

Kirk Douglas and Stanley Kubrick: Reconsidering a Creative and Business Partnership

FENWICK, James <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1261-7150>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/26674/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

FENWICK, James (2020). Kirk Douglas and Stanley Kubrick: Reconsidering a Creative and Business Partnership. In: A Critical Companion to Stanley Kubrick. Lanham, Lexington books.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Chapter 13

Kirk Douglas and Stanley Kubrick: Reconsidering a Creative and Business Partnership

James Fenwick

“Stanley Kubrick is a talented shit.”¹ It has become somewhat of an infamous comment, perhaps written as an attempt at the last laugh, as it were, in a relationship that started with such promise and ended in acrimony over contractual obligations. Kirk Douglas, reflecting on his working relationship with Stanley Kubrick some three decades after it had ended, summed up his feelings about the director in his autobiography *The Ragman's Son* (1989). Of course, people only remember that one line, not helped by the fact that Douglas himself repeats it at any given chance, elaborating on the expletives. Most recently, in an interview with *Variety* to celebrate his 100th birthday, Douglas declared that Kubrick “was a bastard.”² Amidst the sensational language, however, what often gets lost is the deep appreciation Douglas has consistently shown for Kubrick's ability as an artist. Indeed, that most infamous of comments is preceded by Douglas calling Kubrick “extremely talented” (though, conversely, a poor writer).³

This chapter will explore the creative and business relationship between Kubrick and Douglas, moving beyond the myth that has formed about the partnership between the two. Lasting only four years and resulting in only two films, *Paths of Glory* (1957) and *Spartacus* (1960), the relationship had the potential for many more productions, with a contract that had called for at least three films to be directed and produced by Harris-Kubrick Pictures for Bryna Productions. Only one of these had been a genuine Harris-Kubrick / Bryna collaboration (*Paths of Glory*), while the other had seen Kubrick hired as an employee from Harris-Kubrick by Bryna (*Spartacus*). The aim of the chapter will be to understand why so few pictures were produced, why the contract was ended, and the impact of the relationship

on the careers of both Douglas and Kubrick. The chapter will assess the contracts between the Harris-Kubrick Pictures Corporation and Douglas's Bryna Productions, the first of which was agreed in January 1957. However, the contract underwent a series of revisions until its termination in 1958, followed by a second release contract, which was dissolved in 1961, bringing a final, legal end to the partnership. The chapter will reconsider how the contractual negotiations and the creative collaborations were pivotal in Kubrick's own growth primarily as a film producer. Far from being a period in which Kubrick suffered from creative bondage due to the contractual obligations with Douglas and Bryna, it in fact was one of Kubrick's most creative periods, with scholarly evidence pointing towards numerous projects being developed, researched, and even worked into scripts (though ultimately abandoned). The chapter will conclude that the affiliation with Douglas served as a transformational point for Kubrick that allowed him to fully develop as an independent film producer working in mainstream Hollywood, while Douglas's career entered a period of gradual decline.

Both Kubrick and Douglas had underlying dynamics within their respective careers that led them to want power and control over the productions in which they were involved. These dynamics and how they influenced Douglas and Kubrick's subsequent working relationship differ given the trajectories on which their careers were on. Douglas was at his peak by the end of the 1950s; he was one of the biggest box office draws in Hollywood, a leading man, and one of the most successful independent producers in the industry. Kubrick's career was nascent, but fragile; he had had minor success in terms of critical praise—*The Killing* (1956) was regarded highly by much of the critical establishment—but he had achieved no commercial success. More important, Kubrick had alienated a key company at the time, United Artists (UA), which was at the forefront of the rapidly changing industrial contexts of Hollywood. Kubrick and his business partner, James B. Harris, had gone against the express wishes of the vice president of production, Max Youngstein, and published a one-

page ad that publicized the Harris-Kubrick Pictures Corporation as the “new UA team.”⁴ Youngstein immediately rebuked the pair in a heated phone call exchange, bringing an effective end to what had meant to be a multi-picture contract commencing with *The Killing*.⁵

