

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

English Theses

Department of English

12-2009

Exploring the Factory: Analyzing the Film Adaptations of Roald Dahl's Charlie and the Chocolate Factory

Richard B. Davis
Georgia State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/english_theses



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Davis, Richard B., "Exploring the Factory: Analyzing the Film Adaptations of Roald Dahl's Charlie and the Chocolate Factory." Thesis, Georgia State University, 2009.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.57709/1238497>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of English at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

EXPLORING *THE FACTORY*: ANALYZING THE FILM ADAPTATIONS OF ROALD
DAHL'S *CHARLIE AND THE CHOCOLATE FACTORY*

by

RICHARD B. DAVIS

Under the Direction of Pearl McHaney

ABSTRACT

Film adaptations are becoming more popular and past critics and scholars have discussed films based on dramas and novels. However, few have explored the children's literature genre. In discussing such a topic, it takes more than just debating whether the novel or book is better. A discussion on what elements have been maintained, removed, or added in such an adaptation has to be made along with its success or failure. With this in mind, Roald Dahl's 1964 novel, *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*, and its two film adaptations will be explored along with an analysis of film adaptation theory to show that the first version of the novel succeeds and the second one fails.

INDEX WORDS: Film adaptations, Roald Dahl, *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*, *Willy Wonka and the Chocolate Factory*, Mel Stuart, Tim Burton

EXPLORING *THE FACTORY*: ANALYZING THE FILM ADAPTATIONS OF ROALD
DAHL'S *CHARLIE AND THE CHOCOLATE FACTORY*

by

RICHARD B. DAVIS

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2009

Copyright by
Richard Bernard Davis
2009

EXPLORING *THE FACTORY*: ANALYZING THE FILM ADAPTATIONS OF ROALD
DAHL'S *CHARLIE AND THE CHOCOLATE FACTORY*

by

RICHARD B. DAVIS

Committee Chair: Pearl McHaney

Committee: Nancy Chase
Calvin Thomas

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
December 2009

DEDICATION

I would like to thank my mother for all of her encouragement, inspiration, and support. Without her, I would not be where or who I am today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Pearl McHaney for all of her advice and assistance throughout my years of study at Georgia State as well as on the creation of this project. I would also like to acknowledge the other members on my thesis committee, Nancy Chase and Calvin Thomas, for taking the time to be part of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | v |
| 1 ABOUT ROALD DAHL AND <i>CHARLIE AND THE CHOCOLATE FACTORY</i> | 1 |
| 2 THE HISTORY AND THEORY OF FILM ADAPTATIONS | 7 |
| 3 A SUCCESSFUL FILM ADAPTATION: <i>WILLY WONKA AND THE CHOCOLATE FACTORY</i> | 24 |
| 4 A FAILED ADAPTATION: <i>CHARLIE AND THE CHOCOLATE FACTORY</i> | 41 |
| 5 LOOKING BACK AND TO THE FUTURE OF FILM ADAPTATION STUDIES | 57 |
| WORKS CITED | 61 |

ABOUT ROALD DAHL AND *CHARLIE AND THE CHOCOLATE FACTORY*

Among the vast amount of works in the field of children's literature, Roald Dahl's *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* (1964) stands out because it has been adapted into two different film versions. In 1971, Mel Stuart was the first director to adapt Dahl's text and in 2005, Tim Burton directed a second adaptation. However, before I explain adaptation theory with these two films to highlight the similarities and differences these films have with the novel, I believe it necessary to provide some background information on both Dahl and his beloved children's novel. This information will enable an individual to learn and/or remind themselves about both the author and the novel.

Just like his work, Dahl stands out among his fellow British authors because of his life, oeuvre, and writing style. John L. Grigsby records that Dahl was born in Llandaff, Wales, on 13 September 1916 to Harold and Sofie Hesselberg Dahl as the youngest son (41). Jeremy Treglown adds that during Dahl's childhood, he had to deal with the unfortunate deaths of his father and sister. In 1920, his father died of pneumonia and his sister latter suffered from appendicitis ("Chronology" xxiv). Despite these events, Dahl received an education in private schools, including the Repton School, from which he graduated in 1932, but did not go on to study at Oxford as his mother offered. After graduation through 1939, Dahl worked at the Shell Oil Company, which allowed him to travel beyond Wales. Then, he enlisted in the Royal Air Force where he suffered more unfortunate events (Grisby 41). In 1940, he crashed his plane, suffered from a cracked skull, and spent seven months recovering in Alexandria (Treglown, "Chronology" xxviii). However, he stayed in the military as a spy, and as a spy, he met C.S. Forester, who enabled him to start his writing career.

Dahl's writing career began with a story entitled "Shot Down Over Libya" about his experiences while serving in World War II, and did not stop until after his death in 1991 (xxviii). As he wrote more short stories, his work managed to appear in numerous publications, ranging from *Harper's* to *Playboy* (Treglown, "Introduction" xv). Furthermore, Dahl gained celebratory status in America because of his writing and his 1953 marriage to actress Patricia Neal (Grisby 42). Along with being a husband, Dahl also became a father of five children. His first daughter, Olivia, was born in 1955 and died of the measles in 1962. A second daughter, Tessa, came into the world in 1957. Three years later, Neal and Dahl had a boy, named Theo, who had suffered an injury due to a traffic incident. 1964 saw the birth of Ophelia and their last child, Lucy, was born in 1965 ("Chronology" xxx-xxxii). As a father, he maintained his writing of short stories, but branched out into other genres. Dahl becomes a children's author of numerous novels, including *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*, *The Witches* in 1983, and *Matilda* in 1988. Dahl's also wrote Hollywood screenplays for *You Only Live Twice* (1967) and *Chitty Chitty Bang Bang* (1968) (41). While other authors who try to write outside their comfort zone, including Oscar Wilde, do not receive as much success or popularity, Dahl manages to do the opposite.

Dahl manages to become successful and popular because of his unique writing style. Treglown points out:

First, he was a talker and man of action as much as a reader. He liked to tell and to hear stories and, stylistically as well as in characterization and plotting, the origins of his work are to be found as much in jokes and fantasies as in books. He and his narrators can be difficult to separate, in part because Dahl often turned his own experiences into fiction. ("Introduction" x-xi)

Furthermore, “One of his features as a writer is the lack of a clear boundary-line between his work for adults and for children” (xvi). In other words, readers of any age can be entertained by reading *Charlie* or one of Dahl’s short stories. Grisby adds that “In his best stories Dahl presents skillfully composed plots that convey powerful insights into the frequently negative depths of the human psyche. His stories often satirize the conventional norms, institutions, and hierarchies of society from the point of view of, in [Mark] West’s words, ‘an outsider’” (43). Readers can see the “outsider” in numerous Dahl works, including *Charlie* in how the title character stands out from the other children on the tour or in *Matilda* in that the title character loves to read, but her family loves to sit and watch television.

While Dahl has public and critical success, other critics find problems with Dahl’s writings. On the one hand, Richard Brickner observes that Dahl’s writings have ‘an ingenious imagination, a fascination with odd and ordinary detail, and a lust for its thorough exploration...’ (Grisby 41). However, on the other hand, other critics, including David Rees find flaws within Dahl’s writings. Rees criticizes that “The trouble with Dahl’s world is that it is black and white – two-dimensional and unreal – and that he has a habit of elevating personal prejudices, ordinary likes and dislikes, into matters of morality” (144). Rees remarks that Dahl’s “black-and-white” universe is a sham, its goodness as sham as its evil, the remedies he suggests often more unpalatable than the ills he thinks he sees” (149). Regardless of the flaws he observes, Rees accepts the fact that Dahl knows how to write (149). With *Charlie*, as example, readers can see the popularity, as well as the negativity individuals might have towards Dahl’s writing style.

Charlie serves as an example of Dahl’s writing for children, and in order to reach that target audience, the main characters include different types of children. It revolves around

Charlie Bucket, who along with four other children: Augustus Gloop, Veruca Salt, Violet Beauregarde, and Mike Teavee, visit Willy Wonka's chocolate factory. As their visit unfolds, unfortunate events unfold that prevent the other four children from completing the tour. As Charlie remains the last visitor, he wins the factory, a lifetime supply of chocolate, and manages to move his family out of their deplorable living conditions and into the wonderful factory that he will soon take over for Wonka. In keeping with the "outsider" theme, Dahl creates characters that make Charlie stand out because they have their own sins, while Charlie remains pure.

Augustus suffers from gluttony as he likes to eat. Greed surrounds Veruca, because she wants everything. It can be argued that pride plagues Violet, because she likes to chew gum. She prides herself on this habit that she chews the same piece for an extended period of time. Mike, as his surname suggests, watches too much television and could suffer from sloth because of the laziness it takes in watching television. Finally, Charlie, the work's protagonist, remains selfless enough to put everyone else in his family before himself.

Though some readers could view *Charlie* as a modern-day fairy tale, Dahl's work does set itself apart from other works in the children's literary genre with its publication history, criticisms, and multiple film adaptations. According to Treglown, *Charlie* was published in the United States in 1964 and not until 1967 is it published in the United Kingdom ("Chronology" xxxii). Meanwhile, William Todd Schultz observes that as Dahl writes it, he remembers and incorporates specific aspects from his childhood, some of which include attending school near the Cadbury Company factory, a real life chocolate factory. Besides having the satisfaction of smelling the company's creations, he sometimes would get the chance to try some experimental products, just as the fictional five children do in *Charlie*. Schultz quotes Dahl's own reflections about writing the work in which Dahl points out that when it comes to writing *Charlie* he uses

his past experiences in the Cadbury Company as inspiration for the Willy Wonka factory and story (463-64).

