at white people!” (Mitchell 1936). The movie Scarlett just barely indicates these feelings, when she raises her eyebrows when she sees flashily dressed Freedmen idling on the Atlanta streets. Selznick purposely tried to avoid scenes of raw racial tension and violence. In particular, Selznick removed the novel’s portrayal of the Ku Klux Klan, telling screenwriter Sidney Howard in 1937, “I do hope you will agree with me on this omission of what might come out as an unintentional advertisement for intolerant societies in these fascist-ridden times” (Haag 1989). So, in the film, Frank, Ashley, and Dr. Meade seem to have gone on their Shantytown raid acting as chivalric gentlemen defending Scarlett’s honor, not as members of the KKK terrorist organization.16

Rhett seems to have a change of heart in his similar scorn for the Cause, as he goes to join the Confederate army in its final hours. I take this not as an indication of his love for the Cause, but that he has to be written out of the story for a while so that Scarlett can come home alone. At the conclusion of the novel, both protagonists want to return to their roots, if not necessarily to the old ways of the Slave South. Scarlett recalls Tara, the beauty and the “benediction” of the nature around it, and the comfort of Mammy’s “broad bosom on which to lay her head.” “With the spirit of her people who would not know defeat, even when it stared them in the face, she raised her chin. … Tomorrow, I’ll think of some way to get him back. After all, tomorrow is another day” (Mitchell 1936). “Her people who would not know defeat” could refer to her immediate family and ancestors. Her father’s family battled the English rulers of Ireland; Gerald fled Ireland to join his brothers in Georgia after he killed an Englishman. Her mother’s parents fled the Haitian Slave Revolution of 1791-1803, when the slaves overthrew their French masters. As her grandmother explained it, they were “run

16 The Klan figures prominently in the notorious silent-film Birth of a Nation (1915), which “was surely Margaret Mitchell’s model” of her “her incendiary vision of Reconstruction” (Pierpont 1992:96). I discuss that film as it features in Forrest Gump (1994) in Klinger (2007). GWTW, the film, also shows white convicts in chains being sent to work in Scarlett’s sawmill; in reality, the majority of people rightly or, more likely, wrongly imprisoned, were black (Lichtenstein 1995, Blackmon 2008, Todd 2009). Selznick didn’t dare show black people in chains; neither does Forrest Gump when young Forrest runs past a chain gang.
out of Haiti by the niggers and now licked by the Yankees. But we always turn up on top in a few years” (Mitchell 1936). Her “people” could possibly mean her extended family. All the kind slave-owners in the story considered their slaves to be part of their families, and believed the feeling was mutual; Melanie said that she felt no fear that the “darkies” would rise up in rebellion during the war: “Why should our people rise?,” and Scarlett informs Yankees that “Uncle Peter is one of our family” (Mitchell 1936). “Her people” could also mean the white Southern society, defeated in the war, but which managed to re-impose a semi-slavery system, through intimidation, economic exploitation, discrimination, segregation, and violence, on African Americans for another hundred years. Perhaps Scarlett really believed that African Americans were part of her people; then, she would be pleased that the spirit of Mammy’s people, which also would not know defeat, raised its chin, and, largely through the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and early 1960s, threw off what Martin Luther King Jr in his “I Have a Dream” speech at the Lincoln Memorial on 28 August 1963, called “the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination.”

As for author Mitchell’s opinion of African Americans, she quit a history course at Smith College in 1918, “in anger, because a black student was also enrolled” (Pierpont 1992:93), but later in life quietly donated money for medical scholarships in a black college. A guide at the Mitchell House and Museum said, “She gave a lot of money and time to the black community, which was highly irregular at the time, her being a prominent white woman. She gave money anonymously to set up a clinic and 50 scholarships to Morehouse College [which Dr King attended]” (Richardson 2008).