Kubrick needed access to finance and influence in order to grow his own career. At the same time, Kirk Douglas was looking to acquire the services of a talented director that would strengthen the reputation of Bryna Productions in Hollywood. But the one thing that both Douglas and Kubrick wanted was autonomy in order to further develop their careers in their own ways and on their own terms. Sown within their respective motivations were the seeds of the eventual conflict that would impinge on their working relationship. The issue of motivation with regards to *Paths of Glory*, the first film that Douglas and Kubrick worked on together, is complicated. Douglas only agreed to appear in the film after securing a long-term contract for Harris-Kubrick Pictures to produce three further films for Bryna. One of the films would feature Douglas in a leading role, while the other two would be smaller-budgeted features. The deal, signed in January 1957, coincided with the rapid growth of Bryna Productions.⁶ The company’s contract with UA required it to produce several films that were labeled as “B” pictures, due to their low-budgets and non-appearance of Douglas. It may have been that Douglas spotted an opportunity to ensnare a budding producing duo eager to work in Hollywood that could turn around such low-budget pictures for Bryna, allowing him to focus on the big-budget “A” pictures in which he would appear.

As for Harris-Kubrick Pictures, it was in vital need of a high-profile leading man in order to secure a package with a major Hollywood studio following the fallout with UA (and following the abrupt termination of a contract that had been signed with MGM in 1956 to produce *Burning Secret*, an adaptation of the Stefan Zweig 1913 novel of the same name). This contributed to an uneven power balance in the relationship with Bryna, with Kubrick needing Douglas more in these early years. The initial contract was agreed on January 9,

1957. Titled a “Memorandum of Understanding,” it reflected the uneven power dynamic, clearly putting Bryna and Douglas in a position of ownership over the creative and business functions of Harris-Kubrick.⁷ A number of clauses within this initial agreement would cause disagreements and friction throughout the duration of their working relationship.

First, despite the contract being non-exclusive—in other words, Harris-Kubrick was, in theory, allowed to produce its own pictures on its own terms and with whomever it chose—Harris-Kubrick was required to advise Bryna “of all commitments and pending negotiations so that mutually agreeable times can be worked out for the production of the pictures with Bryna.”⁸ This clause would cause tension in the coming months and years, particularly when Harris-Kubrick sought collaborations with among others, Melville Productions (Gregory Peck’s production company) and Pennebaker Productions (Marlon Brando’s production company).

Second, and potentially more problematic, was that Harris-Kubrick had to agree to sell any literary property for which it owned the rights to Bryna, should Bryna desire them. Again, this caused major concerns for Harris-Kubrick, particularly following the purchase of the option rights to Vladimir Nabokov’s *Lolita* (1955) in 1958. The clause also extended to any original material that Harris-Kubrick had in development.

Third, and perhaps the most important of all, was the clause that stated, “Kubrick and Harris are employees of Bryna Productions.”⁹ This was antithetical to what Kubrick aimed to achieve in his career and would arguably lead to an absolute loss of autonomy. Indeed, in the coming months Kubrick would contend the point and fight over the wording of the contract to ensure he maintained a degree of creative autonomy.¹⁰ But even so, why did Kubrick sign up to such an agreement in the first place if it was against everything he stood for? Perhaps it indicates the extent to which Harris-Kubrick needed influential and powerful contacts like Douglas and how it arguably faced an existential threat to its existence if the contract was not

accepted. In short, if Harris and Kubrick did not sign up to the deal, their production company and their own careers in the film industry faced a premature end.