Once *Charlie* was available in the United States, it became a success, but the novel received positive and negative criticisms. Treglown reports, “Within a month, the first printing of 10,000 copies had sold out” (*Roald* 156). Furthermore, Rees acknowledges that a *Sunday Times* survey puts *Charlie* as the “best” children’s book and schools incorporated the book into the curriculum (143). When it comes to viewing *Charlie* as a positive work, Schultz comments that the book resembles a morality tale with the good child, Charlie, winning the prize by being himself, whereas, the other children get what they deserved because of their bad behavior (466). In other words, Dahl uses *Charlie* to explain that in order to succeed in life you must be yourself and properly behave.

However, the book has its share of negative criticisms. Rees quotes Eleanor Cameron who finds it “one of the most tasteless books ever written for children” (143). To further support her argument, Rees concurs that “Willy Wonka is a dreadful example of the unacceptable face of capitalism: the owner of an enormous factory that employs slave labor” (145). He makes an interesting argument because of Wonka’s use of the Oompa-Loompas who run the factory by handling the making, packing, and shipping of Wonka’s creations. The charge of slave labor does not really exist in the book as it seems more like colonialism in that Wonka pays them in cacao beans and has transformed their lives for the better. Before the rescue, the Oompa-Loompas live in Loompaland, and lead hard lives. Giant creatures, such as whangdoodles, would hunt and eat them for breakfast. Yet, they manage to survive by living in tree-houses and eating caterpillars (Dahl 68-70). After Wonka’s rescue, they now live in a safe environment where they can work, play, and eat as many cacao beans as they wish.

Like any other piece of literature, *Charlie* is not a perfect work, if one does truly exist. However, that has not stopped both Stuart and Burton from bringing Dahl's world to life through two very different film adaptations. With this thesis, I will analyze these adaptations. First, a discussion on film adaptations will provide information on how to view films based on literature. Second, I will address the similarities and differences of each film with the source material in order to show that while Burton's version remains more faithful, Stuart's adaptation is more successful. Therefore, this thesis will break new ground because it will enlighten readers on a genre of film studies known as adaptation theory that has often been overlooked with *Charlie* as the focal point.

THE HISTORY AND THEORY OF FILM ADAPTATIONS

Linda Hutcheon observes that “Adaptations are everywhere today: on the television and movie screen, on the musical and dramatic stage, on the Internet, in novels and comic books, in your nearest theme park and video arcade” (2). The video game character, Lara Croft, has been brought to the screen twice in 2001 and 2003, respectively; comic book characters from Batman, Superman, and the Fantastic Four have all had their stories told on film; and, the musical *West Side Story* serves as a musical adaptation of William Shakespeare’s tragedy *Romeo & Juliet*. In other words, if it has been published, it only remains a matter of time before it gets adapted into another art form for public consumption. Furthermore, when it comes to awarding films, the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences has a category called best adapted screenplay devoted to film adaptations from literary sources. As a result, the relationship between film and literature remains surprisingly long, interesting, and complicated.

The history between film and literature dates back to the late eighteenth century. The Industrial Revolution sparked technological advancements, such as the development of the iron press in 1798, which allowed literature to reach more consumers. Timothy Corrigan contends that “Throughout this period, from roughly 1750-1825, Western cultures grew increasingly fascinated by visual images and spectacles that drew on but transformed the traditional pictorial arts, as well as by the similarities and differences in images and words as separate means of communication” (*Film* 9). These cultures, as a result of the technological advancements, begin to have a conversation within their communities about which is better, the image/spectacle or the word.

While the Industrial Revolution helped literature reach the masses and started a conversation that continues today, the nineteenth century, also featured advancements that

further connect the relationship between film and literature. Because of the inventions within the photography industry during the 1830s with the motion picture camera, for example, images begin to reach the screen (Corrigan, *Film* 16). When the public begins to consume filmic images, they see real life events, such as a man sneezing, a horse galloping, or a train coming into a station. Even though these images start off fascinating audiences of different classes, in only a short time, audiences become uninterested and crave something new, and filmmakers around the beginning of the twentieth century started to look at literature as potential sources for films.

Literature inspires films for five different reasons as John M. Desmond and Peter Hawkes point out. First, literature exists as a great source for films because an author has already completed the creative process of inventing characters, plots, and worlds. With this process accomplished, an adaptation of an already established and successful work is easier to create than to begin a new work that might fail (Desmond 14).

Second, adapted texts can bring in higher classes of audiences to the local cinema. When films started to become popular in the beginning of the twentieth century, lower-class citizens remain the ones viewing the silent films in the popular nickelodeons because they provide entertainment, escape, and no language barriers. Interestingly enough, “One contemporary survey reveals that ‘in 1911, 78 per cent of the New York [City] audience consisted of members from the working class’” (Desmond 15). Despite the fact that these theatres continue to bring in consumers, the owners want to bring in more elite members of society in order to show that film viewing exists as a valid form of entertainment. Therefore, adaptations from classical literary authors such as Shakespeare, Dickens, and Hugo begin to occur in order to attract these people who have read these authors and are interested in seeing these fictional characters, plots, and worlds brought to life (Desmond 15).

As these adapted from classical films bring in new audiences, they also aim to educate the lower classes. Desmond and Hawkes described that “A third reason for adaptation comes from the notion that the purpose of motion pictures is to teach the masses about their literary heritage. In this view, film is a pedagogical medium useful for introducing literary masterpieces to contemporary audiences” (15). In other words, adaptations of classic novels can educate current lower class audiences on the vast literary canon. For example, they might not have heard of Jane Austen, but seeing *Sense and Sensibility* on the screen could encourage them to visit their local public library, checkout an Austen work, and read it. Many people do not know about these great works and the films that rely on such great works as sources engage the public in these great stories or characters that the educated class have already known about for years. These types of films have the potential of bringing different classes together.

The advent of sound also helps to usher in a deeper connection between film and literature. Corrigan comments that “In the late 1920s and 1930s, adaptations of contemporary literature become more popular than ever before, partly because the introduction of sound in 1927 allows movies to more fully recreate literary and theatrical dialogue, character psychology, and plot complexity found in novels” (“Literature” 35). Now, instead of just viewing an adapted text, audiences can see and hear the words that beloved literary characters have said.

Currently, films continue the process of adaptations because of the high cost of filmmaking. In order to bring films to the screen, studios have to spend more and more money upwards of a hundred million dollars on stars, special effects, and marketing. With each high-budget film being released, the studios take a gamble. If the film succeeds, then they make their investment back and earn more money. However, if the film fails, then the studios lose out on the money they put into such a film. Because of this game of chance, many film companies

look at literary works for future films because they already have a built-in audience that know about the work. On the one hand, audiences may recognize a work because of its status in the literary canon, such as works by Charles Dickens, F. Scott Fitzgerald, or Oscar Wilde. On the other hand, audiences may know of a work because of its mass popularity, including the successful *Harry Potter* series or works by Roald Dahl and Stephen King (Desmond 16).

The final reason to adapt a work stems from a specific person, such as a film director, who has a commitment to such a text. This person has such a passion for a particular text that he/she want it to be seen on the screen by the masses. Film Director Steven Spielberg directed Thomas Keneally's *Schindler's Ark* (1982) in 1993 under the name of *Schindler's List*. Five years later, talk show host and media empire owner Oprah Winfrey brought Toni Morrison's *Beloved* (1987) to life. In 2004, actor Mel Gibson looked to religious texts to bring the last hours of Jesus Christ's life to the screen with *Passion of the Christ* (Desmond 16). Sometimes these types of adaptations work with critical and financial success and sometimes they fail, as with *Beloved*.

While some adaptations succeed and others fail, Hollywood continues to look at various genres of literature as sources for potential films and franchises. Yet, at the same time, the relationship between film and literature remains interesting because of the issues involved. Corrigan argues that "Perhaps more than any other film practices, cinematic adaptations have drawn the attention, scorn, and admiration of movie viewers, historians, and scholars since 1895" ("Literature" 29). It can be an easy thing to say that after watching a film adaptation that the book remains better than the film or the film improves on the book. However, more specific issues can be addressed when studying film adaptations.

The issues surrounding the relationship between film and literature include specificity and fidelity, according to Corrigan. On the one hand, he writes that “Specificity assumes that different representational practices, such as literature and film, have individual material and formal structures that distinguish and differentiate them from other practices” (31). In other words, while an adaptation has a literary source of origin, it remains different and can stand by itself. Director Michael Almereyda’s adaptation of William Shakespeare’s tragedy *Hamlet* in 2000 serves as such an example because the entire plot moves into contemporary times by being set in the corporate world.

However, fidelity deals with the faithfulness the film has or does not have towards the original material (“Literature” 31). This seems to be the topic most addressed among those who study film adaptations, and Corrigan lists important five questions that deal with the fidelity of these types of films:

- (1) To what extent are the details of the settings and plot accurately retained or recreated?
- (2) To what extent do the nuance and complexity of the characters survive the adaptation?
- (3) To what extent are the themes and ideas of the source communicated in the adaptation?
- (4) To what extent has a different historical or cultural context altered the original?
- (5) To what extent has the change in the material or mode of communication (a printed page, a stage, 35 mm film) changed the meaning of the work for a reader or viewer? (*Film* 20)

Corrigan goes on to point out such an example of fidelity and the issues surround it with Eric von Stroheim’s 1924 film *Greed* adapted from Frank Norris’s 1899 novel *McTeague*. Originally, the film faithfully took every word, image, and character that appears in Norris’s novel for a film that runs over nine hours long. However, through multiple edits, the film was shortened to just

over two hours. Corrigan uses this film as an example because it shows “the collision between artistic specificity to economic and commercial restraints” (“Literature” 32). This film had to be shortened because the majority of the film-viewing public could and would not sit in a theatre for nine hours to watch one film. By showing such a lengthy film, the theatre and studio would not have the chance to earn more money based on multiple showings. While Stroheim intends to remain faithful to the original source, outside forces disrupt his vision in order to make a profit.

