Anthony Loeb: Mr. Cassavetes, Columbia College is a school of the arts, and there are people in this room from many disciplines—television, photography, dance, as well as film. This turnout is really a tribute to the vitality of your work.

To our audience, in introducing Mr. Cassavetes, I would like to say that this man is important to me because he works against the grain of Hollywood, not only independent of the studio structure, but also with an individual rhythm, a unique editing style. He works as Bergman works, with his own repertory company—his wife, his children, his mother-in-law. His is a highly fruitful nepotism. Let's welcome Mr. John Cassavetes.

John Cassavetes: Thank you. I wish I were taller so I could see everyone. I started a long time ago. I was an actor first, for about five minutes, and then I was an assistant stage manager. One time I was in the back of a theater fooling around, and Sam Shaw, who produced ***A Woman Under the Influence***, came up to me and asked, "What are you doing now?" I told him, and he said, "Well, I'll produce a feature picture if you write it." It was just like that. So I said, "What could I write about? I've never written anything." And he said, "I know a great writer living in Duxbury, Massachusetts. His name is Edward McSorley. If you drive up there and see him, he'll write it with you. But you've got to put an outline of all your ideas on paper and write about what you know." So I started writing and came back to Sam and he said, "Wonderful! Go up and see McSorley." I said, "I can't. I don't know where he is." He said, "I'll give you his address. I already called him and told him you were coming." I was making eighty-five dollars a week working in a Broadway show as assistant stage manager, and I borrowed a friend's car. It was a rumble-seat car, and I drove up in the snow and rain without enough gas to get there. I had to borrow money from a cop. Finally, I got to this rose-covered cottage in the middle of winter and I thought that was a good sign, that the roses were blooming in winter. I knocked on the door and a guy answered the door. He was a craggy-faced fifty-five-year-old short prune who looked like a writer is supposed to look—somebody who's lived a lot, you know. "Hello," he said. "What do you want?" I said, "I'm

John Cassavetes. Sam Shaw told...you're expecting me aren't you? I have this manuscript here." He said, "I haven't seen Sam in ten years." Anyway, he invited me in and fed me. His wife was Italian, and she fed me bean soup and onions,and it was freezing cold, and it was terrific. We became good friends, and those are the events surrounding my meeting with Sam Shaw. Our relationship has continued for the past, I don't know, twenty years. Sam introduced me to a lot of things I wasn't aware of—art, music, sculpture, painting. And when you see the films that I make, I know you wonder, "What has this man learned?"

Question: How do you feel when you look back at your films? How do they seem to you?

Cassavetes: Well, a film recalls the memory of doing, working with people you like, people with whom you can come into contact on a real level. The kind of people I work with...we can fight or scream and yell at each other, and still be friends. We can really hate each other with all our hearts and the next day be together because we're working toward a common end. If the film isn't any good, well...I just care that we've done the best we can, you know?

Question: Regarding ***A Woman Under the Influence***, now that it is playing to audiences, do you see any weaknesses that you didn't perceive before?

Cassavetes: No. I feel that whatever film you make, it's part of your life at a time in your life. To go back and look at it and second-guess it doesn't mean anything, because we did spend two and a half years working on it, you know? Obviously, it was the best we could do. There is a certain desire to making a film, when you really

put it in and put it up and you know no limit and you're really willing to die for the film you're making. Now that sounds crazy. If you die for your country, it's not so good, but in film, if it's the last thing you ever do, you want your picture to be done. With that attitude, making it that way, a man moves through life really using himself, really making something of his life.

There's a guy named Tim Carey. I don't know whether you've heard of him. He's an actor who was in ***Paths of Glory***. He played one of the guys who was executed. He's been in a lot of pictures. Maybe he has an average gross income of, say, three thousand dollars a year over the last twenty-five years. He's been making a picture called ***The Little Old Ladies of Pasadena***. He knocks on doors and he says to these old women, "I'm making a film called ***The Little Old Ladies of Pasadena*** and you're going to come out and get on roller skates with me." And he finds a factory, and he goes over to this factory owner and he says, "You're in terrible trouble. I'm the Mafia." And he gets all the roller skates he needs. He has been working on this film about eight years now. There's a trade paper out in California called ***Variety***. And Tim makes an announcement every week for seven years that he's just started production. He has no money but he won't give up. He's had a crew of seven hundred people over these eight years. He calls up colleges for help. He convinces people. This man lives for his work. He's what it is all about.

