On the genealogy of switcherooity

"Switcheroos are everywhere."

David Bordwell[1]

In *Get Shorty* (1995) Chili Palmer furtively enters the house of Karen Flores before dawn. To awaken Harry Zimm – upstairs in bed with Karen – Chili turns on the TV and the sound brings Harry downstairs. Later in the movie the villain Bo Catlett breaks into Karen's house in the middle of the night in order to confront Chili, who is upstairs in bed with Karen. To wake Chili and get him downstairs Bo turns on the TV. The channel is playing an old Western. Chili walks down and stands in front of the set. He is watching Dean Martin perform in a cowboy hat when Bo startles him and the confrontation ensues.

A day or so later when Chili arrives at Bo's house to rescue Karen Bo pulls a gun on him. Whereupon:

> Bo: You broke into my house, and I have a witness to it. . . . Only this time it ain't no John Wayne and Dean Martin shooting bad guys in *El Dorado*.

> Chili: That was *Rio Bravo*. Robert Mitchum played the drunk in *El Dorado*. Dean Martin played the drunk in *Rio Bravo*. Basically, it was the same part. Now John Wayne, he did the same in both. He played John Wayne.

> Bo: Man I can't wait for you to be dead.

Substituting Robert Mitchum for Dean Martin in basically the same part is an example of switcheroo.[2] Chili's needling emendation spotlights the like switcheroo in the movie we are watching: in the later break-in scene Chili plays Harry's part from the earlier and Bo plays Chili's; Karen "did the same in both." *Get Shorty* is a comic movie about characters drawn to movie-making; it's 'all about' switcheroos, including their failures and limitations – "You can't make a Martin Weir [Danny DeVito] into a Mel Gibson."

---

[1] *Reinventing Hollywood: How 1940s Filmmakers Changed Movie Storytelling* (2017) 402.
[2] Admittedly less striking than "The most famous switcheroo in American cinema, changing *The Front Page'*s Hildy Johnson from male to female for *His Girl Friday* (1940)." *Id.* 41. Or from an all-male to an all-female ensemble cast for *Ocean's 8* (2018).

Of large-scale switcheroos David Bordwell quotes Vincent Sherman on the work of Brian Foy, who was

> "taking from movies that have been made before, changing the background and a few details and presenting them as new. . . . He so disguised the plot that few people caught on. I soon learned that it was a common Hollywood practice and I used it myself later on."[3]

So *per* common Hollywood practice Kurosawa's dour *Seven Samurai* (1954) becomes, *switchatis switchandis,* a Western, *The Magnificent Seven* (1960).[4] Which then gets remade as space opera in *Battle Beyond the Stars*[5] (1980), as showbiz comedy in *Three Amigos* (1986), as cartoon showbiz comedy in *A Bug's Life* (1998), and as sci-fi showbiz comedy in *Galaxy Quest* (1999).

Although "Remakes display the switcheroo aesthetic at its most blatant,"[6] Bordwell focuses primarily on the devices of movie story-telling – flashbacks, voice-overs, block construction, ellipses, hook transitions, and other bits of structure. Bordwell's reader learns to see bits *as* bits and thus in a new way, as elements, and to see that everything is an element-for-repurposing. E.g.,[7] in *Three Days of the Condor* (1975) Joe Turner, on the run from assassins, breaks into the home of a CIA bigshot in the middle of the night. To awaken the guy and draw him downstairs Joe flips on the stereo and cranks up the volume. "Basically, it was the same part" as in *Get Shorty*; 'part' in the sense of mechanism, device, bit. It's unlikely this was its first use, and likely there were other uses of it in the twenty years between *Three Days of the Condor* and *Get Shorty*, but there is no way of systematically checking this; there is no Stith Thompson *Motif-Index of Cinema*.[8]

---

[3] *Id.* 40.

[4] Switchback: Hector Escaton and Armistice, the safe-robbing bandidos of Westworld, watch in wonder as characters out of feudal Japan enact their very same safe-robbing routine, part-for-part and mark-for-mark, in Shogun World. "They're us," says the bewildered Armistice. Lee Sizemore, burnt-out scriptwriter, admits "Yes, fine. I may have cribbed a little bit from Westworld. You try writing three hundred stories in three months." *Westworld,* Season Two, "Akane No Mai" (2018).