While specificity and fidelity serve as important issues surrounding the film and literature relationship, this relationship does have its share of complications due to the various theories surrounding film adaptations. Because Corrigan explains that for over a century this relationship has been a topic open for discussion among numerous critics, philosophers, and scholars (“Literature” 38). These thinkers have gone beyond just explaining why they believe the book or film to be better than the source material. Due to the length of time devoted to this subject, theorists such as Dudley Andrew, Linda Costanzo Cahir, and Desmond and Hawkes, have published their own perspectives on this relationship.

When it comes to looking at films adapted from literary sources, Andrew finds three modes in operation: borrowing, intersection, and transforming. He argues that “In the history of the arts, surely ‘borrowing’ is the most frequent mode of adaptation. Here the artist employs, more or less extensively, the material, idea or form of an earlier, generally successful text” (463). Even though Andrew does not go into more specific details about this mode, this term remains broad enough to correspond with any kind of adaptation that takes a plot or character from the literary world and brings it to the screen, including 1939’s *The Wizard of Oz*.

The second mode, intersection, deals with how the adaptation preserves the original text so that the material remains unchanged (463). This kind of adaptation occurs when the artist does

not change or leaves out a single item from the original material; such an example is Kenneth Branagh's *Hamlet* (1996). Maurice Hindle observes that this film runs 242 minutes long and remains the longest Shakespearean adaptation to date because Branagh keeps Shakespeare's masterpiece intact with every character, scene, and word appearing onscreen (191).

The final mode, transforming, occurs with the adapted film reproduces perhaps one or two essential elements of the original source, such as character, setting, or story. Perhaps Amy Heckerling's *Clueless* (1995) serves as a transforming example because of its ability to completely transform Jane Austen's nineteenth-century novel *Emma* into a twentieth-century high school teenage comedy. Despite the broadness of his argument, Andrew does make interesting observations that can be useful. Andrew suggests that "The broader notion of the process of adaptation has much in common with interpretation theory, for in a strong sense adaptation is the appropriation of a meaning from a prior text" (462). This idea might help current and future film theorists and viewers look at the theory of adaptation in a new perspective. Andrew ends his essay by suggesting "Adaptation is a peculiar form of discourse but not an unthinkable one" (469). He makes this observation because of the countless theories that have been published in the film and literature relationship.

Cahir also has her own set of observations when it comes to studying film adaptations, which help to clarify Andrew's categorization. While Andrew calls them modes, she calls them translations and also distinguishes her own set of categories. First, literal translations happen when the adaptation replicates the characters, plot, and setting from the original source material (16). She points out that Christopher Columbus's *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone* (2001) and *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* (2002) and Alfonso Cuarón's *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban* (2004) all serve as examples of literal translations as they all bring J.K.

Rowling's novels to life without major alterations (41). Therefore, literal translations run parallel to Andrew's idea of intersecting, but Cahir's theory is more developed.

Cahir names the second type of adaptations traditional translations. These occur when the adaptation "[...]maintains the overall traits of the book (its plot, settings, and stylistic conventions) but revamps particular details in those particular ways that the filmmakers see as necessary and fitting" (16-17). To illustrate such an example, Cahir states that *The Graduate* (1963) serves as a traditional translation because the film's director, Mike Nichols, takes Charles Webb's novel and alters Benjamin Braddock, the protagonist, from an object of satire to a sympathetic anti-hero. Meanwhile, the film keeps the events within the novel intact (41). Cahir's traditional translation parallels Andrew's borrowing mode of adaptation.

The last category, radical translations, happens when the adapted film "[...] reshapes the book in extreme and revolutionary ways both as a means of interpreting the literature and of making the film a more fully independent work" (17). Like the previous two categories, radical translations can be found throughout the history of cinema, including Francis Ford Coppola's film *Apocalypse Now* (1979) is a radical translation because of its altering of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* novel. Perhaps being radical remains similar to Andrew's mode of transforming when it comes to looking at adapted texts.

When it comes to studying these types of translations, Cahir observes both positive and negative aspects. Literal translations can excite audiences because they can bring to life the worlds that readers have seen only on the page. However, due to issues such as budget, technology, or time, these types of translations might not be able to include everything the author has created. Cahir also observes that "While traditional and radical film translations are more likely to explore the regions of meaning in the literary text than literal translations do, these two

translation modes may frustrate us for their failure to render the literal world that the writer has had us so strongly envision” (42). Therefore, the film and literature relationship remains complicated because for the most part, everything that the author has created does not translate to the screen which in turn can either please or upset the audience.

While Cahir’s theory runs in a similar pattern to Andrew’s, her theory is more extensive because she takes more time developing her ideas in a complete text, instead of Andrew’s short essay. She devotes individual chapters to discussing various topics, including: the film industry; novels, short stories, and plays that have been adapted into films; and about writing film. Furthermore, what makes her text easy to follow and understand happens with her inclusion of numerous tables, including showcasing films that translate the novel’s meaning, films that complicate the original text, and highlighting authors, such as Oscar Wilde, whose texts have been adapted to the screen.

As Cahir expands on Andrew’s essay, Desmond and Hawkes expand on Cahir’s work. Like the previous two theorists, Desmond and Hawkes also have created three categories to describe various film adaptations: close, loose, and intermediate. Their close category functions on a similar level to Cahir’s traditional translation and Andrew’s borrowing mode in that “A film is a close adaptation when most of the narrative elements in the literary text are kept in the film, few elements are dropped, and not many elements are added” (Desmond 44). While Desmond and Hawkes also use *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone* as an example of such an adaptation, they further point out why the film operates as a close one. According to them, the author, J.K. Rowling, upon selling the film rights, required that the film remain true to her work and she insisted on having approval of the actors who would bring the characters to life as well as the director who would bring her written world to life (44). Jonathan Demme’s adaptation of

Thomas Harris's novel *Silence of the Lambs* (1991) also serves as an example of such an adaptation.

The second type of adaptation, loose, also runs parallel to Cahir's radical translations in that the elements of the original text fall by the wayside and the film incorporates new elements. Desmond and Hawkes cite Ernest Hemingway's *To Have and Have Not* text because in 1944, Howard Hawks only keeps the novel's title and the protagonist's name with his adaptation. The final type, intermediate, occurs when an adaptation maintains some elements of the original source, cuts others, and manages to add more elements. To illustrate such an adaptation at work, they use Lasse Hallström's *What's Eating Gilbert Grape* (1993) because the film manages to keep most of the Peter Hedges's characters, plot, and settings. However, the film cuts minor characters and subplots. (44)

After discussing the three categories of adaptations, Desmond and Hawkes also use their work to illustrate different genres of literature that filmmakers use as sources for adaptations, including the novel, short story, drama, and nonfiction. With the first category, they acknowledge important ideas to remember for those interested in studying film adaptations. They comment that "Although estimates vary, several commentators agree that about one-third of all modern commercial films have come from literary sources" (83). In fact, they list 112 different novel-to-film adaptations, including John Ford's 1940 adaptation of John Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath* to Barry Levinson's 1984 version of Bernard Malamud's *The Natural*. Their list also goes beyond adaptations that have been made in the United States, to include those films produced in France and the United Kingdom (120-25). These adaptations happen because literature, specifically the novel, offers filmmakers story materials and narrative techniques. Furthermore, in the past, some authors have written novels in order to make a profit by creating

bestsellers. Now, they intentionally write novels in order to sell the screen rights in hopes of creating a blockbuster (84). As this happens, authors not only receive a payment for their written work, but also for the adaptation of their work; they get paid twice for doing one job.

When it comes to actually studying these types of adaptations, Desmond and Hawkes give future critics, filmmakers, and scholars important information to remember when looking at novel-based film adaptations. They advise that “Serious students of adaptation move beyond casual comments to a close comparison of text and film – a comparison that is informed by an understanding of film as an art form, a business, a technology, and a shaper and reflector of social values” (50). Though they do not necessarily pinpoint actual steps in studying adaptations, I believe the adaptation has to be qualified first as a specific type, using one or more of the categories established by adaptation theorists, albeit close, loose, or intermediate. By naming the adaptation, students will be able to focus their research.

After realizing what type of adaptation a film serves, for the majority of the time, not everything that the author has written will make its way to the screen. Things will get cut because “A major concern of the adapter of a novel running from 150 to 1,000 pages is that feature films last about two hours. One page of a screenplay takes about a minute to show on the screen, so the average script consists of 120 to 125 pages” (85). With this in mind, Desmond and Hawkes use Robert Mulligan’s 1962 adaptation of Harper Lee’s *To Kill a Mockingbird* as an example of how to study a film adaptation. They have created a list of the kept, added, and dropped elements that the adaptation has made with Lee’s original material. Some of the retained elements include Atticus Finch, the setting of Maycomb, Alabama, and the shooting of the rabid dog. The film has added a musical score, titles, and a Mr. Townsend character. Finally, the film

has dropped secondary characters from the Finch family including Uncle Jack Finch, school rooms, and a scene in which characters build a snowman (100-04).

The *To Kill a Mockingbird* film remains a popular and successful adaptation to this day because of its ability to include, delete, and create new elements in order to bring Lee's world to life. However, not every adaptation succeeds, and Desmond and Hawkes address such failed adaptations. Accordingly, an adaptation can fail for three different reasons. First, an adaptation fails when the film does not earn back its budget at the box office. Second, an adaptation fails when critics and/or average moviegoers agree that the film does not work. Finally, Desmond and Hawkes use the term "coherence," which deals with how well or poorly the adaptation combines the contributing factors of the screenplay, director, actors, and the production into making the film. In reference to these factors, Desmond and Hawkes include several different examples of such adaptations from Brian De Palma's *The Bonfire of the Vanities* (1990), Roland Joffé's *The Scarlet Letter* (1995), and Wolfgang Petersen's *The Perfect Storm* (2000) (231-32).