Question: When is he going to know when to stop? When is he going to know when he has enough footage?

Cassavetes: He probably doesn't want to stop, because when he stops, then he really is going to stop, you know. When he stops, he'll face the bills that he has to pay. When he stops, he'll have to become a father again of seven children. When he stops, he'll have to pay attention to his wife. When he stops, he'll have to be a human being, and to be an artist, really, is to be a freak, in the greatest sense of the word. You're not interested in a substitute life, which is what it means to be an artist. Now, not everybody here is going to be an artist and not everybody here is interested in art. Some people are interested in careers and the values that those careers can get them. But you take some directors, like Altman, say. I was his next door neighbor. We were both on the "gimme" when we were working for Screen Gems. We had offices next door to each other. He got signed there and we both were desperately broke. We were both dying because we both wanted to make something and were very unhappy picking up a lot of money doing nothing. He had, at that time, a screenplay he wanted to do, and a staff of people who were really with him. Altman is a good example of what I mean. He is one of the four really independent people in our business.

Question: Who else is in that category?

Cassavetes: Martin Scorsese, Elaine May, Shirley Clark. It's hard to explain what "independence" means—but to those who have it, film is still a mystery, not a way out. There are other independents, of course, but they haven't really hit the limelight yet, so not enough is at stake. To still do what you want after ten years, twenty years, is something. I've known a lot of filmmakers who started out with enormous talents and lost momentum. I don't say they're selling out, but somehow, if you fight the system, you're going to lose to it. That is basically the point. I don't care whether you're a painter or an architect—you can't fight the system. In my mind, if you fight the system, it only means you want to join it. So it is very important that you do something you like, that you're involved in enough to hold your interest, no matter how long it takes. If the film doesn't involve you, it's what we call "a stepping-stone" picture, you know, a stepping-stone to art, and that's all right, too. Take a guy like Polanski who did pictures in Poland: ***Knife in the Water***, and later, ***Repulsion***. You could see in those works a pulse that was meaningful and creative and intense. You can't dispute the fact that he's an artist, but yet you have to say that ***Rosemary's Baby*** is not art. It is a dictated design—boom, boom, boom, boom. People are used within that design to make a commercial product to sell to people. I'm not saying that is bad. I was in it. I'm fine. I'm happy. But it isn't art. I don't know. I think ***Dirty Dozen*** in its way is more artistic, you know, because it's compulsively going forward, trying to make something out of the moment without preordaining the way the outcome is going to be.

Loeb: How about you? How much design was there in ***Woman Under the Influence***? Was the script in your hand when you started to shoot? It's very interesting for people to understand the process. How much improvisation was there?

Cassavetes: On ***A Woman Under the Influence***, like on anything, you start off with an idea. It doesn't mean anything to you. It's just an idea. You can discuss it in your living room. And then if that idea stays with you for a while, at least if it does with me, then, I feel I can spend a long time working on it, no matter what kind of inconvenience it would cause to my life. I got a lot of people together, because I knew we wouldn't have any money to make the picture. I got people off the streets, and the first people that came up, they were our crew. I knew that if they would take the trouble to come up to see us, they would get involved, and they would stay. I know a lot of actors, so I started out with some actors. We had a reading—Elaine May and I and Peter Falk read the plays that ***Woman*** was predicated on, and Peter said he wanted to do it. And then he called me three days later and said that Mike Nichols just offered him a picture to do, ***Day of the Dolphin***, starting November 15. "You don't have any money," he said, "and November is next month." I said, "You can't do it." He said, "Well, what do I tell Mike? He's the director. I can't just say I don't want to do the fish picture. You call him and tell him something. You're the writer, you can make something up." So, in the end, we started with Peter, we started with Gena, we started with those. people who had come in. And we had two very good friends of ours who were secretaries. They are very important. They write all the stuff down and do all the work, and we take all the credit.