One cannot overstate the financial straits that Kubrick found himself in throughout the 1950s, consistently relying on friends and family—and even unemployment checks—after leaving the secure employment of *Look* magazine in 1950 where he had worked as a photographer for four years. He even allowed himself to be hired freelance to work on the dubbing of low-budget features, including the dubiously titled *Shark Safari* in early 1955, and working with his close friend Sig Shore in the 1950s to dub Russian films being exported for the burgeoning US foreign film circuit.¹¹ Kubrick was aware of his precarious employment situation and it no doubt weighed on his mind. This is clear from ideas and scripts that he came up with between 1951 and 1956, many of which were autobiographical in nature, containing characters who, living bohemian lifestyles, had to regretfully fall back on the good will of close friends and family members to fund them.¹² The decision to agree to the contract with Kirk Douglas and Bryna has to be seen in this context. Not only did Harris-Kubrick need the influence and power network of Kirk Douglas, but Kubrick himself needed the financial security of the contract.

Douglas was extraordinarily keen to work on *Paths of Glory* and believed strongly in its liberal values and political message. We can gauge his level of enthusiasm from his correspondence with Kubrick and Harris in January and February 1957, when the script was undergoing rewrites. Indeed, at one-point Douglas intervened in the writing process with a lengthy seven-page letter critiquing the script and making recommendations.¹³ Douglas prefaced the letter by saying that his detailed comments were made in a constructive spirit because he believed the project was both worthwhile and interesting given its anti-military hierarchy stance. He emphasized that he would not have consented to appear in the film if he

did not think so. This remark suggests that a key motivator for Douglas in working with Kubrick was to appear in a film that could amplify his own liberal credentials.

As for Douglas' intervention in the screenwriting process, it reflected his ongoing hands on producing style, even if he was not technically a producer on *Paths of Glory*. He had spent January 1957 re-reading Humphrey Cobb's book and researching ways to develop the screenplay and the main character of Colonel Dax, the role he was to play. He focused his initial criticism on Dax, stating that the character lacked "depth and dimension."¹⁴

Repeatedly, Douglas stressed to Kubrick that Dax was presented as too much of a "Noble Joe"—an average soldier that came across as "sanctimonious" in his desire to do good.¹⁵

Important in Douglas' analysis of *Paths of Glory* was his own role as an actor in the film. He wanted Dax to have both prominence and a complex characterization so that he could flex his acting abilities. Indeed, this is apparent from a further suggestion he made to Kubrick, asking, "Where is Dax during the attack?"¹⁶ Douglas was referring to the only battle sequence in the film, in which the soldiers attack a German fortress, the Ant Hill. Douglas went on, "Remember, this is the only time in this picture where we may have a justifiable reason to use our star in some piece of action. We don't take advantage of it. Something very interesting must be created."¹⁷

Kubrick responded in good spirit to Douglas' intervention, saying, "I am very happy that you have such a deep interest in the project, above and beyond the mere earning of dollars."¹⁸ However, Kubrick did not address any of Douglas's ideas, instead deferring any discussion to when they would meet in person in Germany. Somewhat diplomatically, he merely agreed with Douglas, saying that he too wanted to make a film that was both a commercial success but also one with "great artistic stature."¹⁹ One must wonder what Kubrick's true reaction was to Douglas's memorandum and what discussions followed between the two. This first documented "intervention" by Douglas into the creative decisions

being made by Kubrick also highlights the beginnings of a key source of tension: the sense that Douglas was exploiting Kubrick and Harris for Bryna's and his own promotional means. Whether or not Douglas' comments were being made out of sincerity for the quality of the picture, it generated a conflict for Kubrick and Harris, between genuine collaboration or producing a film to help further the star image of Douglas.

These tensions soon came to a head. Harris-Kubrick believed that Bryna was sidelining the contribution—the centrality—of both Harris and Kubrick on *Paths of Glory* in press releases issued during the production. It had been agreed that the film would be branded as a Bryna Production, due to Douglas's company having been the one to negotiate a deal with UA. But Bryna had no ownership interest in *Paths of Glory*. However, Harris-Kubrick was obliged to utilize the promotional services of Douglas's own publicity unit, Public Relations, headed by Stan Margulies. This took the autonomy of the publicity process out of the hands of Harris, the film's credited producer, and placed it within Douglas's sphere of influence. As a result, Harris and Kubrick came to assume that the publicity machine of Public Relations was geared towards one thing only: the Kirk Douglas celebrity image, at the expense of the film. Harris outlined his concerns in a letter to Margulies in March 1957, arguing "I definitely do not have the feeling that your office is working for Harris-Kubrick Pictures."²⁰ Whatever the truth of the matter, and whether Bryna was pushing its own image over that of Harris-Kubrick, is perhaps not the point. A feeling of mistrust had developed, only three months into the working relationship, with Harris-Kubrick assuming that Douglas was exploiting the company and getting the most out of their arrangement, when it was meant to be the other way around.