They further their observations on failed adaptations by including nine generalizations that "[...] may not apply to all adaptations in all times and places, but they supply a starting point for classroom discussion [...]" (233). Furthermore, these ideas can be used for future scholars of film adaptations to study the success or failure of such films. The first step deals with the original literary source, and whether or not it should be cinematic. The source should have a reasonable length, a worthy plot, and "the text should also have a few multidimensional characters who are interesting and sympathetic and at least one of whom is capable of some kind of change" (Desmond 233). If the source does not include these characteristics, then the adaptation will most likely fail.

The rest of their generalizations fall under the category of “cinematic misjudgments” or erroneous decisions by the filmmakers. An adaptation fails if it remains too loyal to the original source. They include *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone* (2001) as such an example because to some critics, it did not properly work as a film. Desmond and Hawkes quote David Edelstein who criticizes that “As a movie, *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone* has no inner life – no pulse – of its own: It’s secondhand” (235). However, despite these types of reviews, the film has been a box office success with the same director returning to make the sequel, *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*.

Their third generalization occurs when the filmmakers add wrong elements. Such elements include anything from new characters, settings, or storylines in order to fit the vision that the filmmaker has for the film. Richard Siodmak’s *The Killers* (1946) serves as one such adaptation that incorporates this generalization. It takes Ernest Hemingway’s story and uses it for the first part of the film; then the film changes direction by incorporating another plot and new characters, settings, and themes into the narrative (236).

While some adaptations add elements, others might cut elements that are vital in the original source. This fourth generalization exists in such adaptations as John Huston’s *Moby Dick* (1956) because it keeps the major characters, part of the dialogue, and parts of the novel that showcase whaling. However, Desmond and Hawkes comment:

The film drops page after page of scientific, historical, philosophical, political, and religious digression, as well as the many chapters devoted to cetacean classifications, which Melville uses to magnify the subject of whaling. What is left is the narrative spine of the novel without the pattern of symbolic detail that

gives this whaling voyage its ability to raise questions about the nature of God and the universe. (236-37)

Perhaps Huston takes such liberties with Melville's classic work because he does not want to make the film longer than audiences find to be a comfortable length. If he keeps everything Melville originally has written, then the adaptation would run for hours on end and audiences would not sit through such a lengthy film, which in turn, would cause the film to lose money at the box office.

An adaptation might delete essential elements found within the original literary source, adaptations might alter from the original in ways that Desmond and Hawkes suggest as a fifth reason for failure. The phrase, "Going Hollywood," deals with adaptations that conform to the standard Hollywood conventions, including a happy ending (237). Such adaptations have happened throughout film history and Desmond and Hawkes use Roland Joffé's *The Scarlet Letter* (1995) as such an example. In this adaptation, the Dimmesdale character actually survives and Hester begins a new life (237-39). The "Going Hollywood" adaptation fails because it alters too much from the author's original vision.

Their sixth generalization deals with the miscasting of film roles. They assert that "[...] choosing actors to fit closely the physical and personal details of characters adapted from a text is not essential. What is important, though, is to choose actors who fit the literary character well enough so that they do not create a new emphasis that undermines the coherence of the story" (240). They discuss Henry King's *The Sun Also Rises* (1957) because the actors in the film: Tyrone Power, Mel Ferrer, Eddie Albert, and Errol Flynn, appear too old to portray the thirty-year-old characters that Hemingway has created in his work (240).

Miscasting can happen to any type of adaptation, but the seventh generalization involves adaptations of classic works of literature when their settings take place in the past, for the filmmakers spend too much time and detail on recreating the specific settings set forth in the original work. Desmond and Hawkes maintain that “There is nothing wrong with this period emphasis approach as long as the attention to historical detail does not result in an elaborate period piece that fails to convey the story’s emotional drama” (242). In other words, when an adaptation is set in the past, the filmmakers have to walk a fine line between getting the setting correct and creating the drama. This balance has not always happened, for many adapted films have failed, including ones from novels by author Henry James: *The Europeans* (1979), *The Bostonians* (1984), and *The Golden Bowl* (2000). While these films have breathtaking visuals that capture the past, they fail to capture the characterizations that James creates in his works (242).

Even as some adaptations take place from sources set in the past, other adaptations come from works from the first-person perspective. This perspective makes for the eighth generalization of failed adaptations because “[...] the camera has difficulty conveying the judgments of a first-person narrative voice and sustaining the illusion that all events are filtered through a central consciousness” (244). Furthermore, audiences find the camera more relatable as it takes on the third-person perspective, and Jack Clayton’s *The Great Gatsby* (1974) serves as an example of one such film that fails at using the first-person perspective (244).

The previous generalizations deal with actual films; but Desmond and Hawkes’ final generalization deals with the filmmaking process. When it comes to making films, three different steps take place: preproduction, production, and postproduction and during any one of these steps, the adaptation could fail. First, with preproduction, an adaptation could have problems

with its finances, casting, or finding the right location. Second, with production, an adaptation might have problems with an actor's schedule, lighting, or costumes. Finally, problems with postproduction could include editing, the film's musical score, or promotion. Desmond and Hawkes use Terry Gilliam's *The Man Who Killed Don Quixote*. Ultimately, the film failed because it was never completed due to their many problems that are documented in Keith Fulton and Louis Pepe's *Lost in La Mancha* (2002). The adaptation's numerous problems, included a small production stage, interruptions from outside forces while shooting outside, and the actor playing Quixote had to take a leave of absence for medical reasons. Because of these and other problems, the film had to shut down and was never finished (242-43).

While different theorists have different terms associated with film adaptations, these theorists function on similar levels. They deal with similar categories and examples, yet they do not fully address films that have been adapted from children's literature. Deborah Cartmell, in her essay, "Adapting Children's Literature," illustrates that "Surprisingly, given the number of adaptations of children's literature to screen, the area has attracted very little critical attention" (168). Despite mentioning the *Harry Potter* series, these critics do not analyze other works in this popular genre that is now included in college curricula.

Cartmell, like these other critics, has complicated the idea of film adaptations, by separating the idea of adapting children's literature into three categories. She calls the first category classic adaptations and includes such works as *Peter Pan*, *Treasure Island*, and *Little Women*. In order for such a work to be classified as a classic adaptation, it must have multiple versions so every generation has its own version of the original text (168). The second category, obscure adaptations, deals with works that fly under the radar. Cartmell suggests that "It sometimes happens that a film, based on a little-known work, becomes itself the classic text"

(172). These adaptations become more famous than their original sources. Adaptations, including *The Wizard of Oz* (1939), *Mary Poppins* (1964), and *The Neverending Story* (1984) fit into this category (172-73). Her final category, popular adaptations, as the name suggests, deal with those adaptations based on popular children's books. Like the other critics, she mentions the *Harry Potter* series. However, she also adds Roald Dahl's *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* to the list (175).

Besides *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*, Hollywood has frequently looked towards Dahl's oeuvre to create new films, including *Danny, the Champion of the World* (1987), *James and the Giant Peach* (1996), and *Fantastic Mr. Fox* (2009). Despite the amount of film adaptations Dahl's writings have generated, *Charlie* stands out because now two different versions have been made: one by Mel Stuart in 1971 and one by Tim Burton in 2005. After more than thirty years, a new generation has its own version of Dahl's beloved work. In the next two chapters, I will analyze both versions of Dahl's *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* by using Desmond and Hawkes as the basis for the examination. While both Stuart's and Burton's versions function as examples of intermediate adaptations, I will argue that Stuart's adaptation succeeds and Burton's unfortunately fails.

A SUCCESSFUL FILM ADAPTATION: *WILLY WONKA AND THE CHOCOLATE FACTORY*

As previously mentioned, 1971 marks the first occasion in which Roald Dahl's beloved children's novel *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* (1964) was adapted to the screen. The adaptation directed by Mel Stuart functions as an example of an intermediate adaptation because of how the film keeps, removes, and adds and/or expands on elements from the original novel to the film. Meanwhile, the film has had an impact on popular culture within music, television, and film. *Willy Wonka and the Chocolate Factory* succeeds as an intermediate film adaptation because of its loyalty, flexibility, and casting.

According to Stuart, this film would not have happened if not for his daughter, who urged him to bring Dahl's imaginative world to life. After reading the novel, Stuart explains that "I felt that it wasn't just a children's book, but rather a complex morality tale about good kids and bad kids, good parents and bad parents, centered around this fascinating chocolate maker, Willy Wonka. Although it may not be obvious, it is also the story of a quest" (5-6). Stuart wanted to make the film because of its potential to appeal to both children and adults, as well as to fulfill a void in the family film market in which Disney had a major stake for years with its vast amount of animated and live-action films (7). Stan Margulies and David L. Wolper joined Stuart as the film's production (1-3).

Besides these contributors, Dahl actually got involved with the production by writing the screenplay. and after three different versions and additional help from David Seltzer, the final screenplay came to fruition. In the first draft, Dahl included too much from his novel to where the film would have run two-and-half-hours and too expensive to film. Stuart remembers that "A thorough professional, Dahl quickly understood that his approach needed serious reworking"

(14). The second draft came to the production team two months before filming would start, but still needed improvements. Stuart and his team hired David Seltzer to further improve the screenplay and a third draft, with Seltzer's help, appeared one month later (22). This screenplay turned out to be the one to bring *Willy Wonka* to the screen (22).