[5] In which Robert Vaughn plays basically the same part he had played in *The Magnificent Seven.*

[6] *Reinventing Hollywood* 473.

[7] Ray 'Bones' Barboni: Which also means when I speak I'm speakin' for Jimmy. So e.g. as of now you start affording me the proper respect.
Chili Palmer: E.g. means for example, Ray.   I think what you wanna say is i.e.
Ray Bones: Bullshit.   E.g. is short for ergo.
Chili: Ask your man here.
Ray's goon: Best of my knowledge e.g. means for example.
Ray Bones: E.g. i.e. fuck you. The point is I say jump you say okay. Okay?

[8] Another motif: "One scene Darryl F. Zanuck proposed for *Laura* (1944) was to show McPherson visiting a newsreel theater. While he watched, every woman appearing in a newsreel shot would dissolve into an image of Laura. 'Finally the scene is filled with Lauras.'" *Reinventing Hollywood* 274. Preceding if not seeding Zanuck's vision of multi-Lauras were the manifold Technicolor pachyderms in *Dumbo* (1941):

Reinventing Hollywood is about 'How they reinvented' in a particular medium and era. Its thesis is, in the words of François Jacob, "Novelties come from previously unseen association of old material. To create is to recombine."[9] So Bordwell observes,

> "Exploration and variation come with the territory . . . Like all arts, cinema relies on what went before. Variants, rip-offs and reboots are everywhere. All this intentionally imperfect replication yields beneficial change. Just as Hollywood isn't an assembly line, so its repetitions often involve valuable twists. Two scholars' description of Elizabethan theater fits the situation well: 'It is a theatrical milieu buzzing with cross-references and allusions, stock conceits and sensational variations, out of which new plays were born.'"[10]

Jacob was talking about novelty in the milieu of natural selection, not movie-making. By using the metaphor of an ecosystem Bordwell makes the illuminating point that natural selection and Hollywood storytelling bear a family resemblance:

> "Schema, formula, norm, convention, switcheroo—whatever we call the process of varying received patterns . . . the thousands of films Hollywood released from 1939 to 1952 look like a vast array of alternatives, of story combinations proliferating wildly. In the pages to come I'll use various metaphors to describe that process. When we try to visualize a filmmaker choosing among alternatives, it's useful to think of a menu, with more or less fixed options. But the menu analogy misses the dynamic quality, the sense of variants mixing and breeding new hybrids. So perhaps we should visualize the whole thing as a teeming, squirming ecosystem. It played host to exact copies ('What are you doing here?') along with more or less inexact variants—schemas mingling, splitting, fusing, and mutating. And if we back off far enough to see patterns in the stream of story ideas, we can reposition them all in a theme-and-variation array, a map stretching to a virtual horizon. Grasping the storytelling menu, map, and ecosystem is the main goal of this book."[11]

If we back off far enough to see this special pattern – Hollywood movie-making – as one among other similar patterns of change, what is the generic likeness among these patterns?

---

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pl3YXl_m0uk . An instance five decades later is the restaurant scene in *Being John Malkovich* (1999), where every diner, waiter, and musician bears the head of Malkovich and all dialogue is only 'Malkovich' variously inflected: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q6Fuxkinhug .

[9] "Evolution and Tinkering," 196 *Science* 1161, 1163 (1977).

[10] *Reinventing Hollywood* 12, 39.

[11] *Id.* 45-46.

Late in Stephen Jay Gould's life a student called his attention to the likeness between a principle of Darwin's – a principle which Gould had long cherished – and a principle of Nietzsche's.[12] Gould had once formulated the principle in his own distinctive way:

> "Current utility and historical origin are different subjects. Any feature, regardless of how or why it first evolved, becomes available for co-optation to other roles, often strikingly different. Complex features are bursting with potentialities; their conceivable use is not confined to their original function (I confess I have used a credit card to force a door)."[13]

I.e., the history of life is the history of switcheroos.