What emerged during those initial months that Kubrick and Douglas worked together was a clear difference in an understanding of their roles. For Kubrick, he would never accept being a mere "employee" of Douglas and Bryna. While for Douglas, he wanted to recruit

Kubrick to work for Bryna, potentially on a permanent, exclusive basis.²¹ But Harris and Kubrick wanted to end the relationship with Douglas as soon as feasibly possible. To that end, when the pair floated the possibility of breaking up Harris-Kubrick Pictures in May 1957, it may have been partially as a means to end the contract with Bryna.²² But there was only one problem: despite having secured Douglas in the leading role of *Paths of Glory*, Harris-Kubrick was still relatively unknown outside of Hollywood and reliant on the power network of Douglas and Bryna. If Kubrick had insisted on ending the contract in the short term, then the long-term future of Harris-Kubrick, and his own career in Hollywood, was in doubt.

This perhaps suggests why Harris and Kubrick continued to work with Bryna in the immediate aftermath of the post-production and release of *Paths of Glory*. But in doing so, they developed a creative approach to manage the relationship with Bryna. This involved, first, a process of persistent renegotiation of their contract, with Kubrick displaying clear levels of understanding that his own autonomy existed in the semantic wording of any agreement he had with producers and financiers. Second, they attempted to establish their own network of contacts and influence. James B. Harris was particularly useful in this regard, seeking out new options (including for *Lolita*) and utilizing the established contacts of his father, Joseph Harris, the influential co-owner of Essex Universal Corporation, a media group that financed, distributed and imported American and foreign films. It was via his father that Harris initiated contact with Eliot Hyman, chief executive of Seven Arts, to negotiate a deal for the financing of *Lolita*. Third, they implemented an intensification of their overdevelopment strategy, in which they committed Harris-Kubrick Pictures to the development of more projects than could feasibly be produced. Kubrick was working on a number of adaptations and original projects during this period, including an American Civil War epic tentatively titled *Mosby's Rangers* and a World War Two combat film initially

titled *Nazi Paratroopers* and later renamed *The German Lieutenant*.²³ Meanwhile, Harris was instrumental in establishing potential deals with other independent producers as well as seeking out the rights to a variety of literary properties, ranging from Arthur C. Clarke's *The Deep Range* (1957) to Boris Pasternak's *Doctor Zhivago* (1957).²⁴ All of this overdevelopment may have been an attempt to frustrate and delay the contract with Bryna. And yet, they actively collaborated with Bryna.

It is to the latter we must briefly turn to understand how the creative and business partnership evolved following *Paths of Glory*, with a brief case study of a project Bryna and Harris-Kubrick agreed to develop together: *I Stole \$16,000,000*. The film was to be an adaptation of Herbert Emerson Wilson's 1955 autobiography of the same name. Wilson had been a pastor that turned to a life of crime, becoming a notorious bank robber across the USA. When looking at the available archival documentation for the project, it becomes clear that, contrary to their belief that Douglas and Bryna were somehow trying to exploit and sideline their contributions in the working relationship, Harris and Kubrick were in fact being promoted heavily by Douglas's publicity unit, Public Relations. For example, Stan Margulies was contacting journalists and industry insiders about the new project in the winter of 1957. He explained how it had been Harris and Kubrick that had chosen the book due to their ongoing interest in crime as a genre.²⁵ Press releases issued by Margulies placed prominence on Harris and Kubrick as a team working for Bryna Productions and developing their own ideas, with Kirk Douglas only being mentioned in relation to having played the lead in *Paths of Glory*.