Before filming started, it needed financing and The Quaker Oats company became the ones to finance the film. They contributed between two and three million dollars in order to push a new candy bar, amply named the Wonka Bar. They believed that audiences who saw this product on the screen would go out and purchase a real Wonka Bar in order to have a real piece of the *Willy Wonka* film. Quaker Oats began developing the real Wonka Bar while Dahl wrote the screenplay. Though Quaker Oats saw the film as a different way to advertise a new product, they had problems developing the correct formula for the chocolate, and stopped production (8, 11). Finally, filming started in Munich, Germany, on 31 August 1970 with an international production team of individuals from Germany, Great Britain, and the United States (73).

As the film began to become a reality, it kept the plot, the beloved characters, and the ending intact in order not to alienate fans of Dahl's novel. Both plots can be described as a rags-to-riches story that could take place anywhere. The story revolves around a young boy named Charlie Bucket who starts with nothing and by the end finds fortune by winning a lifetime supply of chocolate and a wonderful chocolate factory. Meanwhile, along with the protagonist of Charlie, both plots detail the adventures of four other children and their parents while they tour the factory after finding golden tickets that Wonka has placed in various chocolate bars sold around the world.

With the plot of the novel intact, the film also has to keep the characters that Dahl created intact. Stuart explains that "The trick was to find actors who not only looked the part but also had

the ability to re-create the personality traits that were stressed in the book” (32). Starting with the gluttonous Augustus Gloop character, Stuart found his portrayer in German-born Michael Bollner (35). British actress Julie Dawn Cole was then cast as spoiled Veruca Salt because Stuart “[...] could picture her singing ‘I Want it Now’ and meaning every word of it” (34). Next, American actress Denise Nickerson won the role of gum-chewing Violet Beauregarde because “Personally, I felt that Denise had just enough baby fat in her cheeks to help make her look like an oversized blueberry” (Stuart 34). Another American, Paris Themmen, was cast as the television fan Mike Teavee because “I thought he had a bratty quality to him, which was ideal for the part” (Stuart 34). The final child or the hero as Dahl describes him, Charlie Bucket, was found in American Peter Ostrum (Stuart 33).

As the director found the child actors, the film also needed adult actors to help bring Dahl’s novel to life. Jack Albertson plays Grandpa Joe who accompanies Charlie on the tour. Stuart chose Albertson because “As a vaudeville performer, he would be able to execute the dance number we were going to stage when Charlie finds the Golden Ticket” (35). Second, Diana Soule was cast as Charlie’s mother because she has “[...] the patience, tenderness, and weariness for the part” (Stuart 36). Third, when it came to choosing the Oompa-Loompas, Stuart needed eight different actors and found various dwarfs and midgets from around the world (Stuart 37-38). Finally, “Obviously, Willy Wonka was the most crucial role in the film, and the actor who would play him could make or break the film. I needed someone with a commanding presence who would walk the line between seeming madness and innocence, someone you could trust and fear at the same time” (Stuart 27-28). The role went to beloved American screen star Gene Wilder, and his persona matched perfectly the character Dahl had created. In fact, “Gene’s wiry hair (which we would use to great effect in the film) and devilish persona made him an

ideal choice for the enigmatic chocolate maker, and he moved with the grace of the Wonka I had pictured in my mind” (Stuart 30). All of these actors were chosen for their respected roles because of their appearances and personality.

Along with the maintaining of the characters, the film also retained the overall ending of the novel. In both, Charlie remains the last golden ticket winner standing after traveling through the factory. We see the great glass elevator in action as it takes Charlie, Grandpa Joe, and Wonka out of the factory and into the real world. Finally, Wonka not only saves Charlie and Grandpa Joe but the rest of the Bucket family as well because all of Charlie’s family will come and live at the factory.

Despite *Willy Wonka* maintaining these elements from the original novel, the film also changes or deletes some elements, including the title, minor characters, original Oompa-Loompa songs, Veruca’s exit from the tour, and portions of the ending in part to keep the film at an audience-friendly time limit. The first obvious change is the film’s title. Dahl titles his novel *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* whereas the film is re-titled *Willy Wonka and the Chocolate Factory*. According to Stuart, this deletion happens for three reasons. First, the term “Charlie” denotes a derogatory term for a white overseer of slaves (16). Having that term in a title for a family-friendly film could alienate some potential audiences. Second, Stuart believes that the movie centers on Wonka and not Charlie (19). Even though Wonka does not actually appear until about midway through the film, it constantly refers to Wonka, his products, and his factory without him being seen by the characters and the actual audience. Finally, Stuart explains that using the unique Willy Wonka name in the film’s title would be easier for audiences in referencing the film (19). Though the film’s title slightly changes, it still remains focused on Charlie. He is the first of the five winners audiences see, the camera follows him on his journey,

and the film ends with his happily ever after. This change remains only a subtle deletion that only helps to differentiate the film from the original novel.

While the title receives a change, so does the date of the tour and the number of characters featured in the film. Originally set for February 1st, the film changes the date of the tour to October 1st to retain the cold environment established in the novel. Meanwhile, even though the novel includes many more characters, including Charlie's father and the allowance of two parents per child on the tour, the film deletes these characters. Stuart reveals that "However, apart from the costs involved in the hiring more actors, it would be simply too unwieldy to handle a group this size in every scene. As for Charlie's father, Mr. Bucket, he was an extraneous figure we could eliminate from the story. In the novel, Grandpa Joe was the one who accompanied Charlie to the factory, anyway" (24). Imagine trying to film a scene in the factory with fifteen actors of various ages along with the eight Oompa-Loompas; it would be too expensive. In the film, each winner of the golden ticket can bring one adult family member. Additionally, Dahl has Mr. Bucket appear as only a minor character in the novel. He spends his time away from the family while working at a toothpaste factory in order to provide for his large family. In order to keep the budget intact, and the film focused on Wonka, Charlie, and on track to meet its release date, minor characters were removed.

The film also changes the ways in which the Oompa-Loompas appear. Jane Pulliam points out that their changing appearance happens in a parallel manner as in the change of the film's title. "For similar reasons," she explains, "the Oompa Loompas were changed from African pygmies to creatures with orange faces, green hair, white eyebrows, and dwarf-like bodies" (104). Stuart came up with these changes in order to satisfy some African-American actors who complained to him about the way the novel portrayed the Oompa-Loompas as slaves

to a white man (Stuart 15). Additionally, Dahl changed the appearance of the Oompa-Loompas in later editions of *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* to little white people (Stuart 16). Perhaps Dahl changed their appearance to avoid the slavery criticism, which he might not have realized could have developed while writing the original text with the Oompa-Loompas as small, black people. Furthermore, Pulliam observes that because of their new appearance, they resemble the Munchkins found in *the Wizard of Oz* with their height, green hairstyles, and orange faces (110). Stuart adds that “When we tested the makeup on the Oompa-Loompas, I had an initial concern that the combination of green hair and orange faces might be a bit too much for the audience, but after seeing them on film, I decided that they looked just like candy-making elves, befitting their catchy name” (38). While all together they appear in a similar fashion, the Oompa-Loompas can be differentiated.

As their appearances change, so do their musical numbers. In the novel, Dahl explains that “They love dancing and music. They are always making up songs. I expect you will hear a good deal of singing today from time to time” (71). Five songs exist in the novel, the film not only captures these five, but adds four new songs. Wonka sings his short song as the group travels down the Chocolate River, which helps to show his multiple personalities. After Augustus goes up the pipe in the chocolate room, the Oompa-Loompas sing about his greediness, what has happened to him, and what will happen. They tell everyone in the factory that “He will be altered quite a bit” (78-79). In other words, they will erase his vice and make him a better child. When Violet swells up like a blueberry, the Oompa-Loompas again sing about her obsessive chewing and calm everyone that she will be alright after they give her a special cure (99-102). Upon Veruca falling down the garbage chute, the Oompa-Loompas sing about her being spoiled, who she will meet as she travels down the chute, and they blame her parents for

her rotten behavior (116-18). Finally, after Mike gets sent through the air by television and becomes small in stature, the Oompa-Loompas sing to the remaining tourists about watching too much television, the benefits of reading books, and give a sense of hope that Mike will return to a normal size (137-41). While these songs provide clear messages to the characters and Dahl's readers, they do not appear anywhere in the film. Perhaps they have been removed because of their length, the difficulty of the language since the actors playing the Oompa-Loompas can not all speak English, and how they interrupt the film's pace. However, I will discuss later on that the film does include four new songs that detail what has happened to these four characters, provide messages to the audience, and are memorable.

As just mentioned, Dahl removes Vercua from the tour by having her fall down a garbage chute after being tested by one hundred trained squirrels, but this removal also does not appear in *Willy Wonka*. In the novel, she demands a trained squirrel to take home. She then tries to grab one, but they deem her a "bad nut" (Dahl 112) and take her limbs and carry her across the floor to the garbage chute. While this does appear as an amazing act, the technology of the time could not make this into a reality, according to Stuart (23). It would simply be impossible to find, maintain, and train one hundred squirrels to test nuts let alone carry a human being. Stuart was able to work around this problem by including a new way to remove Veruca from the tour. Furthermore, this sequence could potentially scare younger audiences. Stuart replaces the squirrels with magical geese that lay golden eggs and instead of being a "bad nut," Veruca is deemed a "bad egg" and still manages to fall down a chute. Richard D. Seiter finds that "This substitution does not disturb the continuity of the plot and if anything aligns the narrative more closely to the folk-fairytale world, since a magical goose laying special eggs is a familiar folk

motif” (193). By creating this substitution, Stuart finds a rational compromise with the original novel and current film technology.