Every picture is different. It really depends strongly upon the people that you're working with. They must be your peers, people who could be your friends. Now I'm an older guy, and I walk in the room and someone says, "Who is this?" You know, "What's in it for me?" And that's fine. That's terrific. I've got to work with that guy, and I've got to know that guy's capable of hating me and liking me and dealing with me as a person, and telling me I'm full of shit if I am, and being able to take over the direction of the picture if he can, you know. If he can work harder than me or she can work harder than me, then they should do it. And what is a director, really? A director is a name. The people seek after it, they seek to be a director, or seek to be a cinematographer. If you go on a major studio picture, you'll see people who don't protect the picture. They protect themselves. I've seen guys—and it has nothing to do with their talent—I've seen crews talk about loyalty. They say, "If they fire you, honey, then I'm going with you." I mean the whole crew is going to revolt if it doesn't go your way. But when the chips are down, they all say good-bye. I've never seen anyone go with anybody fired on a major picture. But when you're working for nothing, when you're working with friends, it doesn't happen that way. You have to have your own values. You have to want to make your own picture. You have to have your own image of making a picture. Otherwise, you're no help to anyone or to yourself. So I'm saying that an education in art has to come from working with other people who are connected in a sense with something they want to do and want to be.

Loeb: I have one specific question about the editing in ***Woman***. There's a six-month interlude in the film. When did you decide to put it in? Was that a discovery in the editing room? John, it troubled me.

Cassavetes: Oh, yeah. Elaine May didn't like that, either. She begged me to take that out. I like it because I wanted to know how long Mabel was away.

Question: I wanted to see Peter Falk locked up, too.

Cassavetes: What do you mean you wanted to see him locked up?

Question: Well, he seemed really evil in the movie. It was easy to understand the title, ***A Woman Under the Influence***, because everything that she did was an attempt to please him, but he was being destructive to her. In fact, he seemed nuttier than she.

Cassavetes: I don't think she was nutty.

Question: I don't think she was, either. That's what I'm trying to say. I think he was.

Cassavetes: But we all are. Now, I say that and I mean it, really. We're never nutty on film. That's the trouble with this world. On the screen everyone is perfect. They're a perfect heavy, they're a perfect good guy. That's boring.

Question: Recently I saw some out-takes of ***Star-Trek***. Spock, or the perfect whoever, flubs and stutters or drops something that he's not supposed to. And it was nice to see this "perfect" person, this creation of a human being, make a mistake. Could you comment on that since you mentioned that you don't like rigidity?

Cassavetes: The time limits are terrible on television productions. They want to give you the best product in the world, one that is technically right. If something doesn't match, there's a script coordinator to correct it. It's usually a girl and she usually says, "He didn't say ***the*** man, he said the ***man***." And so they go back again, do it perfectly, and then they cut it that way. It's unfortunate.

Question: In the morning-after scene, the guy Mabel picked up goes into the kitchen and has a cup of coffee, and then you see her husband pull up. What happened?

Loeb: It seemed like he just disappeared. You expect a confrontation. You expect ***High Noon***. And also, how did the mother find out that Mabel had a man over?

Cassavetes: A lot of people ask the same question. The Falk character told the mother. And how did he know? Listen, you have to assume that everybody has lived. Men and women both have an understanding of these things. If a man walks into his house and sees his wife sitting like that, in a mood, and he has lived with her for a number of years, he knows that something is wrong. I'm not interested in pursuing that dramatically. I'm interested in the involvement between the mother and the son. And the mother does control that son, a grown man. He's forty-six years old, and she comes into that house and she runs that house. And she asks Nick to commit this woman, and he only commits her because she wants to. And she really feels that what Nick told her about Mabel is the truth. And then she adds her own truth to it and feels that the son can no longer live with this woman.

