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Abstract

This essay takes a look at three of Philip K. Dick works and their film adaptations; *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep* (*Blade Runner*), “The Minority Report” (*Minority Report*) and “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale” (*Total Recall*). The field of adaptation studies has finally come into its own in the last two decades and now has a sophisticated theoretical base. This essay attempts to give some guidelines on the definition of adaptation, how important the changes made to the original story are and with special focus on story, plot and character changes. Kline’s four approaches: translation; pluralist; transformation and materialist, to evaluating adaptation are used in regards to the films. Also included is a brief biography of the life of Philip K. Dick that is necessary to gain an understanding into his favorite themes; ‘What is Real’ and ‘What is Human’. His stories are packed with dualism and more specifically the difference between Human/Android, Life/Death, Real/Fake and Mother/Lover. These dualisms and the theme of ‘What is Real’ is explored and identified throughout the films.
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Introduction

In her recent book on adaptation theory, Linda Hutcheon repeats the truism that ‘art is derived from other art; stories are born of other stories’ (2). These words are more relevant now than before, because adaptations are everywhere around us. Adaptations today are very different from the most commonly known adaptations of novel to film or more commonly known as literature to film, and it is not possible to see and experience the wonders of adaptations by simply looking at novels and their film adaptations. Various kinds of adaptations can be found in video games, theme parks, virtual reality, historical enactments, the opera and countless other scenes. It can be said that almost everything can be adapted into anything. Dudley Andrew observed that:

[t]he making of a film out of an earlier text is virtually as old as the machinery of cinema itself. Well over half of all commercial films have come from literary original, though by no means all of these original are revered or respected. (Kline 70)

The theory of adaptation studies has been dormant in the academic field but recently it has been on the rise with “[a] decade’s worth of pioneering work by Brian McFarlane, Deborah Cartmell, Imelda Whelehan, James Naremore and Sarah Cardwell” (Leitch 63). For instance Cartmell and Whelehan state in the introduction to their book The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen that “it’s vital that literature and film be distinguished from literature on film [and that] the latter has historically privileged the literary over the cinematic”. They also plead and find it necessary “to free our notion of film adaptations from this dependency on literature so that adaptations are not derided as sycophantic, derivative, and therefore inferior to their literary counterparts” (1-2).
When a film adaptation is being evaluated the comparison to the source material is often used as the device of effectiveness. Since the scope of adaption theory is so large it becomes unavoidable that different evaluations of an adaptation appear. This comes back to the issue of faithfulness or fidelity to the source material. There are a number of ways to evaluate the successfulness of an adaptation but it becomes a question of one’s own choice in what direction to follow.

To have a work adapted into a film, not to mention a Hollywood film, often meant that authors received acclaim and even became know globally because of the adaptation. One author who never really got to experience that feeling of global fame was Philip K. Dick, who died just a month prior to the release of one of his work on the big screen. Even though he dreamed of mainstream publication he was restricted to the ghetto of Science Fiction literature. Dick dealt with many aspects of human nature, the metaphysical, precognitive aspects and the certainty or uncertainty of reality. The questions he puts forth in his work most often focuses on two aspects: ‘What is Real’ and ‘What is Human’ and he was known for using special plot devices to achieve his goal and that is what characterized his literature.

The purpose of this essay is to explore and discuss three of Dick’s works, Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep, “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale”, “The Minority Report” and their film versions: Blade Runner, Total Recall and Minority Report. In regards to Minority Report and “The Minority Report”, the character of John Anderton will be examined along with the precogs. Dick and Spielberg will be placed side by side in order to compare their visions of the work and to examine the changes Spielberg made to the story. Also, the importance of the alternative ending and the significance of eyes are among the points that will be looked at in regards to adaptation theory. In Total Recall and “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale” the issue of false memory is the main topic along with the comparison of the character of Douglas Quail and Douglas Quaid and how they are portrayed in story and
film version. Some political, social and gender issues from both the film and short story deserve some looking into. Finally, in regards to *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep* and *Blade Runner* the overall adaptation will be discussed with special attention to Dick’s Mercerism and Rick Deckard’s spiritual awakening. A few important chapters are left out of the film, the relevance of those changes are discussed and evaluated how important the changes are. A look at how the androids/replicants are portrayed with special attention on Roy Batty, and in addition a brief look at John Isidore’s character. The three possible alternative endings are also examined.

The field of adaptation studies is a vast sea of endless information and to go through all of it would require a far more extensive research than the scope of this essay allows. To simplify the matter only a few points, relevant to the specific works, will be discussed. Karen Kline’s four approaches to evaluating an adaptation will be used to identify the success of the adaptation. Firstly, a brief overview of the definition of what an adaptation is, how is it defined by various theorist of the field. What is the importance of fidelity and how much significance does it play in the decision making of the person who adapts, with special attention to story, plot and character changes. Secondly, a brief look into the life and work of Philip K. Dick is essential to understanding the man behind the literature and his favorite themes. The author’s constant struggle with dualism manifested itself in his work, especially between Human/Android, Life/Death, Real/Fake, Mother/Lover. Lastly, the element of ‘What is Real’ is what ties all these works together and it should be interesting to see how the adapters incorporate this important theme into their films.

The novel and stories and their film adaptations are not listed in chronological order but rather in order of their importance and the amount of academic research that has been done.
Philip K. Dick

Philip Kindred Dick and his twin sister Jane were born on December 16, 1928, in Chicago. They were born six weeks prematurely and as a result became sick. For their parents, Dorothy and Edgar, it was as hard as anything they had had to deal with. In a letter to her son Dorothy wrote:

> [f]or the first six weeks of your life, you were both starving to death because the (incompetent) doctor I had could not find the right formula for your food and because I was so ignorant I did not know how desperate your condition was […] Jane died on the way to the hospital […] You were within a day or so of death. (Sutin 11-12)

The death of his sister haunted Dick for the rest of his life, his mother was continuously reminding him of her and as a result he could not let go of her. He felt great resentment towards his mother because in his opinion it wasn’t her lack of love that caused Jane’s death but her ignorance. Lawrence Sutin, the author of *Divine Invasions: A Life of Philip K. Dick* wrote that “[t]he torment extended throughout his life, manifesting itself in difficult relations with women and a fascination with resolving dualist (twin-poled) dilemmas – SF/mainstream, real/fake, human/android” (12). Twins have a bond that cannot be broken, even in death, to Dick, his sister remained with him throughout his life and was constantly on his mind.

By the time he was six years old his parents had divorced. The divorce affected Dick in a great way, he felt, like many children of divorces, that his father had abandoned him. Dorothy moved with her son to Washington D.C. to seek out a better paying job. In 1938 they moved to Berkeley, California where Dick was reunited with his grandmother and aunt and was able to have a few visits with his father. During these years Dick suffered from many sicknesses such as asthma, a condition affecting his heart and eczema. This kept him out of
school for many days, something that he did not hate since school was not his favorite place to be, he was bored there.

In 1940 when Dick was twelve he, by his own omission, read his first SF magazine *Stirring Science Stories*. Sutin noted that “SF linked perfectly with his prior discovery of the *Oz* fantasies of Frank Baum” (34). This is when his writing career started, at the age of fourteen he finished his first novel *Return to Lilliput*, and also “he regularly published stories and poems in the *Berkeley Gazette*’s ‘Young Authors’ Club’ column” (Sutin 40). High school was for Dick a torture, he got good grades but as before the existence was a complete bore. Also his frequent sickness, which had escaladed into agoraphobia, claustrophobia and vertigo and which “forced Phil, in February 1947, to withdraw from Berkeley High; he graduated in June by working at home with a tutor” (Sutin 49).

To suffer from all these maladies was a strain on Dick who was only a teenager at the time, he started working as a clerk at University Radio and later at Art Music when he was fifteen. This job is what got him through the stress of his sickness and its owner, Herb Hollis, “who became the father figure Phil needed […] [and] Phil would later say that working for Hollis was his first ‘positive validation’” (Sutin 50, 52). Dick created many characters based on Hollis, for instance Jim Fergesson from *Voices from the Street* (c. 1952-53) and Leo Bulero in *The Three Stigmata of Palmer Eldritch* (1965). The stability and the steady income provided by the job by Hollis offered Dick the opportunity to face “the most difficult – and ultimately triumphant – challenges of his life: moving out of his mother’s house in the fall of 1947” (Sutin 55). Not only did he move out at the age of nineteen but he also got married to Jeanette Marlin, something that Dick did not speak about much, they divorced six months later.

Dick always wanted to be a mainstream writer and avoided the SF element, unfortunately he had no success in that field so what he did was mix together SF and
mainstream style as was evident in the works discussed in this essay. In 1950, Dick married Kleo Apostolides, whom he spent eight years with, she along with Anthony Boucher, editor of *The Magazine of Fantasy and Science Fiction* “helped transform Phil into the most prolific young SF writer of his era” (Sutin 67). Dick noted after Boucher had looked over some of his manuscripts that:

> [t]he literary ones he did not respond to, but to my surprise he seemed quite taken with a short fantasy which I had done; he seemed to be weighing it in almost terms of economic worth. This caused me to begin writing more and more fantasy stories, and then sf. In October, 1951, when I was twenty-one years old, I sold my first story: a tiny fantasy to *F&SF*, the magazine which Tony Boucher edited. (Sutin 70)

After that Dick quit his job with Hollis and began focusing on his writing career with help from Kleo. In 1952, Dick needed an agent and he found one in Scott Meredith who had just founded an agency and took him on. From there on, nothing could stop him. From 1951 to 1958 more than eighty stories and thirteen novels appeared and “[t]hey were, at their best, trial runs for far more intricate Phildickina worlds” (Sutin 73-74). In 1954 he started focusing more on novels and as he himself recalled in 1969:

> [i]t is in sf stories that sf action occurs; it is in sf novels that worlds occur.  
> […] As a writer builds up a novel-length piece it slowly begins to imprison him, to take away his freedom; his own characters are taking over and doing what they want to do – not what he would like them to do. This is on the one hand the strength of the novel and on the other, its weakness. (Sutin 88)

In 1957, *Eye in the Sky* was published, this was Dick’s breakthrough novel, in his own opinion and this was the first novel to successfully incorporate the theme of ‘What is Real’, a theme that would come to characterize Dick’s work. It also established him at the age of
twenty-eight “as one of the very best young SF writers” (Sutin 92). The question of ‘What is Real’ is usually portrayed by the uncertainty of the existence of the protagonist and his understanding of the reality around him. Nothing can be taken as an absolute certain, the scene and characters can shift without any warning. False memory was his favorite plot devices to use when incorporating this theme.

In 1958, Dick and Kleo moved to Point Reyes Station, there they met Anne Williams Rubenstein, a thirty-one year old widow raising three daughters. Dick and Anne had an affair that led to Kleo and Dick’s divorce. On April 1st 1959 Anne and Dick got married in Ensenada, Mexico. On February 25, 1960, Laura Archer Dick was born. The marriage grew and prospered, even though Anne worried about money. The couple fought and bickered, sometimes even resorting to violence. Many claimed that this marriage was the reason for Dick’s ‘evil woman syndrome’ in his novels and stories and in a letter to Eleanor Dimoff, Dick stated that: “I tend to take it for granted in a novel that a man’s wife is not going to help him; she’s going to be giving him a bad time, working against him. And the smarter she is, the more likely she’s up to something” (Sutin 109). These feelings of the ‘evil woman’ preceded his marriage to Anne, rather they could be traced back to his mother and Dick’s resentment towards her and her involvement with his sister’s death.

Around 1960 Dick found a new passion, I Ching, Book of Changes, the book consists of yin-yang forces and Oracles dating back almost three thousand years. He based a novel on it which he wrote in 1961, The Man in the High Castle, this is probably one of his best works and he explained how it came into existence:

I had actually decided to give up writing, and was helping my wife in her jewelry business. And I wasn’t happy. She was giving me all the shit part to do, and I decided to pretend I was writing a book. And I said, “Well, I’m writing a very important book.” And to make the fabrication convincing, I
actually had to start typing. And I had no notes, I had nothing in mind, except for years I had wanted to write that idea, about Germany and Japan actually having beaten the United States. And without any notes, I imply sat down and began to write, simply to get out of the jewelry business. And that’s why the jewelry business plays such a large role in the novel. Without any notes I had no preconception of how the book would develop, and I used the *I Ching* to plot the book. (Sutin 112)

The theme of ‘What is Human’ is most prominent in *High Castle* and his other favorite theme ‘What is Real’ is clearly emphasized in his next novel *Martian Time-Slip*. The issue of ‘What is Human’ focuses on the fact that a being that is alive and is human in every way can in fact posses all the characters of what it is meant to be human while something mechanical can possess all these traits and in a fact be more human than the human. Sutin wrote that with the creation of *High Castle* came a “drastic break […] Phil the writer was not merely reborn, but transformed” (Sutin 113). *High Castle* received in 1963 SF’s highest honors, the Hugo Award. At this time he had given up any hope of reaching success in the mainstream and focused all his energy on SF creations.

In the years 1963 and 1964 Dick wrote eleven SF novels. This period was drenched with his continues drug use, for medical reasons, fights with Anne and the creation of his breakthrough novel, *The Three Stigmata of Palmer Eldritch* (w. 1964, p. 1965). In 1964 the marriage of Dick and Anne could not endure more and they separated. He lived a bachelor’s life style until he met Grania, who he had a relationship with for a few months. During that relationship he suffered his worst writers block ever and was even unable to write due to a car accident he had been in. After his relationship with Grania ended he soon found out that he could not be alone and pursued a friendship with Nancy Hackett, at the time she was twenty-
one and Dick was thirty-six. Shortly into their relationship Dick asked Nancy to move in with him and laid it out for her:

   But mainly, as I said, I want you to move in here for my sake, because otherwise I will go clean out of my balmy wits, take more and more pills, get less and less sleep, eat worse, sleep not at all, be all hung up – and do no real writing. Since I left my wife I have done nothing of importance; I want to get going, and I need you as a sort of incentive and muse … someone to write for, because of … see? I want you to read my stuff as I write it and tell me if it’s any good: if you like it, then it’s good, if not, then not; I need someone Out There to whistle back into the dark chamber. If you don’t move in, I’m afraid I’ll have to search or something else to keep me going. But what or where – god only knows … it seems unlikely that it even exists.

   But one must try. (Sutin 143-144)

By March 1965, Nancy gave into Dick and moved in and in July 1966 they got married, primarily because Nancy was pregnant. Isolde Freya was born on March 15, 1967.

   In the latter part of 1965 and through 1966 he wrote five novels, among them were Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep (p. 1968) and Ubik (w. 1966, p. 1969). Sutin recalled that Ubik was the novel that “propelled Phil’s election, in France, as an honorary member of the College du Pataphysique” (152). Dick got out of his slump and started writing, not at the same pace as before but enough to make a living. From 1967 to about 1970, Nancy and Dick went through difficult times: Dick’s drug abuse took a big toll on their relationship, three deaths of close friends; “IRS audit, economic instability, marital infidelity, the standard twisted weirdness of the California sixties, and the hairpin psychic risks of plotting SF novels that sought to mirror these realities” (Sutin 159). Finally in September 1970, Nancy and Isa left Dick.
The next two years in Dick’s life were marked by even more drug use, open house for drug users and sellers, financial crisis, paranoia and a search for his new love. These years were to give ground for one of Dick’s strangest novel, A Scanner Darkly. In February 1972, he attended a SF convention in Vancouver, he was the guest of honor. His house in the Bay Area was being foreclosed and all his friends and lovers had dispersed. He decided to stay in Canada and rented an apartment in which on March 23, 1972 he attempted suicide and “[o]n a piece of cardboard he had written the emergency number of a suicide-prevention center in case – at the last moment – he changed his mind” (Sutin 192), which he did. Later he was taken to X-Kalay, a live-in drug and alcohol rehabilitation center, he stayed there for three weeks and as a result Dick gave up his daily speed and amphetamine usage.