The last deletion the film makes with the novel deals with the ending. Even though the overall ending remains intact, the film does alter Dahl’s original ending. In *Willy Wonka*, Charlie, Grandpa Joe, and the audience never see what has happened to the four children and their parents. Wonka only explains in passing that they will all be returned to their former, nasty selves. However, do we really believe Wonka to be telling the truth? Were the Oompa-Loompas successful in rescuing Augustus, deflating Violet, saving Veruca, or reestablishing Mike’s size? Because of their ordeals, could the children become better after being taught their specific lessons? These questions remain unanswered in the film, but the audience seems delighted at Charlie’s new life that they forget about these other characters. Meanwhile, unlike in the novel, Wonka never meets the rest of the Bucket family, nor does he visit their home. At the end of the film, we only see their house. It can be argued that these parts of Dahl’s original ending get removed from the film due to time constraints.

With the additions and removals, *Willy Wonka* also includes new and/or expands on characters, scenes, dialogue, and music. The film expands the roles of Slugworth, Bill the Candy Man, and Mrs. Bucket because each provides a specific purpose for developing the plot. Günter Meisner plays the role of Slugworth, which gets expanded in the film because he tempts the five children with a test of morality. If they will bring him an Everlasting Gobstopper, which Dahl includes in the novel, then they will become rich. Meanwhile, Slugworth also brings a sense of trouble to the film (Stuart 23). Since no real villain appears in the novel, the film makes Slugworth assume that role.

The Candy Man, otherwise known as Bill, is another character whose role expanded from the novel. Dahl never gives his candy man a name, and he only appears to give Charlie the candy bar that includes the last golden ticket. However, in the film, Aubrey Woods who assumes the role of Bill the Candy Man serves to build up the wonderment of Wonka and his glorious chocolate at the film's beginning by singing "The Candy Man" to a group of young children.

Another expanded character is Charlie's mother, played by Diana Soule. Since Mr. Bucket does not appear in the film, she becomes the breadwinner by working as a laundress in order to support her family. In fact, the film adds a new scene in which the audience sees her working in order to stress the point of the Bucket's low economic status (Stuart 24). By having her assume the breadwinner role, the 1971 film takes on a pro-feminist perspective.

Whereas the film expands on these Dahl characters, the film also includes a brand-new character, Charlie's school teacher, Mr. Turkentine. David Battley plays this role and appears in two new scenes that show the power Wonka's contest has over people. In the first scene, Mr. Turkentine dismisses his class so that they can all go purchase Wonka Bars in hopes of finding a golden ticket. In the other scene, through a lesson in percentages, he manages to alienate Charlie. He makes students call out how many Wonka Bars they have opened, and while two students call out numbers in the triple digits, making it easy for Mr. Turkentine to figure out the percentages, Charlie has only opened two, which stumps Mr. Turkentine. He has been able to open only two because he can not afford to open as many as the rest of the class because of his economic status. Clearly, this additional scene helps the audience feel sympathetic towards Charlie.

This scene happens to be one of many new scenes that *Willy Wonka* adds to Dahl's original novel in order to show Wonka's worldwide appeal, create more suspense, and give the

audience something to laugh at and to see. Dahl uses less than two pages to describe the worldwide mania surrounding the search for the golden tickets (23). Stuart takes the liberty of adding more instances of people and their behavior in searching for the golden tickets within his film. We see not only Wonka Bars fly off store shelves, but also a Wonka van making a special trip to the White House. A patient talks to his psychiatrist about the search for a ticket appearing in a dream. A computer programmer works with a computer in order to pinpoint the locations of the last tickets, but they get into a humorous exchange. An unseen Queen of England makes her way into an auction house in order to bid on a case of Wonka bars. A woman needs time in order to think about exchanging her own case of Wonka bars for her husband, who seems to have been abducted. Finally, Stuart includes a scene in which a fifth and fraudulent winner has been found in order to create more suspense for the film audience before Charlie finds the last real ticket. Clearly, the search for the tickets has made people act out in abnormal behaviors. Whether some of these examples prove humorous, troubling, or suspenseful for the audience, they all help to expand the film's length as each child discovers the real tickets.

Besides the additional scenes of people searching for tickets, the film creates new scenes prior to the reveal of the chocolate room and river. Stuart describes that "To hold back the revelation of the chocolate river set, we created a series of oddly shaped, menacing rooms that the group would have to pass through before they enter the heart of the candy factory" (23-24). These scenes include the children signing a quite large and visibly difficult contract, squeezing into a cramped elevator, and struggling in a room that gets smaller as they journey through it. He further adds that "Each bizarre setting had a touch of *Alice in Wonderland* to it, visually alerting the audience that, in the words of Wonka, 'there was danger round every corner'" (24). These

scenes not only extend the film's length, but also create more suspense for the audience and provide them with new surroundings not found in Dahl's novel.

While these past scenes have been created from scratch, an additional scene has been included that Dahl briefly mentions in the novel, the fizzy lifting drinks. Stuart decides to include a scene in which Charlie and Grandpa Joe consume said drinks and have a fun experience flying through the air. This sequence, according to Stuart, happens for two reasons:

First, we wanted to put Charlie and Grandpa Joe in physical danger as they broke one of Wonka's rules and sampled the drinks. (Up to this point in the film, they have been onlookers of the action.) This causes them to start floating in air, ascending toward a gigantic fan that nearly cuts them to slivers. Second, when Wonka refuses to give Charlie his promised lifetime supply of candy, his apparent reason is that Charlie and Grandpa Joe disobeyed the rules by drinking the fizzy lifting drinks (23).

By including this sequence in the film, it makes Charlie more realistic to the audience and connects him to the other children on the tour, because all of them have done something they were told not to do.

The last scene that the film adds to Dahl's original novel centers on transportation with the Wonkamobile. While everyone gets to see Wonka's boat and elevator, otherwise known as the *Wonkatania* and the Wonkavator in action, the film creates a new mode of transportation with the Wonkamobile. This new vehicle only travels a small distance, but provides the audience with a moment of laughter as Charlie and Grandpa Joe play with the bubbles and Mike and his mother complain about the overabundance of bubbles. This scene also extends the time between Veruca and Mike's disappearance.

Though the film adds new scenes, the biggest addition to the film concerns the music that features four new songs sung by various characters and four brand new Oompa-Loompa songs. Originally, Stuart saw the film as a drama with no music, except the actors would chant poems when needed because “I was wary of adding musical numbers of any kind, thinking it would take away from the sense of reality I wanted to impart to the story” (60). However, the film turns out to be a film with music, just as in the novel turns out to be a novel with lyrics. “The truth is that he [David Wolper] was right: The songs are all first-rate; they help emphasize the story’s key moments and they are instantly identifiable with the film” (Stuart 60). Written by the team of Leslie Bricusse and Anthony Newley, all of the songs in *Willy Wonka* have been included for specific reasons.

The songs sung by characters other than the Oompa-Loompas in the film have been placed in specific spots to help move the plot forward. First, “The Candy Man” sets up Wonka as this larger than life figure. The song provides an infectious melody and its lyrics help set up the whimsical tone that Stuart wanted for the film (63). Second, Stuart classifies “Cheer Up Charlie” as “A poignant summation of Charlie’s conversation with his mother about life looking bleak” (65). Meanwhile, it also provides the film with a contrast to Veruca’s spoiled anthem of “I Want it Now,” which occurs later on in the film (65). Third, “I’ve Got a Golden Ticket” allows Charlie and Grandpa Joe to celebrate the finding of the last ticket. The final song, “Pure Imagination,” could be the film’s most memorable song because of Wilder’s performance. Stuart suggests that “The lyrics were a poetic interpretation of Wonka’s belief that dreams can come true” (63). Therefore, all of these songs, while memorable also help develop the plot.

The Oompa-Loompas also have been given four new songs to sing. Seiter comments that “In the film, the lyrics sung by the Oompa-Loompas are not as dark and threatening [as they

appear in the novel], and their content emphasizes the cause for the mindless, gluttonous, spoiled, gum chewing, TV-addicted generation. The blame is placed on parents who neglect to set limits for their offspring” (195). Stuart also reveals that these songs function as both half chant and half song and they appear easy to sing and catchy, which, in turn, make them perfect for the actors playing the Oompa-Loompas. Furthermore, “[Leslie] Bricusse created a series of original lyrics for each version of the song, summing up each lesson to be learned in a concise, amusing manner” (Stuart 65). Each song begins and ends in a similar way with the Oompa-Loompas offering a puzzle that needs to be explained, a problem, and offers a solution or lesson that can be learned from what has just happened.

The “Taking the Plunge” scene features the first new Oompa-Loompa song and like the original song in the novel, it manages to detail Augustus’s gluttonous behavior. The song also encourages people to not be like Augustus in order to lead better lives. The “Gum-chewing Evils” scene marks the second new song and details the pros and cons of chewing gum. This song teaches that people who have good manners will go far in life. The “I Want It Now” scene features the third song and attempts to place the blame on the parents for spoiled children. Like the previous song, this song stresses the fact that in order to go far in life, a person must not be spoiled. The final song occurs after Mike’s shrunken appearance and explains the dangers of watching too much television. This one refers back to the first song and encourages people to not be greedy in order to go far in life. Regarding all of these songs, including “The Candy Man” and “Pure Imagination,” Stuart comments that they helped make the movie a success and have been continually recreated (70). Interestingly enough, though these songs appear in a 1970s movie, they still have importance almost forty years later as brief lessons that audiences can take away

from the film. Therefore, while the film keeps the themes of the original songs found in Dahl's novel, they are shorter, easier to sing, and enduring in ways that songs in the text are not.