Question: Did you film a confrontation between Falk and the pick-up?

Cassavetes: No, never. Nor did I film a scene in which he told the mother about it. You know, when you're making a film, you deal with it, somehow, in a subjective view. I would rather not deal in terms of conventional expectations of what actually happened. It didn't seem very emotionally important to me that Peter would tell his mother and we would see it.

Question: But what happened to the guy in the house? What actually happened to him?

Cassavetes: It wasn't a continuity cut. It's hard to tell jump cuts with me sometimes. It was a time change. But it comes at a point, probably, where you really want to know how the guy got out of the house. For that reason, you might object to what I did. Anyway, you know what happens within a minute or two. Why should you know right away? You find out that the husband didn't see him.

Question: What was the main thing about the film that interested you, the main idea?

Cassavetes: The woman did—the problem of being alone after having been promised love—a good woman fulfilling her end of the promise and not getting any reward for it. I think the way our world is structured, there is no room for women to have an education, an emotional education. I'm not saying that I would know how to give a woman an emotional education. But it is true that women do have problems being housewives, being married. And that is what interested me and everyone else who worked on

the film. It was an exploration of the problems of women without really knowing what the answers are. We tried to pose as many questions as we could about love and its consequences.

Loeb: There is a scene of her waiting at the bus that is extraordinary. What a beautiful and devastating moment as she waits for her kids and you realize they're all that she has.

Question: There is another scene at the door, when everyone first comes over in the morning for spaghetti. I was wondering, "How did you get that out of Gena and the rest of the group? Was that ad-lib or was it scripted?"

Cassavetes: That was a carefully rehearsed scene which came out of a lot of pre-rehearsing, pre-talking the picture. It's mainly Gena and those actors that were able to do that. It's hard to say why it works so well.

Question: There is a scene with the children, when they are struggling with their father the night they decide to commit Mabel. I got the feeling that for some people, that might have been very painful to watch because it was so involved and might reflect their own personal experience. Did you deliberately extend the sequence so that people would feel the pain more intensely?

Cassavetes: I think so. We did deliberately prolong it. I think the main reason that sequence was so full was because I felt very much like Tony said before. You can't go without a shoot-out. It's a very difficult thing for someone to double-cross somebody. Unless you actually see them do that, unless you actually see the continuity of that, the actual idea that he would do this and carry it through could have been weakened. And I didn't particularly like the scene upstairs. But I felt it was necessary for Nick to go upstairs and make up his mind that he would actually do this in the face of the children, in the face of his wife. It was very important that he actually decide to commit this woman so that it would become a memory for him. It's the hardest thing in the world to put someone that you love in an institution. There is a lot of pain involved.

Question: When you and Peter were discussing Nick's character, did you use ***Husbands*** as a take-off? Did that provide a point of reference?

Cassavetes: No.

Question: You saw them as two totally separate characters?

Cassavetes: Yes. You have to understand something. I would write it down, and then I'd stay away from it so that the actor's intentions or additions could come clear. I allow the man, the actor, the actress, to be in touch with themselves and to draw on it. If the script is right, I don't think that they need any direction at all except their own.

Question: Were you aware of pacing at all when dealing with Peter? It seemed like almost every scene he was in would reach a fever pitch of intensity. Were you letting him reach his own peaks? How much were you controlling him in the film?

Cassavetes: I wasn't controlling him in the sense you mean. I certainly would have cau-

tioned him if I felt he was wrong and if I felt he would be disliked. I feel that Peter is a magical kind of an actor in that he can take a person who is human and add to his humanity. Gena's character is really without pettiness throughout the whole picture, and until the very last scene in the movie, she really is under the influence of family and Nick. She's under the influence of her mother-in-law. She's under the influence of the love for her mother who doesn't like her, but loves her, if you know what I mean. She's under the influence of a father who's disowned her because she's now married and so he's "given" her to the son-in-law. And I forgot what the question was.

Question: I feel that Nick's character was one-dimensional, and he responded in a visceral manner to every stimulus you presented him. He seemed to react that way in every scene.