Free from the drugs Dick was ready to start life anew and in July of 1972 he met Tessa Busby, then eighteen years old. Thanks to Tessa, according to Dick, his writing had started up again. They got married in April 1973 and on July 25, 1973, son Christopher was born. The following year, Flow my Tears, the Policeman Said was published and was well received, it earned “Nebula and Hugo Award nominations and winning the 1975 John W. Campbell Memorial Award” (Sutin 209). After that came 2-3-74, Exegesis, an eight thousand pages long journal with Dick’s theories, visions and contemplations. Throughout February and March 1974, after receiving medication for an impacted wisdom tooth, Dick started having visions and spiritual enlightenment; 2-3-74 refers to those months. Two years later in February 1976, Tessa left with their son Christopher. In August 1978, Dorothy died and Dick remembered her and wrote that “[t]he death of my mother has helped [with his phobias], because I can see what a malign person she was in my life & how I feared and disliked her – which she deserved” (Sutin 254).

Dick did not write much after Tessa left, he only referred to Exegesis and was always making notes. Finally, in 1980, he started negotiations for the adaptation of Do Androids
Dream of Electric Sheep. Director Ridley Scott had been confirmed along with Harrison Ford as the lead. According to Sutin, this film was expected to be the next Star Wars but unfortunately did not achieve the success that had been predicted but “[i]n Japan, Blade Runner is regarded as a cult classic and it is a key factor behind Phil’s towering literary status in that country” (Sutin 274).

On February 18, 1982, Dick was found unconscious on the floor of his apartment. The doctors concluded that he had had a stroke from which he could recover. Unfortunately, he suffered from more strokes and on March 2, 1982, Philip K. Dick passed away, only fifty-three. Philip K. Dick was and is known for his ‘strange’ and even unconventional SF stories and the themes that characterized them. It is important to know a little bit about his life to fully understand his work. This short overview of his biography hopefully gives a little glimpse into the complex mind of Philip K. Dick.

Theory of Adaptation

To be able to judge an adaptation as a successful one or not one must be aware of the basic principles of its theory and how it functions. This chapter on the theory of adaptation will give a short overview of the definition of adaptation, its main themes and the opinions of some of its theorist. This essay utilizes Kline’s approach to identify and evaluate the successfulness of the adaptations discussed below in regards to plot, story and character.

Karen E. Kline suggested four useful critical paradigms of film adaptation and those will be used to successfully identify the adaptations of Dick’s work. The first is ‘translation’ and she explained that it dealt with the “fidelity to the novel, particularly with regard to narrative elements, such as character, setting, and theme” (70). Many critics felt that if too much is taken away or changed then why bother adapting at all, why not just write an original screenplay. One cannot forget the overused term: Which is better? Book or film? Does the
film do justice to the literary original? Kline noted that “[c]ritics adopting the translation paradigm in their evaluations also privilege traditionally literary elements while minimizing specifically cinematic elements, and they value similarities rather than difference between the written and cinematic texts” (71). It should be noted that critics who tend to this practice when evaluating adaptation “fail to see the larger ideological context within which media production processes operate” (Kline 71).

Kline’s second paradigm was what she called the ‘pluralist’ paradigm, “this model value[s] the film’s ability to present a coherent fictive world within itself which bears significant traces of the novel operating at a somewhat abstract emotional/intellectual level” (71). Some might call it the ‘spirit’ of the novel or an independent work of art that is still an adaptation. It incorporates enough from the novel to be considered an adaptation but not too much. Annette Insdorf and Joy Gould Boyum claimed that “a successful adaptation as one that presents ‘analogies’ between the novel and the film, thus implying that there are essential differences between the two sign systems” (Kline 72). The basic element of the pluralist paradigm was finding the perfect balance between novel and film.

The third paradigm was the ‘transformation’ paradigm which considered “the novel[’s] raw material which the film alters significantly, so that the film becomes an artistic work in its own right” (Kline 72). In short, a successful adaptation would transform an original work into a completely new work, which would still hold true to the elements of the original work. According to Kline, two main issues arose with this approach: the first being that the adapted work is regarded as a separate work from the original; the second being that critics often favor the cinematic work over the literary work.

The ‘materialist’ paradigm was the fourth one that Kline puts forth and “[c]ritics adopting this approach examine the film as a product of cultural-historical processes” (74). The source material would not be overlooked but a rather cultural and commercial aspect of
the place in which the film was being made outweighs the original. Dudley Andrew implored all to “use it as we use all cultural practices: to understand the world from which it comes and the one toward which it points” (Kline 74). A successful adaption of this kind would be considered one that is able to hold true to the essence of the original work but still play to the commercial and cultural demands of the presence.

**Definition of adaptation**

Linda Hutcheon mentioned in her book *A Theory of Adaptation* that “to be second is not to be secondary or inferior, likewise to be first is not to be originary or authoritative” (xiii). Also, Thomas Leitch said in his essay *Adaptation Studies at a Crossroads* that “despite the best efforts of Cartmell and Whelehan and virtually every other theorist of adaptation past and present, the field is still hunted by the notion that adaptations ought to be faithful to their ostensible sourcetexts” (64). There had developed a sort of taxonomy of adaptation theory that some do not agree with. Leitch continued and said that the will to taxonomize can be presented in two ways:

First is the frequency with which it gets entangled with gratuitous value judgements that are not required by the taxonomy but sneak in under its cover, as if the will to taxonomize were only a mask for the will to evaluate.

Second is the continued determination of adaptation studies with the world all before it to define its field with primary reference to its closeness to literature. (64)

Many theorists disagreed with this taxonomy approach to adaptation and felt that it was not necessary to categorize the theory of adaptation since many other theorists like Julia Kristeva, Mikhail Bakhtin and Robert Stam had claimed that nothing could be portrayed as the original, everything must be adapted from something. Many of today theorists try to break out of the
mold that had been considered the field of adaptation and with “the defining context of literature, the will to taxonomize and the quest for ostensibly analytical methods and categories that will justify individual evaluations” (Leitch 65).

The first thing that needs to be considered is what an adaptation is? Hutcheon said that when we “call a work an adaptation, we openly announce its overt relationship to another work or works” (6). A work that is an adaptation can never be an original work, the ideas and concepts are driven from something that was already there. In her book Adaptation and Appropriation Julie Sanders described adaptations as the many “ways in which texts feed off and create other texts” (1). This rang true to what Edward Said wrote in his essay On Originality; “the writer thinks less of writing originally, and more of rewriting” (Hutcheon 61). Robert Stam observed that “an adaptation is […] less a resuscitation of an originary word than a turn in an ongoing dialogical process. Intertextual dialogism, then, helps us transcend the aporias of ‘fidelity’” (Leitch 234).

Hutcheon said that the word adaptation referred both to the process and the product and that this thing that we call adaptation could be “defined from three distinct but interrelated perspectives” (7). First of all, it was “seen as a formal entity or product” (7), that is to say, adaptations could be looked at as transposition of a work and the process is “transcoding”. The process involves “a shift of medium or genre, or a change of frame and therefore context: telling the same story from a different point of view” (7-8). For example when a book is adapted into a film and later that film is adapted into a videogame, it moves from one genre to another, always with added differences. Secondly, she refers to the process of creation; “the act of adaptation always involves both (re-)interpretation and then (re-)creation” (8), this development is often called appropriation or salvaging. For example, not everything is adapted, only work that the adapter feels deserves it gets adapted, not all children stories are adapted into films, only those that are worth it. Thirdly, she says that it is a process of
“adaptation is a form of intertextuality: we experience adaptations (as adaptations) as palimpsests through our memory of other works that resonate through repetition with variation” (8). As with films, for instance, it depends on if the audience has read the work that is being adapted prior to seeing the movie, on how their perception of it will be received.

Linda Costanzo Chair writes in her book, Literature into Film: Theory and Practical Approaches, that “the first step in exploring the merits of literature-based films is to see them as translations of the source material and to understand the difference between ‘adaptation’ and ‘translation’” (Leitch 71). Theorists have struggled with the definition of the word adaptation for decades because the term adaptation can both be referred to as the process and the product, “[a]s a product, an adaptation can be given a formal definition, but as a process – of creation and of reception – other aspects have to be considered” (Hutcheon 16). When thinking about adaptations as product they tend to be compared to translations or transposition. Transposition or translation of a text to another media or even within the same genre, e.g. book to film or book to book, is always accompanied by some change. The older ‘rules’ of translation stated that the original text should always be “granted an axiomatic primacy and authority”, however, “[r]ecent translation theory argues that translation involves a transaction between texts and between languages and is thus an act of both inter-cultural and inter-temporal communication” (Hutcheon 16).

Adaptation as a process is a delicate job of cutting and reshaping the story to fit a new media. Not all stories have to be cut, when dealing with short stories that have to be adapted to films, the adapters job is to “expand [the] source material considerably” (Hutcheon 19); as was done with “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale” and “The Minority Report”. A deeper look into adaptation as a process would be to consider the three modes of engagement; “that is, it permits us to think about how adaptations allow people to tell, show, or interact with stories” (Hutcheon 22). People can be told or shown stories according to different
genres, but the third mode of engagement, interaction, is a little bit different and the mode that has new aspects to it. The interaction mode now involves the audiences’ interaction with the stories and it is now made more accessible because of videogames and virtual reality. All three modes have some sort of ‘immersion’ to them; “the telling mode immerses us through imagination in a fictional world; the showing mode immerses us through the perception of the aural and the visual; …the participatory mode immerses us physically and kinesthetically” (Hutcheon 22). Each mode is different in its own way and has its own way of expressing the story.

These three modes of engagement are important to the theory of adaptation and will be discussed in further detail. It is a fact that the most common form of adaptation is from the written word to the screen or from the telling to the showing mode. The first problem that arises is bringing life to the text, it is in the hands of the director and actors to truthfully and convincingly interpret and bring life and meaning to the text or as literary critic David Lodge says; “[i]n the move from telling to showing, a performance adaptation must dramatize: description, narration, and represented thoughts must be transcoded into speech, actions, sounds, and visual images” (Hutcheon 40). The movement from print to film is a delicate process and the two modes are very different, it has to be kept in mind that telling is not the same as showing and that there are a few rules that have to be followed or even at least considered. Charles Sanders Peirce says that “[b]oth stage and screen adaptations must use indexical and iconic signs – that is, precise people, places, and things – whereas literature uses symbolic and conventional signs” (Hutcheon 43). The text that is being adapted usually must undergo considerable compression, removal of characters and scenes. When dealing with the interaction mode, that is to say, videogames, the plot of the story usually remains the same, the main difference being the outcome that depends on the player. Videogames depend on how well the adapted film is portrayed in the game itself as Hutcheon mentions; “[a]s with the
various forms of hypermedia, it is process, not final or finished product, that is important” (50).

Fidelity is one issue that has been a concern when dealing with adaptations; many theorist hold true to the issue while others tend to break from the old mode. Robert Stam explains that:

the notion of ‘fidelity’ does, admittedly, contain its grain of truth. When we say an adaptation has been ‘unfaithful’ to the original, the very violence of the term gives expression to the intense disappointment we feel when a film adaptation fails to capture what we see as the fundamental narrative, thematic, and aesthetic features of its literary source. The notion of fidelity gains its persuasive force from our sense that: a) some adaptations do fail to ‘realize’ what we most appreciated in the source novels; b) some adaptations are indeed better than others; and c) some adaptations miss at least some of the salient features of their sources. (Leitch, 235)

Again the issue of what is the ‘correct’ way of judging an adaptation comes up.

From this brief overview it can be established that the theory of adaptation is not a clean-cut process, rather a mixture of different viewpoints and opinions. What can be established from this is that film adaptations or any adaptations should be judge on or evaluated by their literary or original source. Moreover, adaptations are translations or a transcoded process from one media or genre to another, and are always followed by a change of some sort. A change from the original work is unavoidable. Finally, it is clear that one must find within oneself the right way to judge or evaluate an adaptation based on one self’s opinion. More on adaptation, especially the adapter and the reason for adaptation can be found in appendix seven.
“The Minority Report” vs. *Minority Report*

In 1956 Philip K. Dick published the short story “The Minority Report”, this story like the others that will be discussed incorporated the theme of ‘What is Real’. In short, the question Dick raised in this story was that if you knew the future, would it eventually change the future you know and therefore create another future event? In 2002 director Steven Spielberg released his newest project, *Minority Report*. The screenplay was written by Jon Cohen and Scott Frank and starring such A-listers as Tom Cruise, Max von Sydow and Colin Farell. The film received sudden stardom and it did not have to struggle as *Blade Runner* for its critical acclaim, but more on that below. Anthony Lane said that “[t]he worst thing about the new Steven Spielberg picture is the title, ”Minority Report.” The best thing about it is pretty much everything else” (2002). Roger Ebert concurred and said that it was “a triumph--a film that works on our minds and our emotions. It is a thriller and a human story, a movie of ideas that’s also a whodunit […] This film is such a virtuoso high-wire act, daring so much, achieving it with such grace and skill. ‘Minority Report’ reminds us why we go to the movies in the first place” (2002). Only a handful of critics gave the film a negative review but surprisingly not all that bad. J. Hoberman said that it was “[m]iscast, misguided, and often nonsensical, *Minority Report* is nevertheless the most entertaining, least pretentious genre movie Steven Spielberg has made in the decade since *Jurassic Park*” (2002). As most reviewers did, Hoberman put a positive spin on a negative review. Stuart Klawans wrote that [t]o miss it would be like bypassing one of those grand and macabre curiosities that lie just off the tourist’s route--like visiting Madrid, for example, without troubling to descend the marbled stair to the crypt of the Escorial. In the monumental edifice of *Minority Report*, as in that palatial tomb, you may encounter something madly idiosyncratic, yet absolutely characteristic of its culture. It’s just not much of a pleasure. (2002)
The film grossed more than $350 million, which trebled its $102 million budget making it not only a commercial success (imdb.com) but also a real adaptation success, based on the fact that it made money and the film critics and the public liked it. The film has inspired many academic research papers, such as Martin Hall’s *Time and the Fragmented Subject in Minority Report* and Mark Garrett Cooper’s *The Contradictions of Minority Report*, and will soon become a rival to *Blade Runner*. Even though it was not a completely faithful adaptation in regards to the storyline, the connection between story and film was strong and as Chris Chang wrote in his essay *Future Shock*: “the relationship between original story and film is both tenuous and reverential. Spielberg has captured the tone and concept while exploding and reworking the narrative so completely that comparisons are essentially futile” (Vest, 118). Dick thought that *Blade Runner* and *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep* complimented each other and the same can be said about this short story and its film counterpart. A complete summary of the short story and the film synopsis can be found in appendix one and two.

**Changes in character, plot and story**

John Anderton, the character of Dick’s story was in a sense a typical character for his creation, he was “a beleaguered functionary whose position within an overweening bureaucracy depends upon ego, jealousy, and suspicion” (Vest 119). Dick’s opening paragraph gives a good idea of the state of mind that Anderton is in:

> [t]he first thought Anderton had when he saw the young man was: *I’m getting bald. Bald and fat and old.* But he didn’t say it aloud. Instead, he pushed back his chair, got to his feet, and came resolutely around the side of this desk, his right hand rigidly extended. Smiling with forced amiability, he shook hands with the young man. (Dick 71)
These first glimpses into the character of Anderton reveal much, his fear of growing old and being left behind, the replacement of the old with the young and the disappointments of middle age. Anderton frustration towards Witwer, the young man set to replace him when he retires, spirals into full-blown paranoia when the precogs (mutants that can foresee crimes) determine that he will kill Kaplan, a high-ranking ex-general. Keeping in accordance with Dick’s themes, the evil-woman syndrome, Anderton suspected his younger wife Lisa of betrayal and that was only infused more with Witwer’s interest in her: “Witwer remained silent. But his pale eyes flickered slightly as they rested on the brown-haired woman in her trim police uniform. Lisa was now an executive official of Precrime but once, Witwer knew; she had been Anderton’s secretary. Noticing the interest on Witwer’s face Anderton paused and reflected” (Dick 75). Dick was suggesting that Lisa married Anderton to further her own career; this is not surprising, knowing well the unkind treatment women received in Dick’s stories. The fact that Anderton would suspect his wife of being in alliance with Witwer was not that surprising to any reader of Dick’s work.