Darwin put it this way:

> "Although an organ may not have been originally formed for some special purpose, if it now serves for this end, we are justified in saying that it is specially adapted for it. On the same principle, if a man were to make a machine for some special purpose, but were to use old wheels, springs, and pulleys, only slightly altered, the whole machine, with all its parts, might be said to be specially contrived for its present purpose. Thus throughout nature almost every part of each living being has probably served, in a slightly modified condition, for diverse purposes, and has acted in the living machinery of many ancient and distinct forms." [14]

"The regular course of events seems to be," in Darwin's view, "that a part which originally served for one purpose, becomes adapted by slow changes for widely different purposes."[15]

And this is Nietzsche's "major point of historical method" (*Haupt-Gesichtspunkt der historischen Methodik*); namely,

> "that the origin of the emergence of a thing [*die Ursache der Entstehung eines Dings*] and its ultimate usefulness, its practical application and incorporation into a system of ends, are *toto coelo* separate; that anything in existence, having somehow come about, is continually interpreted anew [*auf neue Ansichten ausgelegt*], requisitioned anew [*neu in Beschlag genommen*], transformed and redirected to a new purpose [*zu einem neuen Nutzen umgebildet und umgerichtet*

---

[12] *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory* (2002) 1214-1218. Gould refers to it in this his final work as 'the Nietzsche-Darwin principle.'

[13] "Quick Lives and Quirky Changes," in *Hen's Teeth and Horse's Toes: Further Reflections in Natural History* (1983) 63.

[14] *The Various Contrivances by Which Orchids are Fertilised by Insects* (2d ed. 1877) 284.

[15] *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (1859) 194. The irony of *The Origin* is there is no origin; only variation and divergence.

wird] by a power greater than it [*einer überlegenen Macht*[16]] . . . No matter how perfectly you have understood the *usefulness* [*die Nützlichkeit*] of any physiological organ (or legal institution, social custom, political usage, art form [*einer Form in den Künsten*] or religious rite), you have not yet thereby grasped how it emerged [*seiner Entstehung*] . . . and the whole history of a 'thing', an organ, a tradition [*Brauch*] can to this extent be a continuous chain of signs [*eine fortgesetzte Zeichen-Kette*], continually revealing new interpretations and adaptations [*neuen Interpretationen und Zurechtmachungen*], the causes of which need not be connected even amongst themselves, but rather sometimes just follow and replace one another at random." [17]

For Nietzsche history is the history of switcheroos.

Bordwell devotes a chapter to the influence of Freud and psychoanalysis on 1940s Hollywood. He writes that movie-makers began to take psychoanalysis seriously when "The drama of profound self-revelation became prominent in forties Hollywood as never before."[18] Explicating schemas which would be developed in the forties Bordwell points out that Dorothy's trip to Oz (*The Wizard of Oz* 1939), an adventure it turns out she has dreamt, "is made of what Freud called day residue, a flotsam of incidents and images that get combined associatively in sleep."[19]

Movies themselves play a part in the drama of human self-revelation in that their making exhibits the florid exuberance of the as-structure.   The phenomenon of the 'as,' Heidegger says, is "the structure that belongs to understanding as such. . . . The 'as' has the function of uncovering something in terms of something, of uncovering something *as* – i.e., as this or that. The 'as' *is* the structure of understanding."[20]

> "Every act of having things before our eyes, every act of perceiving them, is held within this disclosure of those things, a disclosure that things get from a primary making-sense-of-things in terms of their what-they're-for. . . . Our directional being-unto-things-and-people functions within this structure of 'something as something.' In short, it has the *as-structure*."[21]

"The manifestness of beings as such, of beings *as* beings, belongs to world." The 'as' distinguishes us from the other animals. For "bound up with world is this enigmatic 'as', beings *as* such, or formulated in a formal way: 'something *as* something', a possibility which is quite fundamentally

---

[16] *Der Wille zur Switch, natürlich.*
[17] *On the Genealogy of Morality: A Polemic* (tr. Carol Diethe 1994) Second essay, section 12; p. 55.
[18] *Reinventing Hollywood* 297.
[19] *Id.* 300.
[20] Martin Heidegger, *Logic: The Question of Truth* (tr. Thomas Sheehan 2010) 126, 127.
[21] *Id.* 121-122.

closed to the animal." "[T]his '*as such*', beings as such, something as something, 'a as b'. It is this quite elementary '*as*' which – and we can put it quite simply – is refused to the animal."[22]

The 'as' makes possible the unprecedented *Vermehrbarkeit* – extendability, 'evermoreness' – of the human world. The 'as' is the organ of recombination; in Thomas Sheehan's gloss "the distinguishing-and-synthesizing discursivity in which we take this *as* that (or this as *for* that) and thus render those things meaningfully present."[23]