Mitchell was presumably motivated to support medical students at Morehouse after she had difficulty finding a white doctor or hospital willing to treat her black maid, Carrie Holbrook, who was stricken with cancer. In her letters to Morehouse president Benjamin Mays, Mitchell specified that she wanted the students whom she sponsored to practice medicine in Georgia, noting that “Georgia is a huge state and it is poor. It is poor in Negro doctors. I want to better my own state.” (Dickey 2007:169)

Mitchell said, “The one thing I’ve always wanted to avoid is the stirring up of old hates and prejudices, because I wrote my book with no hate and no prejudice” (Richardson 2008). That message does not come through in the novel unless it is read very generously and only if many paragraphs and pages are completely skipped over unread. Mitchell was raised, went to school, and wrote her book, during the “nadir,” or low-point, of American race relations (see Loewen 1996, 2004). During this period, from 1890 to 1940, of extreme violence and hatred directed by whites against blacks, the kindly and caring relationships between slaves and owners she depicted in GWTW might indeed have seemed to Mitchell as
belonging to an age gone with the wind.

Smyth (2008:23-44) reads Mitchell’s novel in a way that Scarlett’s “kinship and understanding of blacks embody blood and cultural ties that in many ways make her the most powerful bi-racial heroine in American historical literature.” Smyth says that Scarlett was “closer than family” to Mammy, Pork and Dilcey, and she treats Dilcey “as an equal.” Dilcey is a character in the novel, a “mustee” (a child of a Native American parent and an African American parent), mother of Prissy, and “broad wife” of Pork. Another character joins the extended family at Tara after the war: Will Benteen, a poor white who used to have a few slaves; he eventually marries Suellen. Scarlett’s “most sympathetic friendships” and “only unguarded relationships,” says Smyth, are with Will and Dilcey, “two racial and class hybrids” that mark Scarlett’s own “status as a racial and class hybrid after 1864.” Scarlett goes to Twelve Oaks in search of food, where she sees the once-grand house in ruins. Smyth describes the scene:

Twelve Oaks, more than the rambling, immigrant-built Tara, exemplified the powerful racial myth of the antebellum South. Scarlett gets no sustenance there but finds food in the slave gardens near the ruins. She pulls a radish from the earth, eats it, and then vomits, falling in the dirt. When she rises at last from the slave earth, purged and grim, a Southern phoenix rising from the ashes, she swears an oath, showing no loyalty to principle or memory, but only to herself and her family’s salvation. The new South is literally born from the ashes of the old; Scarlett draws new life from the soil of her former slaves. She has worn their clothes, eaten their food, slept on their earth, and her kinship is now total. (Smyth 2008:38)

The movie similarly portrays this image, says Smyth. Staggering outside in the near-black silhouette, a symbol of all struggling Southern women, regardless of color, in 1864. With her dark, frizzled hair and ragged, hoop-less dress, Scarlett looks like not only a poor-white Southerner but also a black woman, as she limps toward the slave gardens. (Smyth 2008:39)

Smyth is perhaps re-reading GWTW in the same way as McPherson’s call for more descriptions of “cross-racial alliances;” but, Smyth doesn’t discuss Scarlett of the novel specifically referring to the Yankees in her oath. A more typical critical comment about GWTW is voiced by Watkins, who says, “Gone with the Wind lacks true depth for one reason: because it leaves evil out of the garden of Tara.” “In shallow romantic fiction, except for occasional bad manners, all evils flow entirely from without” (Watkins 1992:202). In Mitchell’s GWTW, the pre-war South was “an Eden that knew no serpent until the Yankees came” (Pierpont 1992:101). Critics often contrast Mitchell’s novel with William Faulkner’s Absalom, Absalom! (1936), where, in the story of two half-brothers, one with a white mother, the other with a black mother, the slave plantation collapses due to its own internal contradictions.