Spielberg manages to capture Anderton’s paranoia and bureaucratic nonsense despite the many changes that were made to the story. The character of Anderton in Dick’s story was split into two characters in Spielberg’s movie: John Anderton (Tom Cruise) and Lamar Burgess (Max von Sydow). By doing so the screenwriters transferred the worries of control over Precrime to Burgess and gave the character of Anderton freedom to be the hero, something that is important to any Hollywood block buster movie. The character of Witwer remained the same in most instances, in the story, Witwer was preparing to take over from Anderton who was retiring, but in the film, Witwer was at Precrime to evaluate it before the National Referendum. He was the one that questions the Precogs visions, could they be trusted? Both film and story focused on Anderton’s strict believe in the system of Precrime, which gave the plausibility of him being framed by Witwer, more credibility.
Anderton’s family situation was different in the film, in the story Anderton was an older man who was married to a younger attractive wife. However, in the film Anderton was younger and had been divorced from his wife, Lara, for six years. Another added twist to the story was that their son was taken when swimming with his father in a crowded public swimming pool. This tragedy had resulted in Anderton becoming addicted to neuron, a futuristic drug. This element of fractured families was something that Spielberg masterfully factored in to the film and in the end becomes the main element of the story.

Why was it necessary to change the character and situation of Anderton so much? Scott Frank explained in an interview with Creative Screenwriting that Philip K. Dick’s stuff, at least for Minority Report, operates on a purely conceptual level and his characters in the short story were very flat. They had no arc. So for me they weren’t all that interesting. There wasn’t much to draw from in the short story in terms of character. (Wehner 140)

Jon Cohen explained it in a similar way and said: “I think my character stuff came through a little bit, especially in the imagining of the female Precog and humanizing her. Sci-fi is often very conceptual and as a result very chilly” (Wehner 156). Furthermore it was necessary to change the character of Anderton because they had humanized the precogs as Cohen explained: “[w]hether or not the system works, you’ve enslaved a person to make the system work. No decent hero is going to allow that to happen” (Wehner 157), again the essence of a Hollywood blockbuster film was to have a hero who knows right from wrong.

The Precogs were one element that underwent significant change from story to film. The first change is that in the film the precogs could only foresee murder, no other crimes unlike Dick’s story where they foresee all crime. The reason they could only foretell of murders was as Gordon Fletcher, Anderton’s second in command, explained that it was “[b]ecause of the nature of murder. There’s nothing more destructive to the metaphysical
fabric that binds us than the untimely murder of one human being by another” (Frank 21).

There was also significant difference in the way the Precogs were treated in the short story and film. In Dick’s story they were described as “deformed and retarded […] three gibbering, fumbling creatures, with […] enlarged heads and wasted bodies” (Dick 73). They were not even considered human and their confinement in the Precrime Agency was similar to slavery. No one in Dick’s story gave any compassion towards the Precogs and neither did Dick; to him they seemed “barely more than a plot device that enables the narrative’s innovative premise” (Vest 122). This coincided with one of Kline’s paradigm for evaluating adaptations; the materialistic approach. In this world of sympathy, equal rights, tolerance and knowledge, it did not seem realistic that three individuals, ‘mutants’ or not, would be held captive under such brutal conditions as Dick described in his story.

In the film, the Precogs were children of drug addicts, more precisely neuron, this drug could cause severe birth defects and Dr. Hineman, the creator of Precrime, was working on a treatment to help these children but instead she accidentally gave them the ability to foresee murders. The three Precogs were only a small number of children that survived the treatment. When Anderton hears Dr. Hineman’s description, he almost felt sickened by what had happened. It seems to be more difficult for them to not feel compassion for the precogs and as Anderton said when explaining to Witwer: “[i]t helps if you don’t think of them as human. Witwer: No…they’re much more than that […] Science has stolen most of our miracles. In a way… they give us hope… hope of the existence of the divine […]. Anderton: The precogs are pattern recognition filters, nothing more” (Frank 23). Frank incorporated one of Dick’s dualism into this scene, Human/Android, the precogs are human but they are not thought of as human, rather something mechanical. Jason Vest believed that “[t]he depravity at the center of Precrime requires the Precogs to live as indentured servants to the American state, enduring the horrors of their homicidal visions to preserve the citizenry’s safety” (Vest 123). In a way it
was also slavery but with compassion, which this futuristic society chooses to ignore. The film had the basic core element of the precogs but omitted the deformity from Dick’s short story.

It was obvious that he film treated the precogs much more kindly than Dick’s story. This was moreover suggested by the name of the chamber they were kept in, the film referred to it as ‘The temple’ while Dick’s story called it the ‘The Monkey Block’; again Kline’s materialist approach was put into use here. The departure from the story was not absolute; the conditions that the precogs were kept in were similar though in the film they were not strapped down in chairs but rather lying comfortably sedative, presumably unaware of their environment.

Dick vs. Spielberg

Philip K. Dick was not known for his graphic description of scenery and atmosphere and in “The Minority Report” he still holds true to his minimal approach to description, for him “physicality is less important than the intellectual excitement of predicting the future” (Vest 128). This gave Spielberg and his screenwriter free range when picturing Washington in the year 2054. Just as bleak, dark and depressing as Blade Runner was, so bright, open and fresh was Spielberg’s Minority Report. Richard Corliss explained that “[b]oth films […] combine futuristic technology with elements of twentieth-century design to achieve an aesthetic that Fred Glass might call the New Bad Future Look” (Vest 126). In the first scenes of Minority Report the viewer experienced the technology of 2054, the freeways, the cars and the eye scanners and also the simplicity of nineteen and twentieth century America, as could be seen with Howard Marks resident in Georgetown. Another example of future technology was the hovering transport ship that Anderton and his team took to prevent Marks from killing his wife and her lover. In Dick’s story it was only described as “a good fast ship” (Dick 88) but
for Spielberg the ship, “in a nod to Lucas’s *Star Wars* films, resembles Slave One, the space vessel piloted by bounty hunter Boba Fett” (Vest 126). The benefits of Dick’s story was that he was not required, with the telling mode, to describe the ship in any great detail but Spielberg, using the showing mode, must convey the future in a realistic way to present his futuristic world.

**Additions to the plot and story and alternative ending**

In Dick’s story, Anderton did not have an addiction to neuron as Tom Cruise’s character in *Minority Report*. The audiences first become aware of his addiction and that it was illegal when you saw him jogging through the desolate neighborhood called ‘The Sprawl’. This neighborhood was the opposite of the bright and clean city of Washington portrayed earlier. This was also what connects *Minority Report* to *Blade Runner* with its huge futuristic commercials targeted at the individuals who lived in this urban decay. This neighborhood did not appear in Dick’s story but rather it was the “innovations and extrapolations prepared by Spielberg, his screenwriters, and his production team for *Minority Report*’s 2054 setting that envision past, present, and future architecture coming together to produce a singular example of the Retro Future Look” (Vest 127). ‘The Sprawl’ was one of few things that connected *Minority Report* to *Blade Runner*, which was a milestone in American SF films for its look, unlike other adaptations that have strived to reproduce that scenery, more on that below. By moving away from Dick’s less enthusiastic descriptions of atmosphere and scenery, Spielberg was able to create a world full of color and futuristic environment that “allows the film’s characters, as well as its audience, to inhabit a world that exceeds the limited features of Dick’s original short story” (Vest 128). As mentioned above in the chapter about adaptation, telling is not the same as showing; Spielberg and his team had to create for their audience a realist setting, unlike Dick, for whom it was enough to say that the story happens in the future.
Dick’s story ended with Precrime still in operation because Anderton proved that the precogs visions were in fact right by shooting Kaplan who wanted to discredit the Precrime system by showing himself standing next to his supposed killer. Anderton and his wife were forced to flee Earth and settle on a new planet. As mentioned above, the precogs were of little or no concern to Dick and at the end of the story they still remained ‘prisoners’ inside Precrime. However, Spielberg ended his film on a happier note, which was necessary for Hollywood action films: Burgess committed suicide instead of facing his crimes; Anderton and Lara remarried and were expecting a baby. Also

in 2054, the six-year Precrime experiment was abandoned. All prisoners were unconditionally pardoned and released, although police departments kept watch on many of them for years to come. Agatha and the twins were transferred to an undisclosed location: a place where they could find relief from their gifts. A place where they could live out their lives in peace.

(Frank)

Not everybody agreed with this ending. John Petrakis said that “the concluding segments mar an otherwise skillful and intelligent film, and suggest that Spielberg’s audience-pleasing instincts will keep him from inheriting the mantle of Stanley Kubrick, who understood early on in his storied career that the most profound endings aren’t always happy” (Vest 134). David Edelstein was far from happy with the ending and asked “whose idea was it to turn Minority Report into a mushy declaration of humanism? It ends up as less of a warning about an Orwellian police state than a protest that Pre-Cogs are people, too. It’s Dick-less” (Vest 134).

As with other adaptation by Dick, things were not always as they seemed, the ending might not be as optimistic as it first appears to be. When looking deeper into the film one could not miss one crucial statement that Gideon said to Anderton when he was being haloed
in the department of Containment: “[i]t’s actually kind of a rush. They say you get visions; that your life flashes before your eyes. That all your dreams come true” (Frank 100). An alternative ending would suggest that everything that happened after Anderton was put in containment was a fiction of his imagination and that none of it was true. What really happened was that Burgess got away with murder; his wife thought he was a killer and the precogs stayed where they were, confined within the temple of Precrime: “[a]ll that Anderton has left is a dream of better days and happier times that will replay endlessly through his consciousness” (Vest 135). Another example of how this could be the actual end was the final shot where the precogs were “sitting in a rough triangle as they read books, then cranes upward and way from their cottage to reveal that the cabin sits on an island surrounded by water” (Vest 135). This was all too similar to the temple where the precogs were kept. If this was really the ending then Spielberg and his screenwriters had successfully managed to incorporate one of Dick’s favorite theme, ‘What is Real’ and the dualism of Real/Fake. By evaluating this adaptation by these premises, the pluralist approach, it was keeping the spirit of Dick story intact and creating a balance between source material and adaptation.

Spielberg’s film was packed with references to sight, seeing and eyes, for instance, Agatha repeatedly asked Anderton the question “Can you see”, in reference to her mother’s murder, Anderton’s eye transplant, the eye scanners and the precogs visions. Agatha continuously tried to make Anderton see the truth about her mother’s murder, which was killed by Lamar Burgess. We found out that her mother had kicked her neuron habit and wanted her baby back and Burgess could not let that happen since the precogs could not operate without Agatha and without her there would be not Precrime. This storyline had nothing to do with Dick’s story and was a complete divergence from it. Anderton’s eye transplant was also not relevant to Dick’s story but becomes one of the film most intriguing scenes.
The eye transplant scene was a testimony to Spielberg and his talented cast and showed the narrative sophistication of *Minority Report*. Anderton needed to have an eye transplant to avoid detection by the city wide retinal scanners. The surgery was performed by Dr. Solomon Eddie and his assistant, Greta Van Eyck. Dr. Eddie was played by Peter Stormare who was a former plastic surgeon and an ex-convict who Anderton put away because he was in the habit of putting his patients on fire and not always managing to put them out in time. Stormare not only portrayed his character with depth and precision but also managed to steal the spotlight from Cruise, furthermore he “skillfully projects the dignified bitterness of a man who must live with the mistakes of his past” (Vest 138). Vest suggested that this scene was a “surreal homage to Kubrick’s 1971 film *A Clockwork Orange*, with Anderton’s eyes being stretched open in the same way that Aldex de Large’s (Malcolm McDowell) are in Kubrick’s film” (137). This was actually a really good point by Vest since both films dealt with the theme of preventing violence before it happened, one with precognitive visions and the other with rehabilitation.

Another scene in *Minority Report* equaled the importance of the scene discussed above and that was when Anderton discovers Leo Crow’s hotel room and presumably believed this was the man that kidnapped and killed his son. It was in this scene that Anderton realized that he was not being set up: “[y]ou were right. I’m not being set up. I’m gonna kill this man […] there is no Minority Report. I don’t have an alternative future” (Frank 87). Agatha insisted to him that he did not need to kill him, he had a choice. With Agatha making the statement of “you still have a choice. The others never had a chance to see their future. You did” (Frank 87), *Minority Report* drew itself away from Dick’s story. As Dick story was pessimistic and ironic the film, on the other hand, “emphasizes how important free choice is to maintaining the dignity of individual lives and the moral authority of democratic societies” (Vest 140). And this point was repeated when Anderton confronted Burgess on the roof and pleaded with
him not to kill himself, that he had a choice. These two scenes were in violation of Kline’s translation paradigm concerning fidelity. These two scenes had nothing to do with Dick’s story but were important to Spielberg’s movie. Unlike Anderton in Dick’s story, Anderton in Spielberg’s movie did not have a minority report; if he would have meet Leo Crow he would most definitely had kill him, no doubt. These two scenes, though not in accordance with the translation paradigm, elevated the film to emphasize on the story behind the story.

Again, one of Dick’s favorite elements, the nature of reality and the uncertainty surrounding it, was used and so brilliantly portrayed in an adaptation based on his work. This gives Dick’s fans some hope that perhaps Spielberg did pay attention to what Dick was all about. It is safe to say that Minority Report does not disappoint in any aspect whether it be the cast, the director, or its adaptation of Dick’s original story. Though not keeping to the storyline completely it still maintains to draw attention to Dick’s key themes and that is what is really important.

“We Can Remember It For you Wholesale” vs. Total Recall

In 1966, Philip K. Dick published his short story “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale”, it is a story that fused together the boundaries of reality, false implanted memory and real memory, a perfect combination of all of his favorite themes. It was twenty-four years later, in 1990, that “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale” was adapted into a motion picture. It starred such big hitters as Arnold Schwarzenegger, Sharon Stone, Rachael Ticotin, Ronny Cox and Michael Ironside. It was directed by Dutch director Paul Verhoeven (RoboCop, 1987) and screenplay by Ronald Shusett and Dan O’Bannon. Even though it was loosely adapted or even just inspired from Philip Dick’s short story the themes and key elements were recognizable to any fan of the author and story. A summary of the short story and film synopsis can be found in appendix three and four.
Both short story and film have the same key themes, real or false memory and the perception of reality. *Total Recall* became a huge box office hit, thanks to the “film’s relentless pace, enormous action set pieces, curious political subtext, and multiple narrative strands” (Vest 29). It proved that Philip Dick’s stories could actually be translated into commercial hits unlike *Blade Runner* at the time. It was unavoidable that it be compared to *Blade Runner* since only a few years had passed since its release, *Blade Runner* was released in 1982. Jonathan Rosenbaum wrote that it was “a worthy entry in the dystopian cycle launched by *Blade Runner*, this seems less derivative than most of its predecessors yet equally accomplished in its straight-ahead storytelling, with plenty of provocative satiric undertones and scenic details” (Rosenbaum). Roger Ebert said that “[t]his is one of the most complex and visually interesting science fiction movies in a long time” (Ebert 1990). The reviews were mostly positive, those that had anything bad to say about the film focused on the violence, which the film had plenty of “[b]ut what *Total Recall* has going for it is that it’s fast-paced, original, extremely entertaining, and should even manage to get you thinking – If I’m not me, who da Hell am I?” (movie gazette). The theme of ‘What is Real’ and the dualism between Real/Fake were obvious from the beginning.

The degree of violence and its graphic nature in the film put many people off, but the attraction of seeing Arnold Schwarzenegger in a completely different role than what he was used to seemed to outweigh the violence. Janet Maslin wrote in the *New York Times* that *Total Recall* “is a thunderous tribute to its star’s determination to create, out of the unlikeliest raw materials, a patiently sympathetic yet surprisingly affable leading man” (1990). She also noted the violence and said that director Paul Verhoeven “is much better at drumming up this sort of artificial excitement than he is at knowing when to stop” (1990). Although she praised Schwarzenegger for his part she did not care too much for the women, describing Sharon

Some critics did not care for the movie at all, like Terrence Rafferty wrote in a *New Yorker* review saying that

*Total Recall* is so terrible that it wipes out our last, stubbornest images of the brief pleasure Schwarzenegger gave us when he played an automaton. We may even begin to believe that *The Terminator* never really happened – that it was just some kind of brain implant, a trick designed to lure us, again and again, into a dark room where a giant will know us senseless and take our money. (Vest 31)

Rita Kempley from the *Washington Post* was not kind at all when she said that it was “[a] gratuitous explosion of vainglory and guts, the movie is all firecrackers and giblets and broken glass. The overall effect is like wading through hospital waste” (1990).