Dreaming is the recombinant as-structure operating in near-frictionless mode; disencumbered from the viscosity of the real the dream's recombining dynamic moves at super-high Reynolds number. A dream swarms with "composite formations;"[24] such that the remembered dream resembles, as Freud variously describes it, a rebus,[25] a piece of breccia,[26] a hysteric's *Gschnas.*[27] Freud shows the basic mechanism of dreaming is to take something as something, 'a as b.' The dream-work, Freud tells us, "confines itself to reshaping [*umzuformen*]."[28] The basic mechanism of reshaping works by 'condensation' (*Verdichtungsarbeit*), 'displacement' (*Verschiebungsarbeit*), 'an eye for depiction' (*die Rücksicht auf Darstellbarkeit*), and 'secondary revision' (*die sekundäre Bearbeitung*).   Condensation and displacement correspond approximately to metonymy and metaphor, respectively. An eye for depiction ('regard for representability') is the dream's *mise en scène*. Secondary revision functions as 'rewrite' – in Bordwell's terms "continuity," "the demand for clarity." Secondary revision does not, Freud says, seem to have a regular share in dream-formation but where it does "endeavours to blend dream-elements of disparate origins into a dream that is meaningful and free of contradictions. . . . with its snippets and scraps it patches the gaps in the dream's structure."[29]   The demand for clarity in dreams, as in the movies, may not always be met: "There are other dreams where the purposeful revision has only partially succeeded; coherence seems to be in control up to a point, then the

---

[22] Martin Heidegger, *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude* (tr. William McNeill and Nicholas Walker 1995) 274, 287.

[23] *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (2015) 222; https://religiousstudies.stanford.edu/people/thomas-sheehan/publications

[24] Sigmund Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams* (tr. Joyce Crick 1999) 247; *Mischgebilden*.

[25] *Id.* 211; *ein Bilderrätsel (Rebus).*

[26] "Speech in dreams has something of the structure of breccia, in which larger fragments of various materials are bound together by a solidified matrix." *Id.* 267.

[27] "A Viennese would not need me to explain the meaning of the principle of 'Gschnas': it consists in producing objects of a rare and valuable appearance out of trivial, preferably ludicrous and worthless material, e.g. arms and weapons out of cooking-pots, straw, and salt-sticks, as our artists do on their social evenings. [Charlie Chaplin in *The Gold Rush* (1925): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4DLdMa98JdM] Now, I had noticed that hysterics do the same; beside what has actually happened to them, they unconsciously create for themselves horrible or extravagant fantasy events which they construct from the most innocuous and banal material of their experience." *Id.* 167, fn.

[28] *Id.* 329.

[29] *Id.* 298, 319.

dream becomes nonsensical or confused . . . In other dreams the revision has given up entirely; we [as interpreters] are helpless in the face of a meaningless heap of fragmentary material." [30]

Viewed in the light of Freud's explication of the dream-work Bordwell's analysis shows movie-making to be a kind of collaborative dream construction. Movies are made of the Hollywood equivalent of day residue: "possibilities already opened up in film, radio, theater, and other media," "schemas . . . circulating in popular media and high culture," "cultural commonplaces," "borrowings from adjacent media" "bits of theory," "the bag of current narrative devices."[31]

This flotsam gets recombined associatively in production:

> "cinema transforms its borrowings from adjacent media." "the originality of a noteworthy film stems from a switcheroo: a revision of a schema that was already in circulation, not only in film but in other media." "it takes nothing away from *Kane*'s originality to see it as a blend of schemas that had been circulating for some years in popular media and high culture." "In representing psychic life, *Spellbound* ransacks the bag of current narrative devices, deploying inner monologues, auditory and visual flashbacks, dreams, and hallucinations."[32]

Bordwell begins his study with the question, "Where do the innovations come from?" Over the course of the book he documents his answer: "Two primary sources, I think: other films and other media." In Nietzsche's terms Bordwell traces "a continuous chain of signs, continually revealing new interpretations and adaptations." He concludes his study with the related question, "If the dynamic of innovation consists of schema and revision, where does true originality come from? Is there no single work we can point to as the ultimate source of this or that new storytelling strategy?" Bordwell is "inclined to say there is no such source."[33]