The aim was for Kubrick to finish the *I Stole \$16,000,000* screenplay by the beginning of 1958 so the film could enter production by April of that year.²⁶ This was consistent with the original agreement, in which a second picture had to be produced for Bryna within fifteen months of the completion of production on *Paths of Glory*. Therefore, it

indicates how Harris and Kubrick were, to some degree, contractually compliant. But more than that, it may have been a realization that they could use the agreement to their advantage, allowing their names to be further established via Douglas's power network and through the close association with the Douglas star brand.

So was *I Stole \$16,000,000* ever a serious venture and did Harris-Kubrick actually intend for it to be produced at Bryna Productions? This is a difficult question to answer and one that needs to be placed in the wider contexts of Harris-Kubrick's activities and the fact that Harris has himself admitted that he and Kubrick were looking to extricate themselves from the deal with Bryna by whatever means necessary.²⁷ Certainly, by spring of 1958, the prospect of the project going ahead had become unclear. Press releases issued by Public Relations stated that Kirk Douglas would "probably" work on the film,²⁸ while Harris and Kubrick had apparently encountered creative differences with Bryna over the ending of the film.²⁹

Further indication of Harris-Kubrick's lack of immediate commitment to *I Stole \$16,000,000* came in the form of a collaboration with Gregory Peck for an original screenplay based on the life of Colonel John S. Mosby, *Mosby's Rangers*. Harris-Kubrick notified Bryna of the collaboration in March 1958, which seems to have initiated a process that led to the termination of the original contract with Bryna.³⁰ Presumably this was based on the perceived uncooperative behavior of Harris-Kubrick. By April 1958, Douglas's lawyer, Samuel Norton, was devising a termination release agreement, the terms of which were arguably even worse than those of the original contract. In order to be released from the contract, Harris-Kubrick had to hand over two-thirds of its share of *Mosby's Rangers* to Bryna. And if Harris-Kubrick did not produce *Mosby's Rangers*, this requirement would carry over to any subsequent feature it did produce.³¹ The termination agreement also stated

that Harris-Kubrick had to arrange a new deal with UA for *I Stole \$16,000,000* to allow it to take ownership of the project from Bryna.

The effect of the termination agreement was to push Harris-Kubrick away from the production of immediate projects such as *Mosby's Rangers* and *I Stole \$16,000,000* in an attempt to force it into producing a project with Bryna. But the long-term impact was that it actually persuaded Harris-Kubrick to pursue an adaptation of *Lolita*. Douglas did not want to be associated with such a project, believing that the book's notorious reputation—the story of a grown man's sexual obsession with a pre-pubescent teenager—and its publication by the Parisian-based Olympia Press—a proprietor of pornography—would not reflect well either on his own star image or the international standing of Bryna. A compromise was therefore reached: *Lolita* would be excluded from the terms and conditions of the termination agreement, in return that Kubrick agree to direct *Spartacus* on a temporary contract.³²

In effect, a mutual agreement of sorts occurred, in which Kubrick favored Douglas with his directorial prowess for *Spartacus*, a production that was struggling following the firing of the original director, Anthony Mann. And in return, Douglas gave Harris-Kubrick the space to produce *Lolita* without any contractual obligation to Bryna. What resulted were the two most successful pictures of each company's respective histories, as well as two of the most commercially successful films in Hollywood history. Therefore, there was a further side-benefit to Kubrick directing *Spartacus*: it provided him with the necessary credentials to rightly claim that he had successfully directed a multi-million dollar epic (the most expensive film ever financed by Universal up to that point) with a stellar cast of some of Hollywood's biggest names. The cultural capital that this brought him, and Harris-Kubrick, cannot be overstated.