It could not be overlooked that the film did enter some risky waters with its representation of women, minorities and Third World colonialism. This was not what was usually present in a big blockbuster movie. Like *Blade Runner* inspired cyberpunk it seemed that *Total Recall* would do the same for a new subgenre of science fiction, ‘New Bad Future’ (NBF). Fred Class said in his essay, *Totally Recalling Arnold: Sex and Violence in the New Bad Future*, that “(NBF) offers something more to the critical viewer than visual pyrotechnics and pumped-up action sequences, [it] tell[s] stories about a future in the grip of feverish social decay” (1990). Some films, like *Mad Max*, depicted a world after a nuclear war, with all its destructive forces and decay, other films, like *Blade Runner, Robocop* and *Alien*, portrayed a world that existed without such destruction. In Glass option, *Total Recall* “exemplifies the ‘New Bad Future’ film: an SF movie that melds standard action-adventure narrative with
political, social, economic, and/or moral seriousness” (1990). This is also true of Minority Report.

Dick’s story “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale” remained on Earth, the character of Douglas Quail never went to Mars like his counter character Doug Quaid did in Total Recall. Even though Total Recall was only inspired by Dick’s story, it still retained the most important elements of it.

‘If I’m not me, who da Hell am I?’

One of Philip K. Dick’s favorite themes to use was implanted false memory, where the identity and authenticity of oneself and ones surrounding was always being questioned. “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale” and Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep incorporated this idea about false memory implantation and the question of what is real and what is not. As the books connected to each other so did Total Recall and Blade Runner, the possibility of rewriting personality and entire lifetimes into a person connected the films without replicating the actual story or theme. The replicants in Blade Runner wanted to replace their false implanted memories with new real experiences of their own while Total Recall “implies that human beings can embrace false memories that obscure or revise their true character” (Vest 34). As when Quaid discovered that he was not who he though he was but rather he was a person named Hauser and he said: “I am Quaid” (Shusett and O’Bannon), to reaffirm who he was.

As mentioned above, the film was only inspired by the book and not a complete adaptation of it; even so, there were few points worth mentioning regarding the adaptation of the story to film. First of all there were two obvious differences: the protagonist profession and his marriage. In the film he “clings to memories of marriage and friendship to authenticate his past” (Vest 34). His visit to Rekall had nothing to do with his marriage,
unlike in the short story, rather he wished to escape his dull life as a construction worker and also to make some sense of those recurring dreams he had been having. He was in a sense very happily married, or that was what he thought. After Lori’s confession about Quaid’s implanted memory both the viewer and Quaid were set in a tidal wave of uncertainty about what was really going on. Quaid realized that his life was just a dream and that for him “blurs the boundary between reality and fantasy” (Vest 35). The audiences and Quaid could no longer tell if the on-screen life that was unfolding before them was real or one of several alternatives: “(1) the product of Rekall’s memory implant; (2) a delusion created by the ‘schizoid embolism’ that Rekall employee Dr. Lull diagnoses after Quaid’s memory implantation procedure goes wrong; (3) a defective rewiring of Quaid’s memory by the Martian intelligence service; or (4) a nightmare from which Quaid struggles to awaken” (Vest 35). This uncertainty about what was real lingered throughout the film and established Dick’s presence and spirit in the film.

If Douglas Quaid thought his life was dull then he did not know his counterpart, Douglas Quail. In “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale”, Quail worked as a minor clerk for a government agency and his trip to Rekall was to escape the everyday existence of his life. Kristen, Quail’s wife, did not believe him when he told her he had actually been to Mars, his lifelong obsession, and finally walked out: “[a]lways the retort, as if she knows everything and I know nothing. What a marriage. Keerist […] His wife had left. Finally” (Dick 43-44). Quail even suspected that his wife’s memory had also been altered and therefore suggesting that Quail himself maybe a little bit unstable. Jason Vest proposed that “Kirsten is little more than a nagging wife whose exit produces relief in her husband […] [she] is such a minor (and stereotypical) character in Dick’s story that her departure allows Quail to pursue his true identity without her nagging interference” (36). Again Dick showed how ‘badly’ he wrote the woman characters. Total Recall gave the character of Quaid’s wife more substance,
incorporating her into the grand scheme of Cohaagen’s manipulation. Quail actually wanted a new life and a new identity unlike Quaid who was perfectly satisfied in being who he was, and not Hauser.

To continue with the topic of false memory and the quest of one’s identity it could not be overlooked that Quaid’s search for who he was, was similar to the replicants quest in Blade Runner. Quaid was throughout the movie searching for answers about who he was, was he Quaid or was he Hauser? That was not unlike Roy Batty “who refuses inaction in the face of this existential crisis” (Vest 37) of not knowing who he was.

Just as the movie began ambiguous it ended ambiguous, after Quaid’s visit to Rekall, it was not clear whether or not what he had experienced was real or just part of the implantation. In the end, when the hero had turned on the reactor and changed Mars atmosphere into a breathable one, he said to Melina: “I just had a terrible thought. What if this is a dream”. Melina replies: “Well then kiss me quick before we wake up” (Shusett and O’Bannon). Melina was indirevitably telling Quaid that she was not part of his delusion and she “both suggests and denies that she is a figment of Quaid’s imagination, underscoring the film’s narrative ambivalence” (Vest 37). The end of the movie, when Quaid kissed Melina and everything was good on Mars, the screen filled with a bright light and mysterious music was heard playing in the background. This could in fact have implied that this had all been a dream; maybe Quaid did have a schizoid embolism during the implantation? Or it could have been that this was the two week vacation that he ordered, and we, as viewers were lucky enough to enjoy it with him? There was one clear example that ‘proved’ that this was all an illusion: when Quaid was about to have his implantation, the technician Ernie said when looking at the material: “[t]hat is a new one: blue sky on Mars” (Shusett and O’Bannon). And of course there was the fact that it was or it is to our best knowledge that Mars should not be able to have a breathable atmosphere in five minutes. Whatever the conclusion was, it still
could not be denied that *Total Recall* “exceeds the existential and ideological boundaries of “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale” without repudiating the narrative basis of Philip K. Dick’s short story” (Vest 38).

**Political, social and gender issues in story and film**

Many make the mistake of thinking that “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale” is only a short story about a guy that has his memory erased; the same can also be said about *Total Recall*. The film has been categorized as an action filled adventure story with a lot of violence. Wrong. The film, more so than the short story, is packed with political and social issues that one cannot ignore.

Many were disgusted by the graphic violence in the film but Paul Verhoeven says that Europeans have a bigger tolerance for violence since their continent has had many more wars than the United States and that it is un-American to point that out. Americans believe in their own goodness, their chosen status as God’s Own People. Hence the gigantic hang-up about Vietnam. They cannot accept that they made a mistake: that’s the Utopian thinking this country (USA) was build on. Right is right – that’s us – and wrong is wrong – that’s the others. (Vest 38)

As an example of this excess violence is the length that Cohaagen goes to capture Quaid: rebels are slaughtered in public, he cuts off the oxygen supply for Venusville (home of the rebels) and simply saying: “Fuck’em. Be a good lesson to the others” (Shusett and O’Bannon). Verhoeven uses these tactics as a reminder of “historical events such as the wholesale slaughter of Indian villages […], the fire bombings of Dresden and Tokyo […_] and the atrocities committed against Mau Mau insurgents in Kenya” and not to mention the Vietnam War which placed the United States as an imperial power among nations (Vest 39).
"Total Recall" is only one of many films that represent the white hero who saves the community from oppression. The white hero representing the US and the oppression that takes place is usually representing communism. Other films are for instance *Rambo: First Blood Part II* (1985), *Commando* (1985), *Raw Deal* (1986) and *Predator* (1987). These films “salvaged American goodness, liberty, autonomy by glamorizing violent white men who reaffirm America’s uncomplicated sense of utopian optimism through their willingness to confront bureaucratic ineptitude, to oppose ‘liberation’ movements that front Communist or fascistic ideologies, and to do ‘what must be done’ to preserve national security against foreign and domestic threats” (Vest 39).

Returning back to the short story, there are only a few hints of political issues. In the story, only government official and intelligence agents are allowed access to Mars. Why? Dick does not go into details about what is happening on Mars but Quail’s erased mission to Mars where he assassinated a political leader gives some idea about what is going on. One of Interplan agents says to Quail that his mission “is not in accord with our great white all-protecting father image” (Dick 46). This small little sentence shows that “Dick’s understanding of the hypocrisy that results from prosecuting wars and colonial ventures […] to defend freedom, liberty, and democracy” (Vest 41). "We Can Remember It for You Wholesale" was written and published at the same time the Vietnam War was raging and it gives a clear example of Dick’s unfriendly feelings towards wars.

**Not your typical housewife**

The women of Dick’s stories have not always been in the spotlight, they have been sub characters that never really do anything remarkable. As mentioned earlier, Dick himself wrote in 1960 a letter to Eleanor Dimoff, where he stated that:

> I do have the suspicion that I’m writing the same woman into one book after another…I tend to take it for granted in a novel that a man’s wife is not
going to help him; she’s going to give him a bad time, working against him.

And the smarter she is, the more likely she’s up to something. A woman schemes…It may be that one of the genuinely weak elements in my books is the female co-lead. I either romanticize them or paint them as harpies.

(Sutin 109)

It is obvious that Kirsten’s character in “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale” is much less exciting than Lori and Melina in Total Recall.

The women of both the story and the film can be identified more or less by some stereotypical personalities. For instance, Kirsten in the story is the typical nagging housewife who does nothing to help the ‘hero’, only makes him feel bad and all around miserable. The protagonist of the story is glad when she walks away; he is free to pursue his own dreams and plans. And even though it is understandable why she left it still emphasizes what Dick reveals in his letter to Dimoff, this fits exactly into the personalities of the women of Dick’s fiction.

Total Recall does not conform to the ideals of stereotypes as much as the book but certain aspects give clear examples of this. Beside the two main female characters in Quaid’s life there are the mutant women of Mars. These women are mostly prostitutes and this “accounts for the charges of masculine hubris, sexism, and outright misogyny that have characterized Total Recall since its initial theatrical release” (Vest 42). The two main characters, Lori and Melina, represent the ‘bad girl’ and the ‘good girl’. Melina is Quaid’s lover and fights alongside him to free Mars while Lori, his wife, betrays him into the arms of Richter. Even though they are both portrayed in a sexual manner, Lori is always trying to seduce Quaid while Melina is a prostitute, they still break out of their stereotypical roles by becoming the fighting machines and equal in force as the men. As Johanna Schmertz notes in her essay On Reading the Politics of Total Recall:
Melina and Lori could be read as embodying a madonna/whore split conception of women, as in films like *Fatal Attraction*, but this too is problematized, as it is the whore, Melina, who would represent the positive half of that slit. A very strong case could be made that the film is not only not sexist, but feminist: Melina…to some extent embodies a female superhero. (Vest 44)

This holds true to one of Dick’s dualism Mother/Lover. Rather than being the stereotypical helpless woman, Lori and Melina can be placed in the same category as some other ‘ass-kicking women’, such as; Ellen Ripley (Sigourney Weaver) in *Alien* and *Aliens*, Sarah Connor (Linda Hamilton) in *The Terminator* and *Terminator 2: Judgement Day* and Lara Croft (Angelina Jolie) in *Lara Croft: Tomb Raider* and *Lara Croft Tomb Raider: The Cradle of Life*. Vest proclaims that *Total Recall* “is not a feminist film so much as a movie that ambiguously oscillates between conventionally sexist and more progressive depictions of female intelligence, sexuality, and agency” (45). Though not proclaimed as a feminist film it is still a welcomed change from Dick’s stigmatic characterization of Kirsten.

**Changes in character, plot and story**

Not many expected to see Arnold Schwarzenegger as the lead male role in *Total Recall*, other actors such as Jeff Bridges, Richard Dreyfuss or Patrick Swayze where up for the role in the first place. Jason Vest explains that these actors did not have the economical power to get the film produced, on the other hand, Schwarzenegger did. His stardom was enough to draw in the financial support needed to launch the production. After his success with *Conan the Barbarian*, *Conan the Destroyer* and *The Terminator* he had placed himself firmly in Hollywood and with that given him much attraction. Schwarzenegger was so impressed with
Verhoeven direction in *RoboCop* that he approached him and suggested they make a movie together, and casting himself in the role of Quaid.

Those of us who have read “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale” could not have imagined the over-muscular actor to portray the meager and withdrawn bureaucratic clerk Douglas Quail. The screenplay was revised when Schwarzenegger came on board and some changes were made to the character to fit his persona and physic. The first thing that was changed was the name of the protagonist from Quail to Quaid. The name Quail is “a marvelous double entendre that not only matches the character’s initially timid and querulous behavior but also symbolizes the man’s status as a game bird who is hunted by Interplan Police Agency officers throughout the story” (Vest 49). This corresponds to Kline’s transformation approach to adaptation, the changes that were made to the character of Quail were necessary and with these changes a new work was created.

Some critics have noted that because the script was altered to fit Schwarzenegger’s persona that it has resulted in a schizophrenic performance by the actor. One would expect him to do well in the tough guy scenes and completely fail when it was time to perform the more vulnerable parts. On the contrary, he delivers his performance as Quaid, the insignificant blue-collar worker who wants more out of life, much better than when Quaid has Hauser’s fighting abilities, which should place Schwarzenegger in his right element. Roger Ebert praises his performance and says that “[h]e’s a confused and frightened innocent, a man betrayed by the structure of reality itself. And in his vulnerability, he opens the way for *Total Recall* to be more than simply an action, violence and special effects extravaganza (1990). That is not to say that his performance is not believable. The way that the screenwriters discreetly incorporate the character of Quail into the character of Quaid is quite brilliant. Quail, from Dick’s story, is not simply a meek and held back individual; before his memory was erased he was a trained assassin, a professional killer:
On Mars, Quail said hoarsely, I killed a man. After getting past fifteen bodyguards. Some armed with sneaky-pete guns, the way you are. He had been trained, by Interplan, over a five year period to be an assassin. A professional killer. He knew ways to take out armed adversaries…such as these two officers; and the one with the ear-receiver knew it, too. (Dick 46-47)

Quail does know how to use deadly force and it seems that he is pretty good at it. So in a fact, Quaid’s character in Total Recall is justified by his predecessor.

In Dick’s story, Quail turns himself in to have his memory altered with his most desirable fantasy, which turns out to be that he is Earth’s savior. Quail prevents the invasion on Earth by miniature aliens by showing them kindness and in return they make a covenant with Quail, Earth will be spared as long as he is alive. The funny twist is that it was no childhood fantasy but something that really happened. Total Recall does in fact incorporate this scene but of course because of its leading man it had to be altered slightly. In Total Recall, instead of saving Earth he saves Mars with the use of alien technology and not kindness. Kindness is replaced by extreme violence and bloodshed, as when Quaid uses an innocent bystander as his personal shield and the way in which he kills Richter. Vest notes that these differences “illustrate how much Total Recall’s writers, producers, and director alter “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale” to service its star’s image” (52). It seems that these changes were necessary to keep up with the movies of the time. Action was at its peak at this era and therefore the film needed action.

In 1994 and 1999 the film was adapted into television series, the later had more success than the one before and was nominated for a Primetime Emmy. In 2012 there is a planned release of a remake of Total Recall starring Colin Farrell as Douglas Quaid and directed by Len Wiseman. The producer, Neil Moritz says that the “new version […] will be
closer to the book it was based on” (BreakingNews.ie). Maybe the new release will hold true to the translation approach and pay more attention to fidelity.

**Blade Runner vs. Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep**

In 1968 Philip K. Dick published his novel *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep* and as Dick explained: “*Sheep* is one of my three favorite novels. I liked it very much. Although it’s essentially a dramatic work, the moral and philosophical ambiguities it dealt with are really very profound” (Sammon 16). He goes on to say that it “stemmed from my basic interest in the problem of differentiating the authentic human being from the reflexive machine, which I call an android. In my mind android is a metaphor for people who are physiologically human but behaving in a nonhuman way” (Sammon 16). It is a book that is not as popular as the adaptation that was created from it but it is a well guarded secret of SF fans because it can affect people in different ways and critic Steven Wu explained that “when I finished the book, I had to sit down and just stare out into space for a while. And then I had to think. It is not often you come across a book like this. Read it now” (Wu). Jason Koornick agreed with Wu and said that “[i]t has all the elements of a great work of science fiction. It works on many levels and addresses a range of humanity’s most pressing concerns” (Koornick).

*Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep* caught the attention of director Ridley Scott who later adapted it to a full motion picture in 1982, titled *Blade Runner*. It occupies a special place in Dick’s adaptations. Firstly, it is the first successful adaptation. Secondly, it adapts a full length novel and thirdly it is the only one of the adaptation to receive cult status. It was revised by Scott ten years later in a Director’s Cut version, where scenes that were not well received by audience were omitted or changed. In 2007, Warner Bros released the 25th anniversary digitally restored Final Cut version. The production of the film did not go as smooth as hoped: “[t]he first writer quit; the production lost its financing weeks before
filming began; Dick died midway; the director and actors feuded as the crew revolted against Scott; and Scott and Deeley were ultimately fired by two of the movie’s financiers” (Gardetta). Scott was powerless to change anything and the movie was released with a clumsy voiceover and a happy ending that Scott did not approve of. The reason for the voiceover narration was that at the first screenings people did not get it and then Warner Brothers stepped in. Not everybody hated the voiceover, some viewers thought that it “gave them important plot information they otherwise would have been unable to gain by simply watching the film […] while others enjoyed what they saw as the narration’s echoes of the hard-boiled narrations found in old films noir and forties’ mystery thrillers” (Sammon 292).

On a whole this film is regarded as a good SF film and critic Desson Howe wrote: “this movie is great in any version […][and] The film is great on every level” (1992). Rita Kempley concurs with Howe and says that “[i]t is […] in fact, an amazingly sophisticated, sumptuously visionary treatise on the consequences of attaining god-hood” (1992).

_Blade Runner_ stars Harrison Ford as Rick Deckard, Rutger Hauer as Roy Batty, Sean Young as Rachael, and Daryl Hannah as Pris. The casting for the lead role of Deckard was a last minute decision, Dustin Hoffman had been hired and had started working on the script with Hampton Fancher when he up and left the project. Paul Sammon explained that “Hoffman did indeed leave the production, […] ‘Frankly, I think it might have been something as simple as money’ explaine[d] Ridley Scott. ‘Also the fact that Dustin was trying to change the basic content of the story into a more socially conscious picture’” (85). Harrison Ford was essentially cast as Deckard and he had had success with _Star Wars_ and just finished shooting _Raiders of the Lost Ark_ with Steven Spielberg. And on the recommendations from Spielberg, Harrison Ford landed the role of Deckard. The Dutch actor, Rutger Hauer, fascinated Scott with his performance in _Soldier Of Orange_ and was the perfect candidate to portray the replicant Roy Batty. Hauer’s, as the other actors that were assigned to play the
replicants, characterizations was so uniquely and mesmerizingly portrayed and he recalled that Ridley had told them “to relax and be comfortable. To have fun and to make the replicants likable. And we did. That, I think, is their underlying appeal” (Sammon 91).

As mentioned earlier, ten years after its premier, Scott released *Blade Runner: The Directors Cut*. There were some meaningful changes made to the film: they took out the dreaded voice-over narration of Harrison Ford and changed the ending, Ford never liked the voiceover or the happy ending and he said: “I thought the film had worked without the narration. I saw it once with the original ending and with the tagged-on ‘sunshine car going through the bucolic landscape’. I didn’t care for that very much” (Gardetta). In the first version there is a relative happy ending, Deckard and Rachael can live together because the fail-safe device is not implanted in her and they drive away together. In the newer version, the fail-safe device is still there, Rachael will cease to operate when her four years are up and Deckard and Rachael will be on the run from Gaff, because he is coming after her. There is more hinting surrounding Deckard’s humanity, he might be an android.

The anticipation for the film was huge not only because it “was being directed by then red-hot filmmaker Ridley Scott, fresh off the box-office triumph of his Gothic science fiction hit *Alien*, [or was] set to star one of the most bankable Hollywood actors (Harrison Ford) and was to be produced by seasoned veteran Michael Deeley” (Sammon xiv) but also because it was rumored to be one of the most expensive genre film ever. Despite all that the film did not score big in the box-office performance, not even grossing the $28 million budget, it was a flop, financially, commercially and critically. Jeff Walker, the unit publicist for *Blade Runner*, remembered that *E.T.* came out just two weeks prior to *Blade Runner* and “[p]eople were going back to see *E.T.* five and ten times. It defined the summer, and it affected how *Blade Runner*, this dark, depressing film noir, was accepted” (Gardetta). Fans blamed the poor performance on various reviews that outright sabotaged the film’s success.
The most famous review and the one that struck at the heartstrings of the most loyal fans was Pat Berman’s review in *State and Columbia Record*, she stated that *Blade Runner* was “like science fiction pornography – all sensation and no heart” (Sammon 313). Another review that did not support the cause was Roger Ebert’s, he said that Ridley Scott “seems more concerned with creating his film worlds than populating them with plausible characters, and that’s the trouble this time. *Blade Runner* is a stunningly interesting visual achievement, but a failure as a story […] The movie’s weakness […] is that it allows the special effects technology to overwhelm its story” (Vest 2). There was not a lot of hope left when a film received such breaking reviews from respected critics. Thankfully, not everybody was as negative, John Bloom wrote that “*Blade Runner* is a well-crafted film, even despite occasional lapses and its occasional reliance on heavy-handed, graphic violence. I suspect history will be kinder to it than the critics” (Sammon 315) and history did proof Bloom right.

It is worth mentioning that in almost all of the reviews there is little or no mention of the original work, which the film was based on. *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep* was not your typical SF fiction with space battles or alien invasions rather it dealt with the question of what it is meant to be human in relative familiar surroundings, mixed with spirituality and the identification of one self. As Jason Vest said in his book *Future Imperfect*, it was “one of American SF’s most intricate, oblique, and richly suggestive books” (3). It could be the lack of knowledge or awareness of what the original work entailed that prompted those reviews. Vest gave another example of why *Blade Runner* received so little success, he claimed that “*Blade Runner* demands multiple exposures to understand how evocatively it questions the nature of humanity, the social utility of technology, the relationship between organic and mechanical life, and the value of spirituality in a heavily industrialized (and apparently soulless) world” (2). Paul Sammon concurred with Vest and explained that “it is one of the most fully realized visions of a future society ever set on film, and repeated
viewings are an absolute necessity if one wants to catch the multitude of design flourishes littering every frame” (xvi). The interesting thing was that after the release of the Final Cut version the reviews seemed to become more positive, even Roger Ebert wrote; “I have never quite embraced Blade Runner, admiring it at arm’s length, but now it is time to cave in and admit it to the canon […] I have been assured that my problems in the past with [it] represent a failure of my own taste and imagination” (2007). Other critics came to admire the film for its contribution to the SF industry as Nick Cramp wrote in 2001: “[it] is arguably the most famous and influential science fiction film ever made. It has exerted a pervasive influence over all subsequent science fiction cinema, and indeed our cultural perception of the future” (2001). As the years went by the film became more and more popular and from the ashes of the premier rose a cult film with ever increasing fan base and notability. It became enormously popular in Japan and Sean Young (Rachael) had mailboxes full of fan letters from Japan and Harrison Ford even said that “[t]he next time [he] turned around, it suddenly had cult status. I think it was a powerful cinematic experience – it just wasn’t originally what people expected or thought they would see. It was ahead of its time, both emotionally – it wasn’t a cuddly movie – and visually” (Gardetta). The film sold more when it came out on VHS, not to mention DVD.

It is obvious that Blade Runner, in the end, was a successful adaptation, other films that have tried to duplicate the feel of dystopia, and the elements of cyberpunk are for instance Batman (1989), The Fifth Element (1997), The Matrix (1999) and I, Robot (2004) to only name a few. A summary of the novel can be found in appendix five and a synopsis for the film in appendix six.
Changes in character, story and plot

With this adaptation screenwriters Hampton Fancher and David Webb Peoples had to delete characters, scenes and some parts of the plot, fortunately they had author Philip K. Dick on their side to lend a helping hand. As mentioned above Dick died just before the release of Blade Runner but he had been able to view about twenty minutes of footage of the film. His comments about what he had seen were that “[i]t was like holding a mirror up to my mind” (Gardetta). To receive such comments from the author was really a compliment to the screenwriters. In addition he had also read at least two versions of the screenplay. In an interview conducted two months before his death he spoke to Gwen Lee about the upcoming movie:

The book had about sixteen plots going through it and they would have had to make a movie lasting sixteen hours. And it would have been impossible. And this is not how you make a movie out of a book […] And you just cannot do it. It just won’t work out. Because a lot of the book consists of just long conversations. A movie moves and a book talks, and that’s the difference you see. (Vest 6)

Dick showed that he understood the dynamic and difficulties of adapting a book to film, not to mention his own book, Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep.

Mercerism and Deckard’s awakening

In regards to the adaptation, the biggest exclusion from book to film was the elimination of Mercerism. In the novel it brought forth spirituality and hope for the remaining inhabitants of Earth. Most of the inhabitants left on Earth were the specials, the outcasts that were not permitted to relocate to Mars. Mercerism played a huge role in the novel; it was a religion for humans that promoted empathy and compassion towards other living things. It did not appeal
to androids because androids did not have empathic feelings towards animals or humans, as could be seen when Pris, despite Isidore’s pleading, started cutting the legs of a spider:

“‘[p]lease, Isidore said. Pris glanced up inquiringly. ‘Is it worth something?’ ‘Don’t mutilate it,’ he said wheezingly. Imploringly. With the scissors Pris snipped of one of the spider’s legs” (Dick 177). The mass extinction of animals was rooted deeply in Mercerism and the guidelines of it required that everyone have one animal that they cared for and loved and the harming of animals was strictly forbidden. This developed into a statue symbol of the individual in the community, owning a sheep, a horse, a goat was a privilege. Mechanical animals were substitutes for the real thing and not as expensive.

Mercerism was like every other religion; it could be looked at from various points of views and scrutinized. When reading the book one could not help but notice that it brought hope and even happiness to those that still recited on Earth. With the exclusion of Mercerism from the film, the beat down, overcrowded, hopeless and water-soaked city of Los Angeles is portrayed as a dark and gloomy place with no hope for redemption. Also with the omission of Mercerism from the film, there was no special empathy towards animals and therefore Deckard did not find his relieve after retiring the first three androids by buying a goat. Deckard and his wife Iran felt so happy and joyful because of the new goat that they had to use the empathy box, where Deckard connected to it and shared his feeling with the other users, as Iran said: “I want you to transmit the mood you’re in now to everyone else; you owe it to them. It would be immoral to keep it for ourselves” (Dick 148). With this passage one could clearly see that the world that Iran and Deckard were living in was starving for hope, to say that it would be immoral to keep good thoughts to ones own was a clear example of how difficult life must be.

Mercerism relied heavily on the empathy boxes, a device that allowed its user to connect with other user all over. Even specials like John Isidore, who were isolated from other
people most of the time, felt no discrimination when using the device. When connected to it all men were equal, specials and regulars: “[h]e experienced them, the others, incorporated the babble of their thoughts, heard in his own brain the noise of their many individual existence. They – and he – cared about one thing; this fusion of their mentalities” (Dick 20). Therefore Mercerism was not just bringer of hope and spirituality but also a place where individuals like John Isidore could find comfort and companionship.

In the interview he did with Gwen Lee, only a few months before his death, Dick talked about the absence of Mercerism from Blade Runner:

They cut out the part about Mercer, the savior, they cut that out. But they concentrated on the main theme, and the main theme is the hunting down of the replicants. And the effect that having to kill these replicants has on Rick Deckard, the detective, the attrition on him of killing creatures which although technically are not human, are genetic replicants. (Vest 9)

**Deckard’s spiritual and moral awakening**

Though not obvious, Ridley Scott and his screenwriters managed to incorporate the ideals of Mercerism and its spirituality into the film. Jason Vest maintained that “Blade Runner subtly constructs a double parallel to Mercer’s quest through Deckard’s moral awakening and through the replicants’ maturing subjectivity” (9). Deckard’s moral awakening was reflected in his changing opinion regarding the replicants; he started to see them for more than what they were, not mere machines but living things that desired more than a four year lifespan. And on the same note, Scott injected spirituality into the replicants search for life and their desire to lead a normal life. As Roy Batty wanted more life, Rachael Tyrell was confused about her own identity and even Deckard had his moments of doubts concerning his own humanity. Blade Runner was packed with issues concerning spirituality and even though
“[s]pirituality is a quality not commonly associated with American SF cinema, […] its presence in Blade Runner reveals the film’s intelligent adaptation of Electric Sheep’s religious themes and its contribution to cinematic representations of faith” (Vest 9). The absence of Mercerism from the film clearly put emphasis on Kline’s pluralist approach to adaptation, where the spirit of the novel was clearly incorporated.

Deckard’s awakening and changing perspective concerning the replicants could be seen incrementally throughout the book and film. In the book it was the desire to buy a real animal that drove him on to retire the escaped androids: “[h]e would earn the bounty money. Every cent. Assuming he made it through alive” (Dick 52). In the film he was coerced into going after them: “Bryant: Stop right where you are. You know the score pal. If you're not cop, you're little people. Deckard: No choice, huh? Bryant: No choice pal” (Fencher and Peoples). Scott managed to brilliantly incorporate the status divide that was so apparent in the book. By Bryant’s words it could be assumed that he was a great man of power and if Deckard did not do as he wanted he could degrade him into a lower social statue and as Vest pointed out: “Blade Runner alters the lifestyle of Electric Sheep’s protagonist to illustrate Deckard’s personal insecurity, thereby echoing the novel’s obsession with social mobility” (11).

In the film, the beginning of Deckard’s empathy and awakening towards the androids was clear when Eldon Tyrell, the creator of the Nexus 6, explained to him the company’s commercial attitude and also the four year lifespan:

Tyrell: Commerce, is our goal here at Tyrell. More human than human is our motto. Rachael is an experiment, nothing more. We began to recognize in them strange obsessions. After all they are emotionally inexperienced with only a few years in which to store up the experiences which you and I take for granted. If we give them the past we create a cushion or pillow for
their emotions and consequently we can control them better. (Fencher and Peoples)

Deckard felt sorry for the replicants because many of them did not know that they were replicants. Tyrell had created something that had the ability to feel and that was what troubled Deckard and he started to doubt the logic in retiring them. Also it was clear that even though Tyrell was their creator he had no empathy towards them but only the drive to make them ‘more human than human’.

Vest made an interesting point when he said that “Blade Runner questions the nature of the human-replicant division” (14) and there he was referring to Dick’s dualism of Human/Android. The escaped replicants were on a quest to better understand their life and their purpose in it. That was also what Deckard seemed to do in the film as he looked through old family pictures and started to doubt his own identity has a human. Scott used one of Dick favorite tools, implanted memories, to give the story more credibility. The replicants were implanted with false memories of their past and family and with them came family photos to further strengthen the bond between replicant and their past life. Deckard’s doubts about his own identity continued throughout the film.