Kaufman (2006:151) says, “While the history of slavery and emancipation is a
collective story of triumph over adversity and injustice, it is also a story of the theft of information.” Castalia, in Allan Gurganus’s novel, *Oldest Living Confederate Widow Tells All* (1989), invents a story of her family’s past, of how they lived in Africa, were captured, shipped to America, separated, and sold as slaves. She addresses her former plantation owner: “Maybe you biggest crime is: how you took me out the story of myself. You stole Castalia’s true life-tale.” Kaufman explains:

The implication is that we will never know what the ‘true life-tale’ of black Americans would have been without the 250 year-long blight of slavery, and that single controlling factor challenges the representation of their history to a degree not faced by the white South after -- in relative terms -- only four years of war and twelve years of Reconstruction. (Kaufman 2006:151)

Albion Tourgée in 1888 mourned that African Americans had no history they could tell stories about:

The white man traces his ancestry back for generations, knows whence they came, where they lived, and guesses what they did. To the American Negro the past is only darkness replete with unimaginable horrors. Ancestors he has none. Until within a quarter of a century he had no record of his kindred. He was simply one number of an infinite “no name series.” He had no father, no mother; only a sire and dam. Being bred for market, he had no name, only a distinguishing appellative, like that of a horse or a dog. Even in comparison with these animals he was at a disadvantage; there was no “herdbook” of slaves. A well-bred horse may be traced back in his descent for a thousand years, and may show a hundred strains of noble blood; but even this poor consolation is denied the eight millions of slave-descended men and women in our country. The remembrance of this condition is not pleasant and can never become so. It is exasperating, galling, degrading. Every freedman’s life is colored by this shadow. (Tourgée 1888/2006:536)

For GWTW’s Mammy, her “distinguishing appellative” is her social function, “Mammy;” she has no name of her own.17 The first half of the Alice Randall’s novel, *The Wind Done Gone* (2001), retells some scenes from GWTW from the viewpoint of the slaves.18

In *The Wind Done Gone* (2001), retells some scenes from GWTW from the viewpoint of the slaves.18

17 Louisa May Alcott, author of *Little Women* (1868), noticed, when she was volunteering in a hospital during the Civil War, that “All colored men are called ‘boys,’ even if their heads are white” (Alcott 1869:278). Alcott is referring to white-haired elderly men being called the belittling appellative “boy.” The term “boy” was apparently used until not very long ago. Even Ilse in *Casablanca* refers to adult Sam as “boy.” The word got its cinematic come-uppance in *In the Heat of the Night* (1967), when southern Sheriff Gillespie says, “Virgil. Virgil, that’s a funny name for a nigger boy to come from Philadelphia. What do they call you up there?” and Police Detective Virgil Tibbs replies, “They call me MISTER Tibbs!” That film also features “The Slap Heard Around the World,” when Virgil slaps a white man. Mitchell uses “nigger” a lot in her novel, but the film avoids the derogatory appellative. If that word were in the film, it would surely not rank in the AFI Top Films list today. Appellatives like “Uncle Peter” and “Big Sam” can also be contrasted with the respectful terms like “Mr. O’Hara” and “Mrs. O’Hara” that the white characters use to refer to each other.

18 The Center for Southern Literature, at the Margaret Mitchell House in Atlanta, invited Randall to speak in July 2001. Writer Pearl Cleage also spoke there in 2007 about her love of Scarlett’s tale: “It was the power of the word, the seduction of the story, and the skill of a writer who could only have told it better if she had understood that Mammy and Prissy and Uncle Peter and Big Sam each had their own spark of divine fire! And what would that book have been like? But Margaret Mitchell didn’t live long enough to write that book, so I’m left to take comfort in the fact that the fictional Miss Scarlett, and her slave owning real life counterparts, lost the war, leaving me free to read and write and read and write and read and write some more” (quoted in Dickey 2007:208). A reporter commented, “It’s either extremely ironic or astoundingly appropriate that this type of dialogue is taking place under the auspices of Mitchell’s name” (quoted in Dickey 2007:200).
said that she fell in love with GWTW when she was young:

This was a troubled love from the beginning. I had to overlook racist stereotyping and Klan whitewashing to appreciate the ambitious, resilient, hardworking, hard-loving character who is Scarlett. Like so many others, I managed to do it. Then one day, rereading the novel, an enormous question arose for me from the center of the text. Where are the mulattos on Tara? Where is Scarlett’s half-sister? Almost immediately I knew I had to tell her story, tell the story that hadn’t been told. Tell it because the silence injured me. (Houghton Mifflin 2003)

