

#

9

April 10  
1953

Dear Frank and Maury:

I enclose herewith "The Boy and the Bull". It consists now, as you can see, of 133 pages instead of the former 172 pages. However, within these 133 pages there are many further cuts, which bring the whole down to 121 pages.

In doing this I have ruthlessly cut all extraneous material and scenes, and kept rigidly to the simple story of the boy and the bull. In my first letter accompanying the script, I told you that two relationships could be lifted entirely: (1) the love story between Manuel and Julietta (which is here cut completely); and (2) the development of Don Alejandro Videgaray's dissolute but sympathetic character through the American girl Jean and other scenes (most of this has now been cut.) I feel we lose absolutely nothing. On the contrary, we gain in simplicity, directness, and hence in dramatic forcefulness. You know have a script which I think you should be able to budget almost exactly.

About Maury's suggestion, based on the French picture he saw, that a dream sequence be inserted---I don't like the idea. This picture is very simple, and deals with very real things, and will best be done if it is done in simple realism. I suspect the French picture was somewhat less realistic than this one, and a sequence which might therefore go well in it, might hurt ours. Also, our boy cannot have a dream glorifying bullfighters, because bullfighters are a menace to the bull he loves. He cannot have a dream imagining himself as a bullfighter, because then he would become the murderer of his pet. In no place in the picture does he manifest the slightest desire to be a matador; rather, he spends his time trying to devise ways to save his bull from the matador.

Likewise, I would suggest that we refrain from trying to find scenes to add to this picture, unless they are essential or extremely unusual. The addition of a scene, simply for its own sake, often weakens the ~~general~~ dramatic line of a story, and therefore its punch to the audience. Of course if we can think of a scene that is brilliant, has never been done before, and will add to our story--we should do it at all costs.

Now about money: you know how I hate to talk about it, but I must. I got the two hundred dollars, and it was a life-saver, and it is gone. That, of course, is not because I am extravagant, but because it was all spent before it arrived. You said to me when I saw you last in Los Angeles that I should budget my income. This, of course, is perfectly correct. I live very cheaply, but it is impossible to budget income without the income. If one earns money and then cannot get it, one runs so far behind that by the



time one does get it, budgeting is out of the question.

There is another factor that I feel I must explain to you in justification of my needing money at the present time. When one is owed money and cannot get it, one's obligations go on just the same, and they must be paid. Thus I have had to sell things in order to keep living. In November I had to sell my Packard---a perfectly good car that would have lasted for years. Because I couldn't collect what was owing me, I had to wholesale it for \$1060. I took at least a seven hundred dollar loss that I should not have had to take had I in my possession the money I had already earned. And again: when I had to come north in order to raise the money to save the trust deed temporarily---I finally managed to collect \$3,000 (and you were damned nice in doing what you did in order for me to get it)--- but the point is, it cost me \$500 to make the trip and collect the \$3000 I had already earned. By these two deals I had to make, I had to throw in as a complete loss, \$1200 of the \$10,000 the "Boy and Bull" brought me. In a word, when a man can least afford it, he has to take the greatest losses. Additionally I have had to sell other things to keep alive ---probably my whole loss for not being able to collect the logs coming to two thousand dollars. Under these circumstances a man simply cannot budget, as you suggest I do. He can only sit to one side, and watch his last assets draining away. He has worked, he has earned money, but he does not have it, and hence he is stripped of everything he owns. This is a terrible thing to happen to a man, and I simply now do not know what I am going to do about the ranch trust deed.

I haven't wanted to worry you about this. I haven't written much about it. You didn't mention it on the telephone the other day, and I didn't want to embarrass you by bringing it up. The money was due April 2, 1953. That was the sixty days they gave me to pay the \$2900 when I was last in Los Angeles. I set that date because---although you did not guarantee it,--you said you were morally certain that my remaining \$2000 would be forthcoming by that time, the whole thing depending upon your production deal on either one of two pictures. I wrote the government frantically, telling them I had 20s due which I expected daily (this because Maury had assured me the German deal was set)---and asked them for fifteen more days. I have not heard from them, but I think it is probably granted. Otherwise they would have had to notify me of seizure and sale. This is the tenth. They must have money by the fifteenth. And what am I to do?

You see, if they execute the lien and sell, I shall not only lose everything I have in the deed: I shall lose the \$1,000 I paid them in December (and in order to get that \$1000 I had to sell a car at a \$700 wholesale loss, for a total cost of \$1700). In addition I shall lose the \$2,000 I paid them in January (and in order to get the \$2000 I had to sell jewelry, cameras, etc. down here at about an \$800 loss under their real US value---for a total of \$2800). And I



shall also lose the \$2900 I paid them out of the note you gave (which \$3000 cost me \$500 in travelling expenses to get, for a cost of \$3500). And I shall have nothing. And yet I have worked decently and honestly and long for the very purpose of getting the money to save myself. It seems so hideously wrong that I should have taken the losses already taken, and that I ~~should~~ should have to take this further \$17,000 loss, when I have done nothing to deserve it---when I have ~~given~~ delivered everything I said I would. It is, really enough to make a man think of cashing in on his insurance by a well-placed bullet, rather than to see his family, through no fault of his own, steadily descending into bankruptcy. They'd be better off.

Also I know that recently you have been able to pay another writer---a writer who has not done nearly as much as I in your service---who has never turned over to you an original screenplay, and who has never re-written for you as a part of his original bargain, without cost. Yet he gets the money---and I am, of course, glad he did---while I, because I have not got mine, am being ruined.

Now this letter is not a reproach, because I know that you are decent men and I value our relationship. It is not written in anger, for anger will do no good. It is actually written to beg you---to supplicate you to pay me the \$1800 if you possibly ~~can~~ can, and before the fifteenth so I can save my trust deed. And to please write me, telling me what the situation is, and what future ~~there~~ there is, if any, for me with your organization. If you really want me---that's the point; and perhaps you don't, in which event kindness would dictate that I be told so. Because th a worry, this loss, this dread of tomorrow, this slow stripping away of everything one has simply because one can not get the money already due-- it is too much for a human being to bear.

Please---in God's name, write me quickly and tell me.

Regards,

Doe

Elba 21  
Apartment 9  
Col. Cuauhtemoc  
Mexico, D.F.

Tel: 36-33-66