In his genealogical moods Nietzsche, too, denied the existence of an ultimate source. "Why," Foucault asks, "does Nietzsche challenge the pursuit of the origin (*Ursprung*), at least on those occasions when he is truly a genealogist?" and gives three reasons rooted in Nietzsche's fight against metaphysics. If instead, Foucault goes on, the genealogist "refuses to extend his faith in metaphysics [*ajouter foi à la métaphysique*], if he listens to history," he finds that

> "there is 'something altogether different' [«*toute autre chose*»] behind things: not a timeless and essential secret, but the secret that they have no essence or that

---

[30] *Id.* 320.
[31] *Reinventing Hollywood* 74, 76, 125, 290, 311, 316.
[32] *Id.* 290, 256, 76, 316.
[33] *Id.* 464.

their essence was fabricated in a piecemeal fashion from alien forms [*fut construite pièce à pièce à partir de figures qui lui étaient étrangères*]."[34]

Or in Derrida's terms, "'historically' constituted as a fabric [*tissu*] of differences." [35] Which returns us to Heidegger. There are bits in *The Origin* [*Ursprung*] *of the Work of Art* which the genealoger can latch onto; *viz.*: "Truth is un-truth, insofar as there belongs to it the reservoir [*der Herkunftsbereich*, provenance-domain] of the not-yet-uncovered, the un-uncovered, in the sense of concealment." "The establishing of truth in a work is the bringing forth [*Hervorbringen*] of a being such as never was before and will never come to be again."   "[E]verything with which man is endowed [*Mitgegebene*] must, in the projection [*Entwurf*, the taking-as], be drawn up from [*heraufgeholt*] the closed ground and expressly set upon this ground. . . . All creation [*alles Schaffen*], because it is such a drawing-up [*ein Holen*], is a drawing [*ein Schöpfen*], as water from a spring [*das Wasser holen aus der Quelle*]."[36]

What's in a bucket hauled up from the ontological waterhole?

Gould claims (not citing Heidegger, for sure) that organisms and populations maintain "a 'fund' or 'pool' of potential utilities now doing something else, or at least doing no harm;" which reservoir he names the 'Exaptive Pool.'[37]   "[C]haracters, evolved for other usages (or for no function at all), and later 'coopted' for their current role," he and Elisabeth Vrba name "exaptations."   Exaptations "are not fashioned for their current role and reflect no attendant process beyond cooptation . . . they were built in the past either as nonaptive by-products or as adaptations for different roles."   "Preaptations" then are "potential, but unrealized, exaptations."[38] The (abyssal) Exaptive Pool is composed of preaptations; the source for "previously unseen association" in Jacob's phrase.

An ontological Exaptive Pool is implied in Heidegger's pointing out that "manifold kinds of beings are manifest to us: material things, lifeless nature, living nature, history, products of human work, culture."[39]   "Where there is world, there beings are manifest;" i.e. show up as meaningful presence (*Anwesen*). And where manifest, by the phenomenology of *The Origin of the Work of Art*, also unmanifest, not-yet-uncovered (*Noch-nicht-Entborgenen*), un-uncovered (*Un-*

---

[34] Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History" in *The Foucault Reader* (ed. Paul Rabinow 1984) 78-79.

[35] "Differance" in *Speech and Phenomena and Other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs* (tr. David B. Allison 1973) 141.

[36] *The Origin of the Work of Art* in *Poetry, Language, Thought* (tr. Albert Hofstadter 1971) 58, 60, 75.

[37] *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory* 1277.

[38] Stephen Jay Gould and Elisabeth S. Vrba, "Exaptation—a missing term in the science of form," 8 *Paleobiology* 4, 6, 12, 11 (1982).

[39] *Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics* 275.

Entborgenen); potential latent in the *Herkunftsbereich* yet unrealized for taking-as (*entwerfen*) in new ways:

> "The look into the light of the possible [*der Lichtblick ins Mögliche*] makes whatever is projecting [*das Entwerfende*] open for the dimension of the 'either/or', the 'both/and', the 'in such a way' [*des ›so‹*], and the 'otherwise' [*des ›anders‹*], the 'what', the 'is' and 'is not'."[40]

A switcheroo is some 'otherwise' of any 'in such a way.'