Scott opted to cut out one scene from the book that clearly emphasized this point of the human-replicant division and was one of the best parts of the book. In the book Deckard goes after Luba Luft, an android disguising itself as an opera singer. He was captured and brought to a police-station, the Mission Street Hall of Justice, which was infested with androids, there, as he is being charged with suspected homicide, he meet Garland and Resch, both were androids but Resch did not know that he was a replicant. Later Deckard retired Luba and then something happened that changed his attitude towards androids and he started to question their inhumanity:
He had never thought of it before, had never felt any empathy on his own part toward the androids he killed. Always he had assumed that throughout his psyche he experienced the android as a clever machine – as in his conscious view. And yet, in contrast to Phil Resch, a difference had manifested itself. And he felt instinctively that he was right. Empathy towards an artificial construct? He asked himself. Something that only pretends to be alive? But Luba Luft had seemed genuinely alive; it had not worn the aspect of a simulation. (Dick 121)

After this section of the book, Deckard started to question his own sanity, was the world wrong for asking him to retire these androids or was it his own feelings that were changing: “[s]uddenly, for the first time in his life, he had begun to wonder” (Dick 123). The character of Luba was replaced, in the film, with the character of Zhora, the exotic dancer and the first replicant that Deckard retired. Because Zhora ran away from him, he was forced to shoot her in the back and it all went down in a very dramatic way. It was this scene in the film that showed the first glimpse of Deckard’s doubts about what he was doing was right. Deckard’s moral awakening in the film tied directly into Dick’s spiritual theme of *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep*. Even though Scott preferred to leave out the scene at the android police station, which probably would have dragged the movie out because of time issues, he did not lose sight of the significant theme that ran through Dick’s book, spiritual awakening and the understanding of one’s own identity. But by leaving out this scene he kept out one of Dick’s most interesting plot twists, where the suspecting becomes the suspect and it seemed that things are not what they appear to be.
Androids vs. Replicants and Isidore vs. Sebastian

The book and the film also differed in the way androids/replicants were portrayed; in Dick’s novel the androids were soulless objects that lacked all empathic feelings towards other then themselves and the ones that were closest to them. Again the scene where Pris cut the legs of a spider that Isidore had found, despite his pleadings she still continued to harm it, this showed that the androids were not capable of caring for animals or their sufferings, not even the feelings of humans were considered and even a human they liked. Jason Vest noted that “[t]he androids are emotionally immature creatures whose lack of empathy restricts their humanity” (17). This tied into Deckard’s changing attitude towards the androids; before he meet up with Rachael at the hotel he had begun to feel uncertain about the inhumanity of androids, especially female type android. But that doubt was wiped out when he found out that Rachael only slept with him for her own means: “[y]ou’re not going to be able to hunt androids any longer, she said calmly. So don’t look sad. Please. He stared at her. No bounty hunter ever has gone on, Rachael said. After being with me” (Dick 169). It became clear that empathy, compassion, and tenderness were what make humans different from androids. Deckard’s “[s]exual intercourse with Rachael destroys [his] faith that the androids qualify as genuine human beings, reaffirming the prejudice against them that he has held all along” (Vest 18). Even though Deckard had spared Rachael’s life she reiterated her inhumanity when she threw Deckard’s new goat off the building, committing one of the most horrendous crimes. Her actions exemplified that the androids were foreign objects that did not belong in that post-apocalypse society that held animal protection and care above all else.

On the other hand in Blade Runner, the replicants were creatures of life, they shared feelings for each other, they wanted to experience empathy and they wished to prolong their
four-year lifespan in order to explore their emotions: “Roy: We’re not computers Sebastian, we’re physical. Pris: I think, Sebastian, therefore I am” (Fencher and Peoples). *Blade Runner* “expands the replicants’ emotional range, their intellectual sophistication, and their tragic circumstances to force Deckard to recognize the spiritual significance of living an authentic life” (Vest 19). In the film the replicants were on a spiritual journey, not unlike the one that Deckard went through in Dick’s novel. As mentioned above the replicants sought to expand their life, in search of answers they inquired about their creator, Eldon Tyrell. The emphasis on spirituality was further approved when Batty meet Tyrell, he was dressed in white robes and portrayed as a god-like figure: “Roy: It’s not an easy thing to meet your maker. Tyrell: What can he do for you? Roy: Can the maker repair what he makes? […] Tyrell: You were made as well as we could make you […] The light that burns twice as bright burns half as long” (Fencher and Peoples). This desire for a greater existence truly outshined the soulless machines of Dick’s novel. Even though the replicants in *Blade Runner* were ‘creatures’ that sought enlightenment and life, they still did not hesitate in eliminating anything or anyone that stood in their way. And though they appeared and acted human they lacked the humane.

In *Blade Runner* it was Roy Batty that was the most memorable character, not only for Rutger Hauer’s exceptional performance but also because even though he was a replicant he became the most human character in the film. Batty’s spiritual quest, as mentioned above, was highlighted by all the biblical reference that he made about him: “Tyrell: You’re the prodigal son. You’re quite a prize! Roy: I’ve done questionable things. Tyrell: Also extraordinary things. Revel in your time. Roy: Nothing the god of biomechanics wouldn’t let you in heaven for.” (Fencher and Peoples). His spiritual quest made him more human than any other character in the film but he was not the most humane character, the way he crushed Tyrell’s skull and gouged out his eyes was exactly what he was designed to do, to kill. Roy’s final words before the completion of his life and the most famous were; “I've seen things you
people wouldn't believe. Attack ships on fire off the shoulder of Orion. I watched C-beams glitter in the darkness at Tan Hauser Gate. All those moments will be lost in time like tears in rain. Time to die” (Fancher and Peoples). David Snyder, Blade Runner’s art director, explained the emotional impact that these final words had on the entire crew; “[a]s soon as Rutger finished his beautiful soliloquy, everyone just wept. I mean, I can hardly talk about it now, almost twelve years later. It was the combined effect of his words and the strain and struggle of working on this masterpiece” (Sammon 195). Batty completed his spiritual quest by saving Deckard, and with that showed him compassion in his final moments and also “demonstrating that [he] is, in the end, a better ‘man’ than Deckard” (Vest 24). Batty’s first intention was to kill Deckard and this last minute change of heart confused many viewers. Ridley explained that it “was an endorsement in a way, that the character is almost more human than human, in that he can demonstrate a very human quality at a time when the roles are reversed and Deckard may have been delighted to blow his head off” (Sammon 193). The dove that Batty grabbed hold of as he was dying could symbolize two things: first of all, Batty’s soul as it ascended to the heavens or “that the dove also refers to Deckard’s spirit, which, through Batty’s action, reclaims its full humanity” (Vest 24).

On the other hand, one of the novels most memorable character was John Isidore, who “had been a special now for over a year, and not merely in regard to the distorted genes which he carried. Worse still, he had failed to pass the minimum mental faculties test, which made him in popular parlance a chickenhead” (Dick 17). Isidore was not completely isolated from rest of society; he had a job with a mechanical-animal repair hospital. This situation brought forth one of the great ironies in Dick’s novel: Isidore, because he was a special, was denied the chance to emigrate to Mars and he was treated as a lesser form of human while the electric animals that he maintained in working order were held in greater revere. Jason Vest explained this new social order best when he said that it is “one in which animal simulations
receive more sympathy than human beings who, through no fault of their own, suffer genetic maladies from the radioactive dust that lingers long after the war has ended” (7). The reason Isidore was a memorable character was his innocent, his childlike behavior and pure heart, a characteristic that Scott incorporated into Sebastian. In the film he had the same role of given the replicants shelter when they needed it. Sebastian lived alone with the toys that he designed, though not titled a special as in Dick’s novel he did have maladies from which he suffered: “Pris: What’s your problem? Sebastian: Methuselah’s syndrome. Pris: What is that? Sebastian: My glands. They grow old too fast” (Fencher and Peoples). Both Isidore and Sebastian saw the error of their ways for trusting the androids/replicants, Isidore ‘accidentally’ told Deckard where the androids were hiding and Sebastian, in his final moments before death, when he had lead Roy Batty straight to Tyrell, ultimately leading to their death.

**Alternative endings**

There were countless ways in which the film and the book differed and only a few things have been stated so far, but the one thing that really stood out was the ending. The book ended with Deckard finding spiritual redemption, the film, on the other hand, had raised many question concerning its ambiguous ending. After having watch Batty die on the roof, Deckard meet up with Gaff, the bounty hunter that had been observing Deckard throughout the film and leaving origami figures all over, he said to Deckard: “[y]ou have done a man’s job, sir […] [i]ts too bad she won’t live. But then again who does” (Fencher and Peoples). Deckard hurried home to find Rachael, she expressed her love for him and as they were leaving Rachael knocked over a tinfoil unicorn origami figure, and Deckard realized that Gaff had already been there and left Rachael alive. The film ended with Deckard and Rachael leaving and the elevator door closing across their uncertain faces. The unicorn referred to an earlier scene where
Deckard had a drunken daydream about a unicorn and “[t]his brief, dreamlike vision implies that Gaff (and his boss, Bryant) has access to Deckard’s implanted memories” (Vest 25). According to this analysis Deckard was a replicant and Gaff had read his file, which would have included all implanted memories. Also there was more evidence to suggest that Deckard was a replicant, in the statement Gaff makes: “[y]ou have done a man’s job” (Fencher and Peoples). Edward James Olmos (Gaff) explained that it was supposed to be “[a]mbiguous. A reference to Deckard maybe being a replicant” (Sammon 198). But the fact was that Deckard was not like Batty and the other replicants, he felt pain when Batty broke his fingers and he did not possess extraordinary strength like the others. The question of whether Deckard was a replicant or not have puzzled critics and others alike but there actually was a third option remaining: Deckard and Rachael were Nexus-7, the next generation, “[t]hey might be Tyrell’s most advanced prototypes: artificial life-forms that live up to his corporate motto, ‘More Human than Human’. They even share human vices: Rachael smokes while Deckard drinks too much” (Vest 26). The ambiguity of the ending remained a mystery until Scott announced that to him Deckard was a replicant but it still gave other interpretations on the ending.

All three outcomes were plausible and one was not necessary the correct one. Scott brilliantly fused the most important themes of Dick’s book, ‘What is Real’ and ‘What is Human’, into the film and that was a clear example of how well the adaptation of his book is achieved, even though Scott himself never finished reading the book before filming. He explained when “I met Philip K. Dick later, and he said, ‘I understand you couldn’t read the book.’ And I said, ‘You know you’re so dense, mate, by page 32, there’s about 17 storylines” (Greenwald). Scott epitomized what a good adaptation could be and showed that it was not necessary to follow the storyline of the original work wholeheartedly. Blade Runner was in no way a failure as a film nor was it a failure as an adaptation, it is “merely different, a necessary reworking of the same basic storyline for a dissimilar medium” (Sammon 8). Even though
Dick only saw twenty minutes of footage of the film he was certain that the film would be an adaptation success:

If you see the movie first, and then you read the book, you will get more material when you read the book…Or, if you start with the book. Then you can go to the movie, and then you get more material. So they don’t fight each other. The book and the movie do not fight each other. They reinforce each other… (Vest 27)

Conclusion

Adaptations have been seriously misrepresented and should not be considered secondary or even inferior since some of the best films ever made are adaptations and to only name a few:

*Gone with the Wind*, won eight Oscars, including Best Picture and Screenplay, *Lord of the Rings – Return of the King*, won 11 Oscars, including Best Picture and Screenplay, *The Godfather*, won three Oscars, including Best Picture and Screenplay (imdb.com).

Science Fiction authors are under more stress than mainstream authors, the reason being that they have to put out more material than their colleges. That was also true of Philip K. Dick, who in his lifetime wrote well over a hundred stories. His more interesting ones have been adapted into motion picture films with varying success. The three stories that have been discussed here all are very different from one another but they all have one thing in common, a reoccurring instance of Dick’s dualism, alternative endings and his favorite theme of ‘What is Real’. Moreover, these stories are not your typical SF story with aliens, huge space battles and extraordinary technology. What made Dick the unique writer that he was, was his ability to mix together SF elements with more mainstream plotlines. Kline’s four paradigms to evaluating adaptations are very useful tools: the translation paradigm, pluralist paradigm,
transformation paradigm and the materialist paradigm. Kline’s approaches were used in this essay to evaluate the adaptations discussed.

The first short story and film that was looked at was “The Minority Report”/Minority Report. Since this is a short story the screenwriters ultimately had to add more plot and scenes to the storyline to fit it into a two hour film. As stated above, the changes that occur when translating from one medium to another is unavoidable and this adaptation is no exception. The two major changes that occur are with the character of Anderton and the portrayal of the precogs. In order for the film to be more ‘Hollywood’ the character of Anderton became young and a hero and to hold true to the materialist approach to evaluating adaptation the treatment of the precogs was more humane.

One would never expect to place Dick and Spielberg next to each other, and one would never do so since these two creators are complete opposites. Where Dick does not bother with scenery and illustration, Spielberg exaggerates everything and that turned out to be a good mix after all. Minority Report is so full of color that it really gives life to Dick’s visually bleak and drab story. Furthermore the alternative ending might suggest that Spielberg and his screenwriters did pay attention to Dick’s principle themes of ‘What is Real’ and his constant dualism approach.

With “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale” and Total Recall we saw that the issue of false memory is most prominent, especially Dick’s dualism of Real/Fake. The film tends to overwhelm the short story with its graphic violence and political issues. Even though the film is only loosely inspired by the story it still managed to hold true to Dick core elements. The character of Quail from Dick’s story is completely transformed in the movie, both in regards to his profession, personal life and demeanor. As with Minority Report, Total Recall explores the possibility an alternative ending. Director Paul Verhoeven uses the graphic violence acts in the film to point out the many political issues. Dick was never
successful in creating memorable women characters but Total Recall uses the women characters of Melina and Lori to the fullest, even putting some feminist issues into the plot. In terms of the overall adaptation it cannot be denied that Verhoeven succeeds in that department.

The adaptation of Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep into Blade Runner was not as successful at first as Total Recall and Minority Report. But as the years have gone by the film has established itself as a cult classic and the amount of academic research stemming from it is staggering. The adaptation was ahead of its time and has inspired many other films to embrace the feel of dystopia and incorporate the elements of cyberpunk featured in the film.

The biggest exclusion from the book to the film is the religion of Mercerism; in the novel it brings hope and spirituality to the remaining residents on Earth. Even though the film does not acknowledge Mercerism, it non-the less incorporates its ideals through Deckard’s moral awakening concerning the replicants. This is another example of how ahead of its time the film really was and it shows how masterfully the film adapts Dick’s religious themes even though it is not standard in American SF cinema.

Dick’s dualism of Human/Android and Real/Fake is clearly incorporated into the film with the every looming doubt about Deckard’s humanity and the replicants false memory implants. Furthermore, as in Total Recall and Minority Report, Blade Runner holds true to the ambiguity theme concerning the ending. Blade Runner is by far the most successful adaptation of Dick’s stories and that is mostly thanks to its director, Ridley Scott.

Other stories written by Dick have been adapted into films with varying success and it would be interesting to see how they incorporate the themes that Dick held so true. Hopefully Hollywood will keep on embracing the writings of this remarkable individual and truly a pioneer in his field.
Appendix 1 – Summary of “The Minority Report”
The story began with Precrime Commissioner John A. Anderton sitting in his office waiting to greet his future successor, Ed Witwer. Anderton did not like Witwer, especially the way he “was moving around the office as if he already owned it – as if he were measuring it for size” (Dick 71). Precrime was founded by Anderton and it was an institution that prevented crimes before they happened with the aid of three precog mutants, it had “successfully abolished the postcrime punitive system of jails and fines […] punishment was never much of a deterrent, and could scarcely have afforded comfort to a victim already dead” (Dick 72). Future criminals were taking into custody and set in detention camps. Witwer was shocked and a little taken back when he saw the three precogs for himself:

In the gloomy half-darkness the three idiots sat babbling. Every incoherent utterance, every random syllable, was analyzed, compared, reassembled in the form of visual symbols, transcribed on conventional punchcards, and ejected into various coded slots. All day long the idiots babbled, imprisoned in their special high-backed chairs, held in one rigid position by metal bands, and bundles of wiring, clamps. Their physical needs were taken care of automatically. They had no spiritual needs. Vegetable-like, they muttered and dozed and existed. Their minds were dull, confused, lost in shadows.

(Dick 73)

Anderton explained to Witwer the everyday operations of Precrime, after the computer had analyzed the babbles of the precogs it spit out a card containing the name of the victim and the murderer. The Army GHQ received a duplicate card to prevent any tampering.

At the end of the tour Anderton had a shocking revelation, he picked up one of the cards and saw his name as the murderer and “[w]ith absolute, overwhelming conviction, he didn’t believe it” (Dick 75). He put the card in his pocket and continued the tour, not letting
anyone know. Anderton could not believe that he would kill Witwer, the idea was crazy. He started to act agitated and suspected a conspiracy, he tells his wife Lisa: “I’m getting out […] while there is still time […] I’m being framed – deliberately and maliciously” (Dick 76).

Lisa pointed out to him that he should calm down and told him that he was not going to kill Witwer but rather a man named Leopold Kaplan, someone he had never heard of before.

Anderton was convinced that this was all a conspiracy to get him out, he planned to hide out and returned home to pack. A man was waiting for him there and took him to a private residence where another man greeted him, Leopold Kaplan, the man he was supposed to murder. It turned out that Kaplan was a retired General of the Army of the Federated Westbloc Alliance, a very powerful man. Anderton tried to explain to Kaplan that this was all a big conspiracy against him and that there was no intend on his part to kill him. Kaplan did not care and only wanted to turn him in to the police, for his own protection. He turned on the radio and announcement was being made from the Precrime office: “[t]he Precrime Agency of the Federal Westbloc Government is in the process of locating and neutralizing its former Commissioner, John Allison Anderton, who through the methodology of the precrime system, is hereby declared a potential murderer and as such forfeits his right to freedom and all its privileges” (Dick 80-81). Witwer had already assumed his position as the new Commissioner.