The loan-out agreement between Harris-Kubrick and Bryna for the directorial services of Kubrick on *Spartacus* did not specify anything about creative control.³³ Instead, Kubrick

was hired as an employee of Bryna with one task: to competently direct the film. In fact, Douglas seems to have welcomed Kubrick's creative interventions on the set of *Spartacus*, including suggestions on how to develop the script and its characters.³⁴ This approach played to Douglas's own preferences for lengthy deliberations about character, motivation and theme, and he even acknowledged the extent to which Kubrick had influenced the production in correspondence and, later, in his autobiography.³⁵ The myth, if we can call it that, that Kubrick and Douglas were somehow in conflict on *Spartacus* and that Kubrick had no control is not entirely true. After all, the contract between Bryna and Harris-Kubrick continued for a further two years after the completion of shooting on *Spartacus*. Instead, the myth of a lack of control seems to have been developed by Kubrick himself in the months after the film's release. This was perhaps a means of distancing himself from the project, and *it* from his own authorial image. It must be remembered that for Harris-Kubrick the *Spartacus* venture was a means to an end: that being the production of *Lolita* free from the constraints of any agreement with Bryna. There was no overriding artistic motivation in directing *Spartacus*, only the business interests of Harris-Kubrick.

But before Kubrick put distance between himself and *Spartacus*, he first exploited the publicity that the film brought him and Harris-Kubrick. Following the film's release in October 1960, Kubrick gave an in-depth interview to the *New York Times*. It was a paper with which he had cultivated a relationship since his earliest days as a short documentary filmmaker in 1950, when he had first reached out to the paper in a bid to raise his profile.³⁶ He now did so again, talking to Eugene Archer for a story eventually headlined "Hailed in Farewell: 'Spartacus' Gets Praise of Pleased Director."³⁷ In it, Kubrick claimed to have been the only one in a position to "authentically impose his personality" onto the film in his role as director.³⁸ He also alleged that he had overruled the power of Douglas to take charge of elements of the script, ultimately making the film more visual. Douglas did concede in

correspondence with producer Ed Lewis that he had been “weaned off” aspects of the script by Kubrick.³⁹ But Kubrick was most certainly overstating in the claim he made to the *Los Angeles Times*, telling film critic Philip Scheuer, “I was given complete freedom.”⁴⁰ Kubrick even aligned *Spartacus* with his own filmography, claiming that it was “just as good as *Paths of Glory*” and contained “just as much of myself in it.”⁴¹ These claims of creative autonomy have to be viewed with caution—especially given how in later years he emphatically stated “*Spartacus* is the only film over which I did not have absolute control”—and instead viewed in the light of the business interests of Harris-Kubrick. Kubrick appeared to be using the publicity of *Spartacus* to raise his own profile and the work of Harris-Kubrick, using interviews to promote the ongoing development of *Lolita*.

By 1961, when Kubrick began to dissociate himself from *Spartacus*, telling journalists he would prefer to be judged by the quality and reception of *Lolita* instead,⁴² it became clear that the relationship between Douglas and Kubrick was not going to work. The sensational press surrounding the production of *Lolita* had propelled Harris and Kubrick into the limelight and clearly signaled that they no longer required the power network and influence of Douglas. Indeed, they had begun to establish their own network of contacts and power that would sustain them through the production and release of *Lolita*, through to the initial development of *Dr. Strangelove* (1964). Douglas, Kubrick, and Harris mutually agreed to part ways in December 1961. They severed all contractual and legal obligations, with the only penance being that Harris-Kubrick had to pay a \$40,000 release fee by 1963.⁴³ The business and creative relationship that had commenced four years previous was over with no films actually produced in line with the contract (both *Paths of Glory* and *Spartacus* were produced outside of the three-picture deal).

The final release agreement allowed Harris-Kubrick to reclaim its total creative and business autonomy, at least from Bryna. Following the agreement, the company was

established as one of the leading independent production outfits in the world, with the successful release of *Lolita* in 1962 by MGM. As for Douglas, arguably he had reached his peak with *Spartacus* and increasingly turned to more personal, lower-budget material, exemplified by *Lonely Are the Brave* (1962), a black and white western. That is not to say he did not continue to appear in leading roles in big budget spectacles; one only has to think of his appearances in the likes of *The Heroes of Telemark* (1965) and *Cast a Giant Shadow* (1966). And his presence on the cinema screen intensified, appearing in over forty pictures throughout the second half of the twentieth century. But the influence and power he had exuded in Hollywood in the 1950s, and which had brought Harris-Kubrick into his orbit, was waning. In contrast, Kubrick's power grew so that, by the end of the 1960s and the release of *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968), he was one of the most influential and powerful film producers in Hollywood.