Willy Wonka & the Chocolate Factory with the help of its musical numbers has had an immense impact on popular culture. An actual candy line has been created by the Nestlé company with Wonka's name and image that can be found in various stores around the world. SweetTarts, and real Wonka bars and Gobstoppers make up some of the products in the line. The film also has had an impact on music, television, and film. In music, a modern rock band has named themselves after the Veruca character; the lead singer of Vermicious K goes by Mike TV; and, Marilyn Manson often uses the film as sources of inspiration for his music (Stuart 109). On television, numerous shows have paid homage to the film, including *The Muppet Show*, *Will & Grace*, and *Family Guy*. Ben Vereen sang his own version of "Pure Imagination" on *The Muppet Show* in 1976 ("Movie" 1). Characters on *Will & Grace* reference the film, and one episode in season five, entitled "Boardroom and a Parked Place," included a role for Wilder in which his character says "Strike that. Reverse it ("Movie" 1). Meanwhile, *Family Guy* used the film in various ways including having an episode entitled "Wasted Talent" that spoofs the film and uses the music from "I've Got a Golden Ticket" ("Movie" 4). At the same time, *Willy Wonka* has been mentioned in various films, including *Austin Powers: The Spy Who Shagged Me*, *Grosse Pointe Blank*, and *Sicko*. ("Movie" 1-4) Finally, as previously mentioned, the film stands out among other film adaptations because it has been remade and will be discussed in the next chapter.

Willy Wonka exists as an adaptation that ultimately succeeds. Based on the Desmond and Hawkes criteria, it succeeds because of it honors Dahl's original novel, it creates new elements that enhance the film, and it casts convincingly (231-56). With Dahl's help, the film maintains

the plot and themes found in the novel that help make both the novel and the film classics in their respected fields. Both tell the story of a poor boy and his family who because of luck move up the economic ladder. Meanwhile, the other children in both the novel and film teach audiences that to go far in life, they should not be greedy, behave in rude manners, or watch too much television.

As the film maintains certain elements from the novel, it also breaks away from the novel by creating new characters, scenes, music, and expanding on minor characters in order to create more laughter, delight, and suspense. Characters such as Mr. Turkentine, Bill the Candy Man, and Slugworth add to the film. They each bring laughter, joy, and a sense of evil to the film that further develop Dahl's original novel. Meanwhile, the additional scenes serve many purposes. They critique culture by showing how obsessive people can be when they want something badly enough, at which point audiences can laugh. These scenes enable the film to suspend the revealing of Charlie's finding the last ticket. Other scenes that have been included further develop the original by building up Wonka's reputation as "The Candy Man," which serves as a delightful song that helps set the tone of the film. Finally, the additional music enables the film to allow characters the chance to celebrate, teach lessons about bad behavior, and explain that dreams do come true. Stuart summarizes that "In the end, the thrust and scope of the book was streamlined in places and amplified in others, to make it not only more cinematic but more palatable to mature audiences" (24-25). In other words, the film succeeds because it maintains parts of the original novel and adds new material in order to make the film more pleasing to audiences who have or have not read the book.

The film also succeeds because of its casting choices for Charlie and Wonka. According to Stuart, who comments on casting, "The screenwriter can supply them with the words, the

director can guide their actions, but it is only the actor or actress who provides the extra ingredient of magic that makes the screen light up” (27). The magic does exist with Peter Ostrum and Gene Wilder in their respected roles of Charlie and Wonka. With Charlie, Seiter finds that “Peter Ostrum gives to this role the ‘all boy’ dimension that Dahl adds in the screenplay. In the film Charlie becomes a more complex and interesting character” (194). While watching the film, Charlie takes on more of the “outsider” role. He stands out among his peers because of his low economic status, which in turn, creates sympathy for audiences as we see during the percentages lecture. Even though the film gives him a job as a newspaper delivery boy, he unselfishly spends his money on bread for the family, showing his caring side. Furthermore, as he wants the ticket, audiences want him to have it as well because they know life will turn around for him. The casting choice of Ostrum as Charlie lights up the screen and gives the character more complexity and sympathy.

The casting of Wilder as Wonka also provides the film with the magic that has made the film like a gobstopper, everlasting. Seiter finds that “Gene Wilder’s portrayal of Wonka commands the film viewer’s attention and catches the dazzling and deranged spirit of the character as his gold-topped cane cuts and whistles through the air, narrowly missing those children who try to precede him through the factory” (191). Like Charlie, Wonka does have more complexity in the film than in the novel. When audiences first see Wonka come out of the factory, he appears as a crippled man, but when he dives and rolls forward, he shows his playful side. Meanwhile, audiences can laugh with him. While in the Inventing Room, Wonka walks around and throws a working clock into a vat of some liquid and a pair of sneakers in another one. When he does this, Mr. Salt questions him on it, and Wonka responds, “Gives it a little kick.” At the same time, audiences can view him as a personification of crazy while on the

Wonkatania when he sings. With so many layers to his personality and behavior, audiences also love Wonka.

Future film adaptations should look at *Willy Wonka and the Chocolate Factory* as a perfect example of how to bring a novel to the screen. It successfully juggles three aspects of adaptations. The film maintains the important and beloved parts of the novel, including the plot, characters, and themes. It deletes minor characters, songs, and parts of the ending without upsetting fans of the novel. Finally, *Willy Wonka* creates new elements that enhance the viewing experience and help make it not only a successful adaptation, but a classic film.

A FAILED ADAPTATION: *CHARLIE AND THE CHOCOLATE FACTORY*

More than thirty years after Stuart's version, 2005 marks another important year in the life of Dahl's novel. Audiences have another opportunity to see Dahl's novel come to the screen because Tim Burton adapted the novel into another intermediate adaptation. While *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* manages to be more faithful than its predecessor in some ways, it otherwise removes and adds and/or expands on elements of Dahl's novel. However, this film fails as an adaptation because of its faithfulness, the casting of Johnny Depp, and the inclusion of unnecessary elements.

Since Stuart's version has a universal appeal and an impact on popular culture, then why remake it? John Horn writes that the filming process took almost a decade with many false starts, screenwriters, and casting suggestions (2). According to Alison McMahan, author of *The Films of Tim Burton: Animating Live Action in Contemporary Hollywood*, the idea of remaking or reviving the film started with Dahl's estate and the Plan B production company. After many possible directors, casting suggestions, and screenplays, the remake had been approved by Dahl's wife, Felicity. In the end, Tim Burton directed the \$150 million remake from a screenplay written by John August (McMahan 188-89). John Salisbury states that the film began production in June 2004 at Pinewood Studios in England, where Burton had filmed *Batman* in 1988 (236). The *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* 2005 film was another opportunity for Burton to work with people he had already worked with both in front of and behind the camera. August had written the screenplay for Burton's *Big Fish*, and Burton again collaborated with Danny Elfman who provided the music for the film.

With all of the players in place, Burton jumped at the chance to direct the film because as he told Chris Nashawaty he was not a fan of Stuart's version even though many people share an

opposite opinion (1). Burton told August that “[...] he wanted their *Charlie* to come straight from the book” (Nashawaty 2). The new version would have to maintain more fidelity to the novel than did its predecessor. The film manages to accomplish such a task by keeping the plot, ordinary setting, small details, characters, the original Veruca elimination, music, and ending from the book intact. Just as in the novel and the first version, this *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* film revolves around a poor boy named Charlie Bucket, who lives in an unknown location. Horn further suggests that “Like the book, the film is not set in a specific time, nor a specific country or it might be Philadelphia, or it might be London” (4). Upon winning one of five golden tickets, Charlie and four other children would visit Willy Wonka on February first and take a magical tour of Wonka’s mysterious chocolate factory. After surviving the tour unscathed, Charlie’s life turns around. He wins a lifetime supply of chocolate and inherits the factory showing that anything is possible.

The remake also maintains smaller details in the novel that do not appear in Stuart’s film. Jane Pulliam observes “The opening scene of Tim Burton’s *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* is more in the spirit of Dahl’s first chapter, immediately establishing the family as the film’s moral center” (105). Moreover, Burton shows us unseen environments, characters, and commentary. We see Loompaland, Prince Pondicherry and his Chocolate Palace. The film now includes Charlie’s father who loses his job at the toothpaste factory. Finally, Burton allows Charlie’s grandparents to say what audiences initially think about the four ticket finders: Augustus, Veruca, Violet, and Mike. For example, one of Charlie’s grandparents states “What a repulsive boy” in regards to Augustus.

These four characters, along with the rest of the cast, keep the international feel of the novel intact. German-born Philip Wiegratz plays gluttonous Augustus Gloop; Americans

AnnaSophia Robb and Jordan Fry bring gum-chewing Violet and media-obsessed Mike to life, respectively; and British actress Julia Winter plays the spoiled Veruca Salt (“Bringing” 7).

Freddie Highmore, another English actor, was cast as Charlie because of his physicality. Burton comments that “He had to look like he was undernourished and his grandparents are really old and they didn’t have much to eat, and if a strong wind blew, Freddie might just blow away” (3).

By casting someone like Highmore, audiences can believe Charlie to be a starving child, who not only yearns for nourishment but also for a better life for himself and his struggling family.

The film’s adult actors also come from all over the world. American actor Johnny Depp plays Wonka; he co-starred with Highmore in *Finding Neverland*. Salisbury comments on this casting decision by describing that Depp was Burton’s only choice to play Wonka, something to which studio executives also agreed upon based on Depp’s performance in *The Pirates of the Caribbean* film. Meanwhile, this marks the fourth time that Burton and Depp have worked together on a film, showing that these individuals like and respect each other (230). Burton also adds that Depp is “a great character actor” (230). Another American, Deep Roy, was cast to play the entire Oompa-Loompa workforce. Nashawaty observes that the 4-foot-4-inch actor, through CGI, computer-generated imagery, gets shrunk to 30 inches in order to play Wonka’s helpers (2). Having one man play all of the Oompa-Loompas with the help of technology turns out to be a daunting task because “If five, six or 20 Oompa-Loompas appear in a scene, Roy played all of them. In separate takes, and from different starting marks, he would act out each single part on the motion capture stage, whereby his body and facial movements were recorded in the computer” (“Bringing” 14). On the other side of the Atlantic, British actors Helena Bonham Carter and Noah Taylor were cast as Charlie’s parents and Irish actor David Kelly played

Grandpa Joe. Such an international cast helps convince the audience that the story could happen in any location (Pulliam 105).