Cassavetes: One of the things we had worked out in the beginning of the movie was that these characters could not be petty because you would lose the whole intention of what the film was about. Most of the arguments between men and women are based upon somebody's inability to express what they really mean. At least that is the way I feel. And that is the way the members of the cast felt, that when a man and woman get together, they fight about the television—turn it on, turn it low, turn it up—drinking, etc. All the things that really count are very rarely expressed, no matter how long a marriage goes on, no matter how long the love goes on. Mabel's problem was that she had no self. Her problem was that she was doing everything to please someone other than herself. When Nick wanted her to go to bed with him, she'd go to bed. When he wanted her to be embarrassed, she'd be embarrassed. If he wanted her to apologize, she'd apologize. He wanted her to be nice to guys coming in at 8:00 in the morning—ten guys for spaghetti—well, O.K. That is a man's dream for a woman to get up and say, "Yeah, let's cook it and have a good time." That is a man's dream, not a woman's dream, you know. But he couldn't control that friendship. He couldn't control the feelings of warmth and niceness that he instilled in her. I mean, here is a construction worker, a guy who goes out and works with his hands. He is a very formal guy. He believes in family and home. His mother really has a great influence over him. Relatives have a great influence over him. He is a conservative, and all of a sudden he marries a girl. He takes the one little act of danger in his life. She is a little kooky. She is a little crazy. She loves him intensely. It is a little embarrassing to him. It is very embarrassing to him to display emotion. He doesn't want to display that emotion to the world. He doesn't want to have that closeness and that rapport with people. He wants distance in his public life, and the only thing that can throw him off is this woman. And while he feels this thing in her to be unusual—crazy in bed, divinely kooky, whatever—he can't handle the results. He is living two different lives and he loves them both. And he has got it made. She is living one life. She waits for this man to come home. His life is falling apart through a series of embarrassments, the pull of family, the pull of friends. How is he going to look in front of his friends when this woman carries on? At a certain point in the picture he falls out of love with her and that is why he has her committed.

Question: That was hard to take.

Cassavetes: Yeah. The point is that I don't believe any man can be told when he makes a jerk of himself, you know? Now that seems like a little thing. It is not shooting someone in the head or anything, but it can cause a hell of a lot of pain. That is the one moment of pettiness in the picture because he was really petty—dog, deep-down petty, you know—in the spaghetti scene. He was embarrassed. He couldn't come off it. He couldn't come down.

Now as an actor, Peter became very passive when we did the scene with the doctor. Those were peculiar choices that he made. When the doctor came in, he had the freedom to throw him out. But he chose to let him in. Peter also had the freedom not to stand by and let his wife go crazy, but he chose to let her go crazy. And when he came upon her and tried to stop her, it was too late and he knew it was too late and why did he wait that long? Now in talking with Peter afterwards, Peter said, "She was doing great. I didn't want to stop her." That was a lie. Peter is a tremendously internal man, and I think he wanted her to be committed. I think he wanted her to go away. I don't think he recognized her worth because to him, at that mo-

ment, she was worthless. She wasn't behaving like he would behave, so he didn't want her anymore. That is what I saw. Now within the values of his being too loud, too boisterous, whatever, these actions were by a man who was not used to functioning outside himself, outside the boundaries, without his control. When he went out to the work area the day after she was committed, I really felt he was shocked that anyone would give a shit that Mabel went to an institution. Who was she that anyone would care? Why would anyone like her? Who was she? She was a product of his imagination. She wasn't a person. She was a person who did exactly what he said. She was a kook. She was known as a nut. So he didn't like to be discovered. He didn't like it when the guys said something because he felt enormously guilty for it.