On his way to the police department, Anderton started to doubt everything, “he was almost ready to concede that he was the victim of a weary, neurotic fantasy, spawned by growing insecurity” (Dick 82). Suddenly the car he was in was rammed by a big truck and somebody was pulling him out. It was a man named Fleming and he explained to Anderton that he worked for an organization that was “[a] sort of police force that watches the police. To see […] that everything stays on an even keel” (Dick 83). He told Anderton to keep a low profile until he could prove his case, providing him with money and new identification. Also he informed him that his wife was behind this whole affair.
With his new identification and money he checked into a hotel. He examined the message contained with the identification and money, it read: “[t]he existence of a majority logically implies a corresponding minority” (Dick 84). He did not realize at first what this meant until he heard descriptions of what the precogs actually do. There were computers that calculated and analyzed the data received from the precogs, there were three computers, the third computer was to confirm the analyzes of one of the other computer; “[i]n this manner, a so-called majority report is obtained” (Dick 85). Now he realized what the message meant, only two of the precogs had come to the conclusion that he would kill Kaplan, but the third report was somehow important, somehow he had to get his hands on the minority report, the one that said that he would not kill Kaplan.

Anderton contacted Page, a technician at Precrime, and asked him for help in getting into the Agency. Page arranged his arrival and let him in to the ‘monkey block’, the place where the precogs were kept. Anderton searched for the minority report and found that it said that:

the report that Anderton would commit a murder was an event to be integrated along with everything else. That assertion – and Anderton’s reaction – was one more piece of datum […] [h]aving been informed that he would commit a murder, Anderton would change his mind and not do so. The preview of the murder had cancelled out the murder; prophylaxis had occurred simply in his being informed. Already a new time-path had been created. (Dick 87-88)

This was what proved his innocence but he could not show it to Witwer because he had already seen it and done nothing. As he was leaving his wife showed up and told him Witwer was coming and that there was a ship on the roof for him to escape. Lisa told him that Kaplan “heads an unusual kind of exclusive veterans’ organization. It’s actually a kind of club, with a
few restricted members. High officers only” (Dick 89). She tried to explain to him that because of the existence of the minority report the original majority report was real; there was no conspiracy against him. So in a fact, the system of Precrime still worked and if he handed the copies over to Kaplan he and his group would discredit the police. Anderton did not listen and refused to turn around until she pulled a gun on him. Suddenly Fleming appeared in the ship and knocked Lisa out, he tells Anderton that Witwer was working with Kaplan. When Fleming tried to kill Lisa, Anderton quickly knocked him out and told Lisa to contact Witwer and tell him he was coming in.

Witwer told Anderton that Kaplan just left with the reports from the monkey block. Anderton explained to Witwer Kaplan’s plan; “[h]e has the information that proves the majority report obsolete. He can break the precrime system […] The Army discredits us” (Dick 94). Kaplan’s Military Agency wanted control of the police again; they had lost it after the War. In his search for answers, Anderton studied the majority reports of the precogs; they both showed that Anderton became aware of Kaplan’s plot against Precrime and shot him and several other officers, Kaplan was the only one to die. Anderton and Witwer realized that Kaplan was going to go public with the minority report. Anderton told Witwer that he must kill Kaplan to preserve the Precrime system.

Anderton went to meet Kaplan at the Army rally where he intended to give a public statement, ‘clearing’ Anderton of those charges brought against him. Kaplan began to read from the majority report and was assuring the crowd that this Precrime system was unjust and should be abolished. Suddenly he realized what was going to happen, Anderton pulled out his gun and killed him. Instead of life in a detention camp, Anderton was exiled from Earth, Lisa was going with him. Before they left, Witwer arrived because he needed to know if the minority report was wrong. Anderton explained to him that there were three minority reports; the first one said that Anderton would kill Kaplan, but the knowledge of the first report
superseded the first one and therefore created another situation with the third report in were Anderton puts the Precrime system ahead of his own security. He explained that “[e]ach report was different […] [e]ach was unique. But two of them agreed on one point. If left free, I would kill Kaplan. That created the illusion of a majority report” (Dick 101). Witwer confused asked if this could ever happen again, and Anderton explained that this could only happen in one situation, to the next Police Commissioner.

Appendix 2 – Summary of Minority Report

The film is set in the year 2054 and the starting point is the department of Precrime, an agency specializing in preventing murders. John Anderton (Tom Cruise) is the senior detective at Precrime; he does not have time for Danny Witwer (Colin Farell), the Federal Investigator from the Department of Justice, and brushes him off. The Precrime Agency has been operational for six years and has eliminated murders and this is only possible because of three precognitives, Agatha, Arthur and Dashiell, who have the ability to predict the future.

We find out that soon there will be a National vote and a commercial advices people to “vote Yes on the national Precrime Referendum and make murder a thing of the past” (Frank 15). It seems that Anderton has lost his family and that is son was killed and as he reminisces over images of them he inhales some sort of narcotics, it becomes obvious that he is in a lot of pain. Later we are introduced to Lamar Burgess (Max von Sydow), Director of Precrime, who is worried about the investigation Witwer is conducting. Witwer and Anderton discuss the methodology of the Precrime system and Anderton says; “[t]he fact that you prevented it from happening doesn’t change the fact that it was going to happen” (Frank 20). Witwer is not as convinced of the benefits of Precrime and ask to see the three precogs; who are kept under strict supervision and in a non-contamination area. Witwer is looking for flaws in the system; “Anderton: There hasn’t been a murder in six years. There’s nothing wrong with the system.
It’s perfect. Witwer: I agree. The system is perfect. If there’s a flaw, it’s human. It always is” (Frank 24).

After Witwer leaves, John becomes fascinated with Agatha, when suddenly she reaches out and grabs him and starts to portray images of an old murder. Anderton heads down to the archives where all the prisoners are to look at Agatha’s data stream of the murder she showed him. The intended murderer is still a John Doe and the intended victim is Anne Lively. Agatha’s data stream is missing and so is the updated information about Lively. Anderton goes to Burgess with this information, he brushes it off lightly and is more concerned with Anderton and his drug use and is worried what will happen if Witwer finds out about it. Anderton assures Burgess that everything is all right.

Back at the Precrime Agency, Anderton is reviewing a murder that will take place in the near future, the intended victim is a man called Leo Crow and to his surprise he is the shooter. He runs and calls Burgess and tells him he is being set up by Witwer, who takes control of the investigation. A team of Precrime cops and Federal Agents try to apprehend him but without success. Anderton arrives at the home of Dr. Iris Hineman, the inventor of Precrime, she laughs and says “[i]f the unintended consequences of a series of genetic mistakes and science gone haywire can be called invention, then yes, I invented precrime” (Frank 48). Anderton tries to explain to her that he is not a murderer and she says that there is nothing she can do for him; “I can’t help you. No one can. The Precogs are never wrong […] but occasionally, they do disagree” (Frank 50). Dr. Hineman explains to him that sometimes there is a thing called the Minority Report, an alternative future that can play out. Shocked to hear about the existence of these Minority Reports and that Burgess knew about their existence he wants to know where he can find them, since they are all erased as soon as they occur. No one except Dr. Hineman knows that the Minority Reports are stored inside the precog that predicted them.
Anderton needs new eyes in order to escape detection by the city wide eye scanners. After having recovered from the eye surgery, Anderton heads to the Department of Precrime to download Agatha’s previsions. Witwer tries to stop him but he escapes with Agatha and brings her to a high tech hacker who is trying to download the images from her mind. She tells Anderton that he does not have a Minority Report, he will kill Leo Crow. She wants him to see who killed Anne Lively but she can’t finish because the Precrime agents are there. With the help of Agatha’s previsions they escape the agents and find the building where Anderton is to kill Leo Crow.

Anderton finds Crow’s room and on the bed a stack of pictures, one of the pictures is of his son, Sean. He realizes that he is not being set up and that he will kill this man. Leo Crow is the man that killed his son. He does not kill him instead he reads him his rights. Crow doesn’t understand and says that this is not what was supposed to happen, Anderton was supposed to kill him. Anderton realizes that this man did not kill his son rather that this is all a set up. Crow yanks on the gun making Anderton shoot him by accident.

Witwer meets Burgess and tells him of what he has discovered; he has come to think that someone got away with murder by faking an echo of the precogs. A prevision echo is sort of like a Déjà vu, where the precogs see the same prevision over and over again. Burgess kills Witwer. Lara, Anderton’s ex-wife, calls Burgess and tells him that Anderton is there with the precog. Anderton realizes that Anne Lively was Agatha’s mother and then suddenly the Precrime agents are all around them. He is being arrested for the murder of Leo Crow and Danny Witwer.

Lara is in Burgess’s office and asks him about Anne Lively. Lara now knows that it is all Burgess. She goes down to the Department of Containment where Anderton is being held and demands to speak to him. Anderton reveals all that he has found out and in the middle of the press conference where everybody can see who really killed Anne Lively. Burgess meets
Anderton on the roof where Anderton says; “[y]ou see the problem, don’t you? If you don’t kill me, it means the precogs were wrong and Precrime is over. If you do kill me, you go away, but … it proves the system works. The precogs were right […] except, you’ve seen your own future. Which means you can change it if you want to” (Frank 113). Burgess kills himself and the Precrime Department was dissolved.

Appendix 3 – Summary of “We Can Remember It for You Wholesale”

The story centers around Douglas Quail, “a miserable little salaried […] clerk at the West Coast Emigration Bureau” (Dick 35,39), who dreams about going to Mars and is determined to make that dream come true; “[b]efore I die I’ll see Mars. It was, of course, impossible, and he knew this even as he dreamed” (Dick 35). Finally, he decides to make an appointment with a company called REKAL, Incorporated, they specialize in false memory implants, you can have the vacation of your dreams implanted into your memory without leaving your house. Skeptical about the cost and the results he begins to have second thoughts about the procedure. Mr. McClane explains to him that it will be like he was really there; “[y]ou get tangible proof of your trip […] [t]icket stub […] [i]t proves you went and returned […] Postcards […] Film. Shots you took of local sights on Mars with a rented movie camera […] Plus the names of people you met, two hundred poscreds worth of souvenirs […] And passport, certificates listing the shots you received” (Dick 39). He also assures him that he will not remember being at REKAL, to him it will be a real trip. Quail agrees to go ahead with the implantation but as an added bonus he will also be a secret undercover agent for Interplan.

McClane is called into the procedure room where Quail is sedated, there is a problem with the implantation, “[t]here’s no space to insert false memory-patterns” (Dick 39). Heavily dozed with sedatives Quail speaks to McClane; “[w]hat do you want now? […] [y]ou’ve
broken my cover. Get out of here before I take you all apart” (Dick 39-40). It appears that Quail was in fact an undercover agent that was sent to Mars on a special assignment and his memory was erased.

Someone, probably at a government military-science lab, erased his conscious memories; all he knew was that going to Mars meant something special to him, and so did being a secret agent. They couldn’t erase that; it’s not a memory but a desire, undoubtedly the same one that motivated him to volunteer for the assignment in the first place. (Dick 40)

McClane, a little bit scared and shocked at what he has discovered, tells the technicians to get him into a cab and inform him that the procedure did not work, and hope that he does not remember the memories that they disturbed.

On his way home, Quail remembers going to Mars and calls his wife to tell her what he has done. After a depressing phone call he finds the returned money in an envelope signed by REKAL. He returns to REKAL and demands the rest of his fee back since the memory implantation did not take. Mr. McClane refunds him the balance and tells him; “[d]on’t discuss your, ahem, recent trip to Mars with anyone […] [t]he trip you partially remember. Act as if you don’t remember; pretend it never took place. Don’t ask me why; just take my advice: it’ll be better for all of us” (Dick 43). Angry, disappointed and confused about the whole affair he returns home, he asks Kristen, his wife, to explain to him what is happening. She tells him he is crazy and leaves. A little relieved that she had finally left he discovers he is not alone in his apartment.

It was somebody from Interplan Police Agency who seems a little bit familiar to Quail. He tells Quail that they now know all about what he has been doing and thinking about today and that he is remembering his trip to Mars. The police officer says that they have a transmitter wired into his skull; this transmitter sends all of Quail’s thoughts directly to them
and “anything [he] think[s] may be held against [him]” (Dick 45). While talking to the agent from Interplan, Quail starts to remember everything, the reason why he was sent to Mars and what he did there. He now knows too much and needs to be killed. Quail had killed somebody on Mars, some high ranking politician. Quail was a trained assassin, a professional killer.

Quickly he escapes the two agents and rethinks his situation, what he could do and where he could go. He finds out that the transmitter in his head operates as a radio; he can talk (think) to the other agents. He wants them to try and wipe his memory again and replace it with something more exciting and then he would surrender himself to them, “the alternative was death now and for certain. At least this way he had a chance, slim as it was” (Dick 49). Quail surrenders himself to Interplan where their top psychiatrists try to find his ultimate fantasy. His fantasy is that he saved Earth from miniature aliens that were about to invade and they made a deal with him not to attack as long as he was alive; “[s]o by merely existing […] by simply being alive, I keep Earth safe from alien rule. I’m in effect, then, the most important person on Terra. Without lifting a finger” (Dick 50).

Quail is taken to REKAL where his childhood fantasy will be implanted and his trip to Mars erased. Again, when Quail is under sedation, there is a problem. It seems that his childhood fantasy is no fantasy at all but an actual memory buried deep within his consciousness.

**Appendix 4 – Summary of Total Recall**
The film begins with Doug Quaid (Arnold Schwarzenegger) taking a romantic walk on what appears to be Mars, he has a fall and his protective gear breaks and due to the poisoned atmosphere he swells up. It is a dream; Quaid wakes up next to his wife, Lori (Sharon Stone), apparently this dream is reoccurring. In this futuristic society there is trouble on Mars, terrorist are denying access to mines and heavy fighting is breaking out. For some reason Quaid is drawn to Mars and wants to move there and says; “I feel I was meant for something
more than this. I want to do something with my life. I want to be somebody” (Shusett and O’Bannon).

On his way to work Quaid sees a commercial on TV from Rekall “where you can buy the memory of your ideal vacation, cheaper, safer, and better than the real thing” (Shusett and O’Bannon). Quaid goes to Rekall and purchases a two weeks package to Mars, with the alternated identity of a secret agent. During the procedure, Quaid freaks out and starts yelling; “[y]ou’re dead, all of you! You blew my cover […] They’ll be here any minute! They’ll kill you all” (Shusett and O’Bannon). The staff at Rekall realize that is memory has already been erased by someone. Scarred and panicking they erase all his memory of Rekall, refund his money and put him in a cab. Quaid does not understand what is going on when he wakes up and is attacked by Harry, his friend from work, and three other men. Harry says; “[y]ou blabbed, Quaid! You blabbed about Mars” (Shusett and O’Bannon). Surprised at his own fighting skills he escapes after having killed them.

Quaid returns home to tell Lori about what happen, she brushes it off and wants to call a doctor. Suddenly she tries to kill him, Quaid overpowers her and she explains to him that she is only there to watch him, his memory was erased and a new identity was implanted. He notices that men are coming after him so he takes off for the subway and barely manages to escape, what he does not know is that they have some sort of a tracking device on him, they can follow him anywhere. Richter (Michael Ironside), the man hunting Quaid, is talking to Cohaagen (Ronny Cox), the political leader and dictator on Mars, on the phone. Cohaagen wants Quaid delivered alive, Richter does not agree, he wants him dead.