However, it could have been very different for Kubrick. While it is only hypothetical, without the assistance of Douglas and Bryna, Kubrick may never have become the producer that he did. After all, following the release of *The Killing*, Harris-Kubrick was struggling to find financing, with its initial contract with MGM in 1956 being cancelled and its relationship with the most influential company for independent producers, UA, being non-existent. What Harris-Kubrick needed more than anything was access to a network of power that it could then exploit to its own ends. Kirk Douglas and Bryna offered exactly that and while it is not to suggest that Kubrick and Harris were somehow acting with nefarious means in signing their contract with Bryna, they were certainly trying to use it to their advantage. The association with Douglas's star allowed them to grow. But at the same time, the desire to escape the perceived creative bondage in which they found themselves arguably pushed them towards a particularly controversial project, *Lolita*, as they knew Douglas wanted no part in its adaptation. What this also hints towards is fuller consideration of a wide range of

industrial contexts to understand why some projects come to fruition and others remain unmade. After all, one must ask, was it Kirk Douglas that was responsible in the end for *Lolita*? What if that project had been included in the 1958 Termination Agreement, allowing Douglas considerable ownership of it? As Douglas himself later made clear, “In the nearly thirty years since *Spartacus*, Stanley has made only seven movies. If I had held him to his contract, half of his remaining movies would have been made for my company.”⁴⁴ The history of Kubrick’s career would certainly have been very different.

REFERENCES

- Archer, Eugene. “Hailed in Farewell: ‘Spartacus’ Gets Praise of Pleased Director.” *The New York Times*, October 2, 1960, X9.
- Douglas, Kirk. *The Ragman’s Son: An Autobiography*. London: Pan Books, 1989.
- Fenwick, James. “A Production Strategy of Overdevelopment: Kirk Douglas’s Bryna Productions and the Unproduced *Viva Gringo*.” In *Shadow Cinema: Industrial and Production Contexts*, edited by James Fenwick, David Eldridge, and Kieran Foster. New York: Bloomsbury, 2020.
- . “‘Look, Ma, I’m A Corporation!’ United Artists and Kirk Douglas’s Bryna Productions 1955-1959.” In *United Artists: The Routledge Hollywood Centenary Series*, edited by Yannis Tzioumakis, Peter Krämer, Gary Needham, and Tino Balio. London: Routledge, 2020, 94-111.
- . “Kubrick and Production.” In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Stanley Kubrick*, edited by Nathan Abrams and I.Q. Hunter. New York: Bloomsbury, 2020.
- . *Stanley Kubrick Produces*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, forthcoming.

Pryor, Thomas. "Young Man With Ideas and a Camera." *The New York Times*, January 14, 1951.

Roshanian, Arya. "Kirk Douglas on Stanley Kubrick: He was a bastard." *Variety*, December 8, 2016. <https://variety.com/2016/biz/news/kirk-douglas-on-stanley-kubrick-1201937274/>.

Scheuer, Philip. "\$12 Million Risk Taken by Douglas." *Los Angeles Times*, September 29, 1960, C9.

NOTES

¹ Kirk Douglas, *The Ragman's Son: An Autobiography* (London: Pan Books, 1989), 333.

² "Kirk Douglas on Stanley Kubrick: He was a bastard," *Variety*, December 8, 2016, <https://variety.com/2016/biz/news/kirk-douglas-on-stanley-kubrick-1201937274/> (accessed January 7, 2020).

³ Douglas, *The Ragman's Son*, 332-33.

⁴ "The New UA Team," *Variety*, March 21, 1956, 17.

⁵ Letter from James B. Harris to David Stillman, June 1, 1956, private archive of James B. Harris, Los Angeles.