Now it is very complicated to structure that. The emotions are complicated. It is hard to explain because they are hard messages to get over to anybody. So you have to allow the actor total freedom, not a little freedom. Don't say, "Improvise your emotions," and then stop and say, "Wait a minute, buddy, if you could do this it would be good, and by the way, go back to what you were doing before." It won't work. So what you do is you let that actor run with it. He grows with the part. He is making a fool of himself and he is making a jerk of himself and he is becoming more transparent. So by the time you get him to the beach—the beach scene, I think, is wonderful and Peter is wonderful because he absolutely has no idea what he is doing there—I had the camera there and they just started walking. I never went near them, and they are walking and Peter has some lines and he says the lines and then they don't know what to do. Now I could tell them, but that would kill it. What difference does it make what he does? He has to do it. I can't do it. The camera can move. It can follow, you know. So where they play that scene and what they do has to be in their own timing. And when Peter gets there at the beach and he pushes the little girl down, there was a wonderful moment. I see him trying to communicate with his children. I see him trying to touch. I see him not caring. I see so many things that developed that wouldn't have if you formalized a view of the character through your own mind and didn't allow room for interpretation. I wrote it, and as soon as I wrote it, I killed the writer. There is no writer because the writer can only make you feel insecure. I have been in a lot of movies, and as soon as the writer would come on the set, everyone died, because the writer knows exactly how everyone should be played, exactly what the intentions are. But writing is one medium and film is another medium.

Question: How do you separate yourself?

Cassavetes: You do one thing at a time. After we finish with the film, we distribute it. But we don't distribute the film while we're making the film, you know.

Loeb: Well, what about your overall intention, the overall strategy. It has to stay controlled. You have a tragedy. It's a high-powered thing.

Cassavetes: Why is it a tragedy?

Loeb: Well, I felt that Falk never reached a moment of understanding, a perception of what was wrong in that house. When I walked out of the theater I had the distinct impression: "It's going to happen again." That saddened the hell out of me. "She tried to cut her wrists tonight and next week she'll do it again because no one understood." Without insight, the triangle will continue.

Cassavetes: All right. That's the point of the whole picture. Now we're down to the difference, maybe, between the way it should be and the way it is. That's the point of the picture. That's what we tried to do. There's the outside world and there is the inside world. The inside world is your home, your family, the things that create emotions within you. The outside world is you: where you are going and how you move and where you fly, you know? And they are two worlds. I really believe—after making the picture, not before—that the inside world really holds you, really contains you, can cause you pain that you didn't show outside, and that is why no one ever talks about it.

I think Nick changed. I think he has perception. I think he has insight. The simple act of throwing his mother and father and everybody out at that end—it may not be a big thing for a less

structured person, but it was a very big thing for him to clear everybody out and mean it. I think he came to the realization that he was alone with that woman. He was the only one who could save that woman or kill that woman or have anything to do with that woman, and that it was a one-to-one relationship. People prefer distance, and in movies today there is a reluctance to show really deep feelings. They don't like vulnerability. No one is willing to be laughed at. Nobody wants to be laughed at. Let's laugh. I spilled stuff on my tie tonight. Why should you guys not laugh at me, because I look like a dope. Why should I take offense at that? The only reason I would was if I don't like you and you don't like me. Now that's a crazy assumption to make—that no one likes anybody, and we sometimes live under that assumption.

Question: When you script your films, how specific are you? How do your anticipate the improvisation?

Cassavetes: The idea is that they, the characters, can do whatever they want to within the confines of the script.

Question: Well, what is the script, then?

Cassavetes: A script is a series of words strung together. They kind of spell out the story in a mysterious way.

Question: What is the process like for you when you're doing the script? Is it like acting for you?

Do you say, "I know these people so well, I can tell you everything they're going to do."?

Cassavetes: No, I deal with the characters as any writer would deal with a character. There are certain characters that you like, that you have feeling for, and other characters stand still. So you work until you have all the people in some kind of a motion, you know?

Question: How do you deal with the time lag between the idea and the time it takes to pull it off? Is the wait frustrating for you?

Cassavetes: You do get tired, frustrated. You hate the project but you want to go on. Something drives you, and that's usually the other people involved. Their determination adds to yours. When they drift off, you come on again. It goes back and forth.

Question: Did you have trouble raising the funds for this?