Jacob avers that "To create is to recombine." Bordwell characterizes film narrative as "opportunistic, protean, and promiscuous."[41] Heidegger tells us that

> "Art . . . is the spring that leaps [*erspringt*] to the truth of what is, in the work. To originate something by a leap [*etwas erspringen*], to bring something into being from out of the source of its nature [*aus der Wesensherkunft*] in a founding leap [*im stiftenden Sprung*]—that is what the word origin [*Ursprung*] means. . . . art is by nature [*in ihren Wesen*] an origin [*ein Ursprung*]: a distinctive way in which truth comes into being, that is, becomes historical."[42]

"The source of its nature": this *Wesensherkunft* – 'essence-provenance' – so our conjecture here goes, is none other than Bordwell's "what went before," the ontological Exaptive Pool, the "still quite undiscovered" *Bestand* ('standing reserve').[43]

Then what to make of this? –

> "The setting-into-work of truth thrusts up the unfamiliar and extraordinary [*das Ungeheure*] and at the same time thrusts down the ordinary [*das Geheure*] and what we believe to be such. The truth that discloses itself in the work can never

---

[40] *Id.* 364.

[41] *Reinventing Hollywood* 245.

[42] *The Origin of the Work of Art* 75.

[43] In *Being and Time* Heidegger had written, "There are various ways in which phenomena can be covered up. In the first place, a phenomenon can be covered up in the sense that it is still quite *undiscovered* [*überhaupt noch unentdeckt*]. It is neither known nor unknown [*Über seinen Bestand gibt es weder Kenntnis noch Unkenntnis*]." *Being and Time* (tr. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson 1962) 60. In his later thinking *Bestand* looms into view as something ominous and vast. Vaster still by the principle of the Exaptive Pool is the undiscovered, unmanifest *Bestand.* How to access it? By that mode of making present (*Gegenwärtigung*) which Heidegger calls **Ver**gegenwärtigung, 'envisaging,' 'making present to mind': "In envisaging, one's deliberation catches sight directly [*direkt ansichtig*] of that which is needed but which is un-ready-to-hand." *Being and Time* 410. I.e., one has an insight. Need underwear? Use fig leaves. Need a jimmy? Use a credit card. *Etc. ad libitum.*

be proved or derived [*nie zu belegen und abzuleiten*] from what went before [*aus dem Bisherigen*]."[44]

He may mean here simply that "the truth that discloses itself in the work" emerges as novel, as not pre-existent in the ingredients. So "the truth that discloses itself" is to "what went before" as the organism is to its DNA.[45] This interpretation may be supported by what follows directly after the quoted sentences above:

> "What went before [*das Bisherige*] is refuted [*widerlegt*] in its exclusive reality by the work. What art founds [*stiftet*] can therefore never be compensated and made up for by what is already present and available. Founding [*die Stiftung*] is an overflow [*ein Überfluss*], an endowing, a bestowal [*eine Schenkung*]."[46]

Again he seems to mean that the work exceeds the sum of its parts, is irreducible solely to them; that the work as *hapax phainomenon* – "a being such as never was before and will never come to be again" – overflows the "exclusive reality" of what went before and what is present and available. Which does not imply that the work is *not* constituted from "what went before."

Being and Time's proposition that "The question of existence only gets worked out in existing"[47] expresses for the individual human life the same notion as 'never before and never again' does for the work of art. Individuation can proceed only from *Geworfenheit,* 'thrownness.' So Sheehan glosses Heidegger's term 'facticity' as our situatedness in 'what went before': "We are already thrown into a family, a language, a social structure, the whole panoply of things and situations which we did not choose and which condition our actions and choices. From the first instant of our lives we are already confronted by a history as long as our gene-structure."[48] This history is

---

[44] *The Origin of the Work of Art* 72.

[45] The organism does not pre-exist in its DNA. To believe that it does is to step backward to 'preformationism.' For "What is the difference between the claim that the sperm has a little man in it, and that the sperm has the complete information necessary to make the little man? . . . That is the first big truth about the relationship between development and genes. Namely that organisms don't develop. That is, they don't unfold a pre-existent program." Richard Lewontin, "The Organism as Subject and Object of Evolution," https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ftzoa2dw3CQ at 9:16 and at 15:12. Lecture based on "The Organism as the Subject and Object of Evolution" in Richard Levins and Richard Lewontin, *The Dialectical Biologist* (1987). *See also* Richard Lewontin, *The Triple Helix: Gene, Organism, and Environment* (2002).