⁶ James Fenwick, "'Look, Ma, I'm A Corporation!'" in *United Artists: The Routledge Hollywood Centenary Series*, eds. Yannis Tzioumakis, Peter Krämer, Gary Needham, and Tino Balio (London: Routledge, 2020), 96-97.

⁷ Memorandum of Understanding Between Bryna Productions, Kirk Douglas, James Harris and Stanley Kubrick, January 9, 1957, Box 11, Folder 21, KDP.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ James Fenwick, *Stanley Kubrick Produces* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, forthcoming).

¹¹ *Shark Safari*, uncatalogued, Brown Wallet K, University of the Arts London, Stanley Kubrick Archives (SKA).

¹² Take, for example, Kubrick's idea for a script titled *The Famished Monkey*, a story of a young intellectual in Greenwich Village who "lives off other people." Similarly, Kubrick devised an idea for a script called *New York Story*, in which an artist in Greenwich Village lives off the "kind issuances of money from a 50-year-old widow." "Early Work," Brown Wallet E, uncatalogued, SKA.

¹³ Letter from Kirk Douglas to Stanley Kubrick, February 13, 1957, Box 23, Folder 19, KDP.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Letter from Stanley Kubrick to Kirk Douglas, February 19, 1957, Box 23, Folder 19, KDP.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Letter from James B. Harris to Stan Margulies, March 28, 1957, Box 23, Folder 19, KDP.

²¹ Letter from Kirk Douglas to Sam Norton, May 25, 1957, Box 11, Folder 21, KDP.

²² James Fenwick, "Kubrick and Production," in *The Bloomsbury Companion to Stanley Kubrick*, eds. Nathan Abrams and I.Q. Hunter (New York: Bloomsbury, 2020).

²³ Fenwick, *Stanley Kubrick Produces*.

²⁴ Private archive of James B. Harris, Los Angeles.

²⁵ Letter from Stan Margulies to Mac Reynolds, December 4, 1957, Box 56, Folder 11, KDP.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ James B. Harris, interview with the author, February 16, 2017.

- ²⁸ Public Relations press release, February 17, 1958, Box 56, Folder 11, KDP.
- ²⁹ Public Relations press release, February 13, 1958, Box 56, Folder 11 KDP.
- ³⁰ Telegram from Bryna Productions to Harris-Kubrick, March 18, 1958, Box 11, Folder 21, KDP.
- ³¹ Memo from Sam Norton to Edward Lewis, April 22, 1958, Box 11, Folder 21, KDP.
- ³² Letter of agreement between Bryna Productions and Harris-Kubrick Pictures, March 30, 1959, Box 11, Folder 21, KDP.
- ³³ Harris-Kubrick Pictures Loan-Out Agreement, April 8, 1959, 35/4, KDP.
- ³⁴ Memo from Kirk Douglas, April 29, 1959, 33/6, KDP.
- ³⁵ Ibid.; Douglas, *Ragman's Son*, 332-33.
- ³⁶ Thomas Pryor, "Young Man With Ideas and a Camera," *The New York Times*, January 14, 1951, X5.
- ³⁷ Eugene Archer, "Hailed in Farewell: 'Spartacus' Gets Praise of Pleased Director," *The New York Times*, October 2, 1960, X9.
- ³⁸ Ibid.
- ³⁹ Memo from Kirk Douglas, April 5, 1959, 33/4, KDP.
- ⁴⁰ Philip Scheuer, "\$12 Million Risk Taken by Douglas," *Los Angeles Times*, September 29, 1960, C9.
- ⁴¹ Archer, "Hailed in Farewell," X9.
- ⁴² Filippo Ulivieri, "Dr. Mabuse No. 2: an investigation into Stanley Kubrick's promotional strategies and the building of a mythological image," (unpublished manuscript, August 1 2019).
- ⁴³ Release agreement, December 15, 1961, Box 11, Folder 21, KDP.
- ⁴⁴ Douglas, *Ragman's Son*, 333.