Cassavetes: I got Gena and Peter to put up all the money.

Loeb: How have your films done financially? How did ***Husbands*** do at the box office?

Cassavetes: ***Husbands*** grossed $1,400,000. Columbia paid us $3,500,000 for it. I don't think they ever liked the film. After they first bought it, we all took it to the San Francisco Film Festival. The day we got the check, we went up there and everything was supposed to be terrific. But after the film came on, everyone yelled, "Fascist!" They were booing and they were going crazy. Here is this whole row of Columbia executives and their wives, and the wives turn to the executives and say, "What is wrong, why are they booing?" The audience got worse. They got hostile—eighteen hundred people really booing. The terrible part is that you have to get up after the film ends. There are chairs there, the microphone is there, and people yell, "Fascist!" I had a suit on. I felt like ripping it off. You don't know what to say, so you say, "How did you like the film?" Absolute silence. Finally, one guy said, "If you guys were making a satire about the middle class and how piggish they are, that is one thing. But if those guys depicted on the screen are really like you, that's

another." And I said, "It's us...it's us," and Peter said, "That's right...that's right." Well, we thought we were going to be killed. It was getting terrific. The only friends we had were Gena and Seymour, who were in the audience, in the back. Anytime anybody said something, Gena would shout, "Sit down!" A guy would get up and yell, and Seymour would say "Bullshit." Anyway, you don't always win with a film. But I still like it, and I will always remember the experience of that film and how much enjoyment I had in working with Peter Falk and Ben Gazzara.

Question: I don't understand why you say this film is a failure.

Cassavetes: To the studio, at least. A financial failure.

Loeb: I thought it was an extraordinary picture. The fantasy of men, their essential childishness, is captured so well.

Cassavetes: Well, we did wonderfully well in New York. For some reason, New Yorkers liked the picture.

Question: Maybe it was a success after all—to move that many people, even to anger, is something. People often don't want to see truth. It is too painful. It's hard to tolerate.

Cassavetes: I'm not sure about that. I think when the picture came out it was boring to many people.

Question: What is your favorite film?

Cassavetes: Shadows.

Loeb: That was your first film. Can you talk about it a moment before we close?

Cassavetes: Shadows was finished in 1960. It took three years, or so. We were so dumb when we made that picture. I was the director, so I said, "Print," and everyone said, "Print," and no one kept a record. We did everything wrong, technically. The only thing we did right was to get a group of people together who were young, full of life, and wanting to do something of meaning. I saw it recently, for the first time in a long time. I saw all those people on the screen, you know—young and beautiful and just full of life and everything, and it made me emotional, especially seeing Rupert Crosse up there, because suddenly he was so alive and it was terrific. He died recently of cancer. He was supposed to be in ***The Last Detail*** and he died. I got up recently to talk about the film at the American Film Institute. We saw it together and I cried at the end. I saw Rupert and it just hit me. I stood up before everyone and had trouble talking. I don't know. Anyway, thank you everybody for coming here.

Feature Credits

Director and Screenwriter:

Shadows (improvisational cinema drama) 1961
Too Late Blues 1962
(produced by Mr. Cassavetes and co-written with Richard Carr)
Faces 1968
Husbands 1970
Minnie and Moscowitz 1971
A Woman Under the Influence 1974
The Killing of a Chinese Bookie 1976
Opening Night 1979
Gloria 1980

Director:

A Child Is Waiting 1963

Actor:

Taxi 1954
The Night Holds Terror 1955
Crime In the Streets 1956
A Man Is Ten Feet Tall / Edge of the City 1957
Affair In Havana 1958
Saddle the Wind 1958
Virgin Island 1958
The Webster Boy 1961
The Killers 1964
The Dirty Dozen 1967
Rosemary's Baby 1968
Minnie and Moskowitz 1971
Capone 1975
The Killing of a Chinese Bookie 1976
Two Minute Warning 1976
Mikey and Nicky 1976
Opening Night 1978
Brass Target 1978
The Fury 1978

These credits reflect the best information readily available to date.