[46] *The Origin of the Work of Art* 72*.

[47] *Die Frage der Existenz ist immer nur durch das Existieren selbst ins Reine zu bringen.* § 4.

[48] *Karl Rahner: The Philosophical Foundations* (1987) 296; https://religiousstudies.stanford.edu/people/thomas-sheehan/publications .

the broad sense of what *Being and Time* names '*das Erbe,*' the heritage. Heidegger's injunction there, in essence, is 'Take from what you have inherited and work to make it your own.' [49]

To characterize this operation he deploys two terms in this key section[50]: *schöpfen* – to draw, as water from a well; and *überliefern* – to free up for, to hand over. So "we must ask about the source from which *in general* openness [human existence] draws [*geschöpft werden*] the possibilities through which it explicitly understands itself."   "But before deciding too quickly whether openness draws [*schöpft*] its authentic possibilities of existence from thrownness, we must first, etc."   "The resolute return to one's thrownness entails *freeing up for oneself* [*ein Sichüberliefern*] those inherited possibilities . . . the actual freeing up of a heritage [*das Überliefern eines Erbes*] takes place in resolution."[51]

So here again is the notion of a reservoir (or an ore-face); one draws up (or loosens up) possibilities from that source – thrownness, the heritage. As Heidegger goes on to say, "When carried out *explicitly*, resolution—the act of returning to and freeing up oneself—becomes the *retrieval* [*Wiederholung*] of an inherited possibility of existence. *Retrieval is the act of explicitly freeing-up* [*Überlieferung*], i.e., explicitly returning to the possibilities found in already-openness."[52]

That's not the whole story. Heidegger takes the heritage to be the 'good part' of our thrownness: "Granted that everything 'good' is our heritage and that the nature of 'the good' is to make authentic existence possible, the actual freeing up of a heritage takes place in resolution."[53] The other part – '*Tradition*' in German – is ungood. He says in the introductory pages of *Being and Time* that tradition is something to which the human being falls prey:

> "This tradition keeps it from providing its own guidance, whether in inquiring or in choosing. . . . Tradition takes what has come down to us and delivers it over to self-evidence; it blocks our access to those primordial 'sources' [*ursprünglichen »Quellen*«] from which the categories and concepts handed down to us [*überlieferten*] have been in part quite genuinely drawn [*geschöpft wurden*]. Indeed it makes us forget that they have such an origin [*Herkunft*], and makes us

[49] Gazing at his father's instruments Faust mutters to himself, *Was du ererbt von deinen Vätern hast,/ Erwirb es, um es zu besitzen.*
[50] Section 74: *Die Grundverfassung der Geschichtlichkeit,* 'The Basic Structure of Historicalness.' In the translation of Thomas Sheehan and Corinne Painter, "Choosing One's Fate: A Re-Reading of *Sein und Zeit* §74," 29 *Research in Phenomenology* 63 (1999); https://religiousstudies.stanford.edu/people/thomas-sheehan/publications
[51] "Choosing One's Fate" 64, 65.
[52] *Id.* 67.
[53] *Id.* 65.

suppose that the necessity of going back to these sources is something which we need not even understand."[54]

We need not take account of this distinction for the purpose at hand. *The Subject Was Roses*, or movies rather, and "The task for the ambitious moviemaker is to come up with variants—switcheroos, again—that reveal fresh possibilities while still keeping the story clear enough to be understood by a mass audience."[55] Bordwell insightfully documents how moviemakers of the forties came up with variants by drawing on, freeing up, and reimagining "what went before" – the grandeur of the heritage, the dreck of tradition, and everything in between; their drive to create was omnivorous.

So it continues. Harry Zimm is a schlockmeister of shoestring horror flicks. In his first encounter with Chili Harry says in by-the-way self-promotion, "You mentioned *Grotesque*? That happened to be *Grotesque Part Two* that Karen Flores was in. She starred in all three of my *Slime Creatures* releases you might have seen." Driving Chili through Hollywood in a convertible Harry boasts that his next picture will be "A blockbuster. But quality. No mutants or maniacs. This one's gonna be my *Driving Miss Daisy*." And he's right. His next picture will turn out to be the switcherential masterpiece *Get Shorty.*

DCW 6/25/2018

---

[54] *Being and Time* 42-43.
[55] *Reinventing Hollywood* 72.