Quaid hides out in a hotel, the phone rings and a man appears that says “[i]f you want to live, don’t hang up” (Shusett and O’Bannon). The man leaves a suitcase for him and he takes off to an abandoned factory where he discovers inside the suitcase a recording of himself that explains everything to him:
[h]owdy, Stranger; this is Hauser. If things have gone wrong, I’m talking to myself – and you’ve got a wet towel wrapped around your head […] You’re not you. You’re me […] All my life I worked for Mars Intelligence. I did Cohagen’s dirty work. Then a few weeks ago, I met somebody – a woman. And I learned a few things; like I’ve been playing for the wrong team […] there is enough shit in here to fuck Cohagen good […] Get your ass to Mars. (Shusett and O’Bannon)

Back on Mars, Cohagen informs Richter that “Kuato [the terrorist leader] wants what’s in Quaid’s head. And he might be able to get it, cause they say he’s psychic” (Shusett and O’Bannon). Quaid is following a lead he left for himself, he is looking for a woman named Melina (Rachael Ticotin). It is the woman from his dreams, she sends him away, says that he is still working for Cohagen and that he never really loved her.

Back at his hotel room Quaid has a visitor, Dr. Edgemar, he claims that what Quaid is experiencing is not real and that he is back at Rekall; “[y]ou’re strapped into an implant chair, and I’m monitoring you at a psycho-probe console […] you’re experiencing […] a free-form delusion based on our memory tapes” (Shusett and O’Bannon). Lori appears, as a means of persuasion, but Quaid is wracked with indecision and just when he is about to accept that this is not real he see a drop of sweat run down Dr. Edgemar’s head. Quickly he kills him and Lori attacks him and more men join in and they overpower Quaid. All of a sudden, Melina appears and rescues Quaid, they return to the bar with Richter on their tail. They barely escape before Richter arrives and starts shooting everybody. Cohagen orders Richter to pull back and gives a look of pleasure. Cohagen orders the area to be sealed off and air fans shot off.

Quaid and Melina arrive at the rebel base to meet Kuato. George, one of the leaders, is there and he takes Quaid to see Kuato, they need to know what Cohagen found in the Pyramid mines and that information is buried somewhere inside Quaid’s memory. George
warns Quaid not to be afraid because Kuato is a mutant, he unbuttons his shirt and there is Kuato, a small second head growing from George’s chest. Kuato probes Quaid’s mind and finds that inside the Pyramid mine is a structure that is about half a million years old.

Suddenly Quaid snaps out of it and realizes that Cohaagen has found them, his men storm the rebel base, George, Melina, Quaid and Benny (the cab driver) escape to an air lock where Benny kills George and Kuato. Kuato’s last words to Quaid are; “[s]tart the reactor…Free Mars” (Shuset and O’Bannon). Melina and Quaid are taken to Cohaagen’s office where he explains to Quaid that the plan worked. Hauser and Cohaagen came up with the character of Quaid and implanted him inside the rebel base and now that the mission is complete, Quaid will return to being Hauser.

Quaid and Melina are being prepared to have their memory altered when Quaid manages to escape. They head to the Pyramid mines to start the reactor, it was built by aliens and it makes air, that is why Cohaagen won’t turn it on. Richter and his men are there to meet Quaid but he kills them all, including Richter. At the altar where the start button for the reactor is, Cohaagen is there to meet Quaid, he threatens to blow it all up. The bomb goes off and blows a hole in the mine, everything is being sucked out, just before he gets sucked out, Quaid manages to turn the reactor on. Melina and Quaid are suffocating on the harsh surface of Mars but just in time, the reactor makes oxygen and changes the whole atmosphere of Mars. The people of Mars do not need to be protected inside the dome anymore, they can breath outside. Quaid and Melina stand outside and she says; “I cant believe it, it’s like a dream […] Quaid: I just had a terrible thought. What if this is a dream. Melina: Well then kiss me quick before we wake up” (Shusett and O’Bannon). White light fills the screen.

**Appendix 5 – Summary of Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep**

It is a story set in futuristic apocalypse where the Earths’ atmosphere has been poisoned by radiation from World War Terminus, a nuclear war fought between the great nations of the
world. It is a world different from our own, because of the radiation in the atmosphere, many animals are extinct or endangered and humans are divided by status into regulars or specials. A regular is “a man who could reproduce within the tolerances set by law” (Dick 8) [...] but “Once pegged as special, a citizen, even if accepting sterilization, dropped out of history. He ceased, in effect, to be part of mankind” (Dick 15). Because of the lack of animals they are held in high regards, owning and taking care of one animal is a symbol of your status in the community. The main religion on Earth is Mercerism based on the sufferings of Wilbur Mercer. In addition, empathy boxes are used to link various users together to better understand Mercerism, when using it people enter a virtual reality which portrays Mercer’s journey. The contradicting religion is a TV show with Buster Friendly and his friendly friends.

The story centers around Rick Deckard, a bounty hunter, he tracks down and retires (kills) escaped androids that look like humans in every possible way; the androids are servants to the people that emigrate to Mars. The only way to distinguish between a human and an android is with the Voigt-Kampff Empathy test, a test that detects empathy, since androids do not have feelings it is a sure way to detect them. Deckard has a mission to track down six escaped androids that have proven to be difficult to capture, these androids are of the latest design, the Nexus-6.

It all starts when Deckard is sent to test the efficiency of the Voigt-Kampff on a Nexus-6 android at the Rosen Association; there he meets Rachael Rosen, a Nexus-6 android that does not know that it is an android. After determining that the Voigt-Kampff test works in detecting the androids, Deckard goes after the escaped ones. The androids have hidden themselves among the population of Earth and have managed to fit in perfectly and have even created an alternative police building.
After having retired three of the Nexus-6 from the list, Deckard administers the Voigt-Kampff test on himself and discovers that he has “an empathically empathic response” (Dick 122) towards androids, especially the female type. After claiming his reward for retiring the three Nexus 6 androids he goes and buys himself a goat to replace the electric sheep that he already owns. The goat both lifts his social status and his spirit and seems to work as a stress release for him. Soon after he receives new information on the location of the remaining androids but feels uneasy because of his newfound empathy towards them. He contacts Rachael Rosen and asks her to “[c]ome down […] to San Francisco tonight and [he will] give up on the remaining andys” (Dick 156). They meet in a hotel and Rachael offers to retire Pris for him if only Deckard would consent to sleeping with her. Later Deckard finds out that Rachael and the Rosen Association have been monitoring his process all day and the only reason Rachael slept with him was to have him give up on bounty hunting because as she says; “[n]o bounty hunter ever has gone on […] After being with me” (Dick 169). Hurt and betrayed by Rachael, who he has started to have genuine feelings for, he goes after the three remaining androids.

Meanwhile there is an alternate story unfolding, it is the story about John Isidore, a special, who lives alone in a huge empty apartment building. One day he notices that he has three new neighbors, the remaining Nexus-6. Among them is Pris Stratton, this android is identical to Rachael Rosen, arriving later is Roy Batty and Irmgard Batty. The three of them first mistake Isidore for an android because of a slip of the tongue that he had made, he had unknowingly said “[i]t used to be eaten with beef gravy” (Dick 127), no one ate meat any more, it was considered barbaric. In fear of Deckard, whom they know is coming after them, Pris moves in with Isidore. At first Isidore does not realize that the new neighbors are androids, and when he finds out he does not care, he is happy for the companionship.
Deckard arrives at the building and Isidore indicates to him that the androids are there. Deckard retires the three remaining androids. Relieved to have finished his job he returns home only to realize that Rachel had been there and killed his new goat. Devastated he leaves and drives into the desert to meditate, there he finds a toad and brings it home. His wife finds out that the toad is electric, instead of being sad that the toad is not real he say; “I’d prefer to know” (Dick 207).

Appendix 6 – Summary of Blade Runner
Blade Runner is set in futuristic Los Angeles 2019. Rick Deckard, the best bounty hunter or blade runner ever, has quit his job but is pressured into taking one final task; “I’d quit because I’d had a belly full of killing. But then I’d rather be a killer than a victim” (Fancher and Peoples). His mission is to track down four replicants, the exotic dancer Zhora, Leon, Pris and their leader, Roy Batty, a top of the line combat model, that have escaped and returned to Earth. The replicants have a failsafe devise in them that only gives them a lifespan of four years, they have come back to earth to meet their maker and ask him to fix the failsafe.

Deckard meets Eldon Tyrell, the creator of the Nexus-6, and Rachael to test the Voigt-Kampff on the new Nexus-6 model. Deckard determines that Rachael is a replicant but she is unaware that she is. Tyrell explains that she is “More human than human […] Rachael is an experiment, nothing more” (Fancher and Peoples). Later, Deckard and Gaff (the agent assigned to him), are looking for Leon, one of the replicants, they search his apartment but it is empty. Deckard finds old pictures and finds it interesting that replicants should have family pictures around them; “I didn't know why a replicant would collect photos. Maybe they were like Rachael. They needed memories” (Fancher and Peoples). Tyrell had informed Deckard that he had implanted false memories into Rachael, they same seems to have been done to Leon.
Meanwhile Roy Batty has found out that he needs to find J. F. Sebastian, a genetic designer, who could take him to see Tyrell. Deckard goes after a lead and finds one of the replicants and retires it, soon after he discovers that now there are four left instead of three. Rachael has disappeared from the Tyrell Cooperation and he has to find her. Later Leon, one of the replicants, attacks Deckard and is about to kill him when Rachael shoots him. Deckard takes Rachael to his apartment; they end up in bed together.

Sebastian finds Pris outside his apartment building and offers her shelter. We find out that Sebastian has a condition called Methuselah's syndrome, he grows old fast. Roy makes Sebastian take him to see Tyrell and once there Roy starts questioning him about life and death, Roy wants more life, Tyrell says that is impossible and then Roy kills him and Sebastian.

Deckard has arrived at Sebastian’s apartment and finds Pris, he kills her. At that moment Roy arrives and attacks him, he chases him all over the building and finally saving his life at the last moment. After Roy has died Deckard looks for Rachael and discovers that she has been spared and that the fail-safe device might not apply to her.

Appendix 7 – More on Adaptation

The adapter

Hutcheon says that “the move to a performance or interactive mode entails a shift from a solo model of creation to a collaborative one. The transition from the one to the other is often fraught with difficulties” (80). The question of who should get the ‘credit’ for the adaptation is a difficult one and especially when dealing with films and television adaptations. One clear example of how difficult this process is is Steven Spielberg’s film adaptation Empire of the Sun; first there was one writer who wrote the first shooting script/adaptation, then later it was reworked by another writer and finally changed once more in the editing room. Hutcheon
asks; “who then is the adapter?” (81). There are a few candidates that come up for the role of adapter. Music director or composer is the one that creates the music that “reinforces emotions or provokes reactions in the audience and directs our interpretation of different characters” (81). Plausible but unlikely that the music director or composer should be titled the adapter because they usually work from the script and not the adapted work. Costume and set designers and even cinematographers have often been linked to the role of adapters because their work is inspired from the adapted text or the original but “what they feel immediately responsible to is the director’s interpretation of the film script” (Hutcheon 81).

There is also the question of whether actors can be considered as adaptors; “[a]s in staged works, the performers are the ones who embody and give material existence to the adaptation” (Hutcheon 81). The actors follow the screenplay that they are given but many have admitted in seeking inspiration from the original texts. But is that enough to consider them as adaptors? Probably not since they always have to follow the screenplay and act according to that.

Finally, editors have also been considered adapters because most of the finalization for the films is done by them. It was editor Walter Murch who said it best; “[w]hen it works, film edition – which could just as easily be called ‘film construction’ – identifies and exploits underlying patterns of sound and image that are not obvious on the surface” (Hutcheon 82).

All the roles mentioned above have an input on the adaption process but the one that usually gets all the credit for the adaptation is the director. Michael Ondaatje best describes this when he explains the process of filmmaking and being on set;

[i]t is hard for any person who has been on the set of a movie to believe that only one man or woman makes a film. At times a film set resembles a beehive or daily life in Louis XIV’s court – every kind of society is witnessed in action, and it seems every trade is busy at work. But as far as the public is concerned, there is always just one Sun King who is
sweepingly credited with responsibility for story, style, design, dramatic tension, taste, and even weather in connection with the finished product.

When, of course, there are many hard-won professions at work. (Hutcheon 82)

The director has the vision but he is not alone in creating that vision, he has help in creating that vision with the music director, the costume and set director, the cinematographers, the actors and of course the editors. Another good description of the adaptation process comes from Zadie Smith, an author of a novel that was adapted to television; “[t]elly is watching a creative idea make its excruciatingly slow progress from script-writer to producer to actor to third and second assistant directors to the director himself to the camera man, to that poor maligned fellow who must hold the huge, furry gray Q-tip up in the air if anything is to be heard by anyone. Telly is group responsibility” (Hutcheon 83). The consensus among people who work in the entertainment business seems to be that the process of adaptation is not just a one man’s job but the collaboration of many professionals. Screenwriter and novelist William Goldman “sees the finished film as the studio’s adaptation of the editor’s adaptation of the director’s adaptation of the actors’ adaptation of the screenwriter’s adaptation of a novel that might itself be an adaptation of narrative or generic conventions” (Hutcheon 83). But as a final point to the question of who is the adapter, to the public it is the director who is ultimately responsible for the final work and “overall vision and therefore for the adaptation as adaptation” (Hutcheon 85). In actuality the director and the screenwriter share the task of creating the adaptation and the responsibility for its creation.

Why adapt?

The question or questions of why anybody would adapt a work from one genre to another are complex. When a person decides to adapt a novel into a film they are freely opening
themselves up for scrutiny and criticism. Hutcheon asks why “would anyone willingly enter this moralistic fray and become an adapter? What motivates adapters, knowing that their efforts will be compared to competing imagined versions in people’s heads and inevitably be found wanting? Why would they risk censure for monetary opportunism”? (86). These are good questions to focus on when considering why make an adaptation.

One of the most popular reason why an adaptation is made is financial, like the saying goes; Money makes the World go around. The ‘easiest’ way to make an adaptation is to adapt a popular videogame, not many players of videogames had believed in the success of these developments. However, in the last decade the voices of doubt have been silenced with films like; Tomb Raider (2003, 2001), Pokémon (1998), Final Fantasy (2005), and Resident Evil (2002). The same has happened with comic book adaptation, more and more comic book superheroes are being made into wide screen heroes. A lot of money can be made of a successful adaptation and it does not hurt if the original ‘text’ or media had gained popularity prior to the adaption being made. Ben Brady says in his book Principles of adaptation for film and television that “an adaptation is an original screenplay and, as such, is the sole property of the screenwriter” (Hutcheon xi), meaning that the screenwriter can make much money if his screenplay is done right.

Making films, television series, videogames or musicals is an expensive process, all rely on financial support. This financial support comes with budgets and pressures for success. The recipe for a successful film has often been big money equals big stars and big directors. What then of the screenwriter, he becomes lost in the shadow the stardom that surrounds the film. Hutcheon says that “[f]ilm option fees for novels are small, because so few works are actually made into films” (88) but well-know writers, such as, Stephen King and John Grisham can make big money by selling their novels because producers recognize that their works alone is enough to sell a film. In short, when thinking about the monitory
aspects of adaptation one cannot forget that the entertainment industry is exactly that, an industry. Industry thrives on money and it really rings true to what Jay Bolter and Richard Grusin said in their book *Remediation: Understanding new media*; “[t]he goal is to have the child watching a Batman video while wearing a Batman cape, eating a fast-food meal with a Batman promotional wrapper, and playing with a Batman toy…The goal is literally to engage all of the child’s senses” (Hutcheon 88).

The financial aspect of making an adaption may be the positive point of this spectrum. The legal side is a whole other story. Porter Abbott says that “adapters are raiders…they don’t copy they steal what they want and leave the rest” (Hutcheon 88). Hutcheon gives a good example of how a material can be ‘stolen’; the German director Murnau did an adaptation of Bram Stoker’s famous novel *Dracula*, the film was titled *Nosferatu* (1922). Murnau did not want to pay royalties to the English, probably because of WW1, so he changed the plot, made it into a love story, deleted the character of Van Helsing and changed the way Dracula dies. He faced legal actions for this and all copies of the film were ordered to be destroyed. Copies of the film were however not destroyed in Germany and pirated copies were distributed in England and USA, but no original exist (Hutcheon 89). No one can adapt an original text or anything without obtaining permission from the author, Publication Company or other persons or institutions involved. The process of seeking legal actions against an adaptation can be tricky, the courts examine the plot, mood, characters and character development and more (Hutcheon 90). Hutcheon says that “from the perspective of the law, straightforward adaptation is closer to the work of postmodern appropriation artists like Hans Haacke and Sherrie Levine, who take the work of others and re-function it either by title changes or recontextualizing” (90).
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