Thus the central character of Randall’s novel is Cynara, daughter of “Planter” (Gerald O’Hara) and Pallas, half-sister of “Other,” and the person “R.” goes to after he leaves Other. The Wind Done Gone tells how the slaves managed to subvert their owners and gain a degree of control of their own destinies. For example, Pallas and “Garlic” (Pork) orchestrated events so that Planter and “Lady” (Ellen O’Hara) would marry, and Pallas could move with Lady from the big city of Savannah to the isolated countryside of “Tata” (Tara). “If Lady married a man on a lonely place, a man with no people, Pallas could run the place, and she’d be free, free as she was going to be” (Randall 2001:60). In another scene, “Miss Priss” tells Cynara what happened to Other’s three brothers:

Miss Priss let her voice drop real low. . . . She kind of hissed in my ear. “Your Mama killed those boys soon as they were born.”

“Why would she do that?”

“What would we a done with a sober white man on this place?” (Randall 2001:63)

Donald McCaig’s novel, Rhett Butler’s People (2007), approved for publication by the Mitchell Estate, “works hard to cleanse Rhett of the stains on his reputation that Mitchell considered compliments” (Carter 2007). The main example is McCaig telling the story that Mitchell hinted at, but didn’t expand on, about Rhett being in jail “for killing a negro” (Mitchell 1936). In McCaig’s telling, Rhett shoots this person, his closest friend, so that he won’t have to die a gruesome death at the hands of a lynch mob. A successful 2003 French musical spectacular by Gérard Presgurvic, Autant en Emporte le Vent, also gave the black characters greater voice, in song and dance, as they expressed their desire for freedom.

---

19 In Mitchell’s novel, there are no sexual or romantic relationships between whites and blacks, and no resulting children. Scarlett does notice “the enormous increase in mulatto babies in Atlanta since the Yankee soldiers had settled in the town” (Mitchell 1936). This is apparently meant to be a slur. Pierpont (1992:92) says there were in fact a “substantial number of mulattoes, who by the 1860 census accounted for a minimum of 12% of the non-white Southern rural population.” One out of every four black people in a Southern city, says Harper (2002), was a mulatto. “Mulatto” in the slave censuses might refer to a combination of black and either white or Native American; so, it is difficult to conclude what percentage of the mulattoes had a white or a Native parent or grandparent. “Bi-racial” or “multiracial” are terms preferable to mulatto, quadroon, octoroon, mustee or mestizo or métis, half-caste, half-breed, etc., etc., if it is necessary to refer to race or ethnicity at all. “Double” actually seems more accurate than “half.” It seems to me that it is fine to be proud of one’s ancestry, as long as pride doesn’t mean regarding other people as inferior. All people in all countries have various racial heritages, as well as mixed cultures; everybody world is apparently genetically related to Mitochondrial Eve of East Africa.
Works like The Wind Done Gone, Rhett Butler’s People, and Autant en Emporte le Vent help redeem Mitchell’s story and Selznick’s film. GWTW’s views of racial relationships and commentaries on historical events are often distressing, abhorrent, and wrong; but, it is still quite entertaining to observe Scarlett in her romantic escapades. Television comedienne Carol Burnett’s 1976 parody, Went with the Wind, summarized the plot of the movie and the personalities of the characters in 18 hilarious minutes. The scene where “Starlett” comes down the stairs, wearing not only the dress she made from the curtain drapes, but the curtain rod as well, like a huge shoulder pad, was ranked #2 in TV Guide’s 1999 list of “The 50 Funniest Moments in Television."

We can at times laugh at Scarlett’s foibles, admire her determination and resilience, and sympathize with her in some of her personal predicaments. Her story is worth listening to, as long as we understand it is a fictional and rather narrow perspective of a larger and very complex American historical and social narrative.
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