Burton also maintained the original way Veruca gets removed from the tour. Because of advancements in CGI (Computer Generated Imagery) technology, a film can show squirrels moving a child across space and throwing her down a garbage chute. However, this task still had its share of difficulties. “Like Wonka, Tim Burton also wanted the real thing – live, trained squirrels” (Bringing 15). In order for this to happen, a mixture of computer generated and real life squirrels were used in removing Veruca (15). Senior Animal Trainer Mike Alexander of Birds & Animals Unlimited who worked with Burton on *Planet of the Apes* admits that “When I found out what was involved, it was a bit overwhelming” (15). Despite the degree of difficulty, he managed to work with real squirrels. “Alexander’s team of four trainers (under the watchful eye of a Humane Society rep[resentative]), spent 19 weeks with their lively charges, providing mostly one-on-one attention. Some of the animals came from private homes in the UK while the majority were recruited from local rescue shelters” (16). Meanwhile, Nick Davis, one of the people in charge of the CGI for the film, explains that “Our job was to make the CGI squirrels as realistic as possible, to interact with humans in a kind of anthropomorphic way and yet remain absolutely true to their animal nature” (“Bringing” 16). As a result of the blending of the real and technology-made squirrels, Burton maintained Veruca’s original elimination as written by Dahl.

The film also kept most of Dahl’s original lyrics in his Oompa-Loompa songs. Elfman, lead singer of the 1980s band Oingo Boingo, returned to Dahl’s lyrics and incorporated them into the film. Elfman comments that “I wanted to stay as a true to Roald Dahl’s words as possible [...] In the end, I had to do a lot of editing, but I was 95% true to the book, with just a bit of tweaking here and there” (“Bringing” 18). Dahl’s lyrics are long and sometimes complicated, so

Elfman shortened and simplified them. He wanted each song to stand apart from the others.

Elfman also explains that the music of Bollywood was used for Augustus's song; 70's funk inspired Violet's song; music in the rock genre informed Mike's tune to reflect his personality; and, to defer the sourness of the garbage chute, the film incorporates the 60's sweet psychedelic sound for Veruca's song ("Bringing" 18). By incorporating these different sounds, the film allows adult audiences to reflect back on their childhood and current child audiences to discover new types of music.

In order for audiences and the tourists of the factory to accept Roy's performances, Burton relied on CGI, which turned out to be a complicated process. For example, during a Oompa-Loompa number, the routine was first choreographed to Elfman's music. Then, Roy would have to perform each Oompa-Loompa role in a different way, with varying physical gestures and facial expression, in order for audiences to believe that hundreds of Oompa-Loompas were singing and dancing, and not just one actor (Bringing 14). Furthermore, Chas Jarrett describes that "Although effectively the Oompas look alike, we've slightly altered the facial tones of each. Their hairstyles may be a little different and each performance is slightly varied from one character to another" ("Bringing" 14). Having an actor play multiple look-alike roles enables the film to save money on hiring additional actors to play additional Oompa-Loompas, and in return, they can spend more money on the CGI effects.

After the removal of each child, the film, just as does the novel, reveals what has happened to Augustus, Violet, Veruca, and Mike at the end of the tour. In keeping with Dahl's original ending, this Mike has been stretched out. Veruca and her father, also, come out of the factory covered in garbage. Violet has been successfully deflated although still purple in color, but she now appears more flexible. Finally, Augustus has been saved from the pipe, but

continues to eat. The camera captures him licking himself as he emerges from the factory since chocolate still covers both his body and clothes. By revealing the turnouts of these characters, audiences see that Augustus, Violet, Veruca, and Mike have learned little from their journey and will continue to be their gluttonous, spoiled, and ill-mannered selves. This realistically shows that it will take more than just accidents and a musical number to improve the demeanor of these four children.

As Burton and his team maintain the integrity of Dahl's novel for the most part, some characters and music featured in both the novel and Stuart's film do not end up making it into the final cut of the film. Burton takes a cue from Stuart's adaptation by also allowing only one parent to accompany their child on the tour, instead of Dahl's allowance of two adults per child. Such a decision makes it easier to keep track of fewer characters and saves money on hiring additional actors. Burton also manages to change somewhat which parent accompanies the child on the tour; Violet's mother accompanies her daughter, and Mr. Teavee, who speaks Mrs. Teavee's lines, joins his son.

In addition to the minor deletions or changes in characters, Burton cuts different musical aspects from his film. While it is from Dahl's lyrics that the Oompa-Loompa songs appear in the film, the majority of the original Oompa-Loompa lyrics have been cut. Perhaps the film makes such deletions because of the many words and the time it takes to perform each song that Dahl originally wrote. With Elfman's changes, the songs get right to the point. Burton does not include Wonka's only musical number that appears in the novel, as well in Stuart's version, which takes place on the *Wonkatania* during the trip down the Chocolate River. It could be argued that the film deletes this song because of its unnecessary value, it slowing the plot, and the risk of pushing the film further into the musical genre.

Even with the deletions, the film manages to add and/or expand on ideas developed in the novel. In terms of additions, the film includes a narrator, flashbacks, a new musical sequence, and a new subplot with an original character that shifts Dahl's original ending. The narrator, who is one of Wonka's many Oompa-Loompas, advances the film. He moves the plot forward when he describes the contest and the characters. Finally, he helps the audience realize the film's use of flashbacks. The narrator also harkens back to the novel as Dahl writes it in a third-person narration.

The flashbacks serve a similar function of providing additional information. They explain how Wonka became the Wonka the world now knows. Meanwhile, Burton uses the flashbacks to include scenes and details in the novel that are not in Stuart's version. These moments include the Chocolate Palace that soon melts because of the heat and how Wonka manages to acquire the Oompa-Loompas by visiting Loompaland.

While the Chocolate Palace sequence also shows part of Wonka's worldwide appeal, Burton includes a new musical sequence that introduces the new visitors to the factory and to Wonka himself. Though it starts in a cheerful manner, it soon turns miserable as the puppets end up in flames. Edwin Page points out that although "everything at the factory seems bright and cherry, there is a hidden darkness. Though this sequence isn't in Dahl's book it is a very effective prelude to the vibrant yet sinister nature of the chocolate factory" (212). This scene foreshadows what the visitors and audiences soon experience on the tour.

Burton also adds a new subplot with a new character, Dr. Wonka. Told mostly through flashbacks, the new plot revolves around Wonka and his father, Dr. Wonka, a dentist, in order to provide information as to Wonka's personality and development. Burton comments that "Where the book allows room for possibility and the reader's interpretation, [...] we felt the film needed

to provide some framework in the case of Wonka's eccentricity, to offer some possibility of why he is without delving too deeply into it. Why is he behaving this way and what's behind it?"

(Bringing 3). John Salisbury, meanwhile, adds to the additional back-story by revealing that, "In adapting Dahl's book, John August's script gave Wonka a psychological motivation for his eccentricities. It's a familiar one, centering his fractious relationship with his father who, in Burton's version, is a dentist played by Christopher Lee" (228). Burton further suggests that:

Yeah, that's the one thing that we added that's not in the book, a little bit of his back-story. Well, the parents have always got to figure into it somewhere, haven't they? We're all a product of that in some way, shape or form, your parents and social upbringing, everything helps create, especially if it's traumatic [...]

Wonka's a complicated character, he has to be, and that's why we tried to give him a little context. There's none in the book, it's a fable...but in this day and age you have to, because if you don't show any of that or feel any of that, he's just a weird guy. (228)

This additional subplot, while it expands the film's running time, it also offers the audience clues into Wonka's behavior. It can be argued that the film adds this subplot in order to give information on this character that remains mysterious in Dahl's novel.

The ending of the film shifts away from the original ending in order to give an ending to this subplot. Though Wonka meets Charlie's family, albeit before they all move into the factory to live happily ever after, Charlie joins Wonka on a trip to reunite Wonka with his father. While it seems that Dr. Wonka does not want anything to do with Wonka because of his choice of working with candy, the audience discovers that Dr. Wonka has been keeping tabs on his son through various newspaper clippings. Page illustrates that "This [entire] back-story gives Wonka

additional depth and creates a stronger bond between him and Charlie when the boy helps to reunite him with his father” (216). The additional sequence at the film’s end allows the father and son to reunite and enables Wonka to learn about the importance of family.

Besides the additions, *Charlie* also expands on specific characters to give them more depth. The film makes Grandpa Joe a former Wonka employee who was with Wonka from the beginning of career as a candy maker. Making Grandpa Joe take up this role provides a logical explanation as to why he knows so much about Wonka and the factory. Furthermore, when he joins Charlie on the tour, he has a sense of nostalgia.

Another parent on the tour, Mrs. Beauregarde, is also expanded in this film. American actress Missi Pyle who plays the role and worked with Burton in *Big Fish* describes that “Mrs. Beauregarde wants her daughter to have everything she didn’t [...] A self-proclaimed winner, she has instilled in Violet her own competitive spirit to the exclusion of any other thought. The two of them arrive at the factory – in matching outfits, of course – fully expecting to go home with the grand prize” (“Bringing” 8). Perhaps the film expands on Mrs. Beauregarde’s character to reflect the current trend of stage mothers who stop at nothing in order for their daughters to win the coveted prize, trophy, or title.

The film expands on Mrs. Beauregarde’s daughter and Mike Teavee even more. Violet still smacks her gum, but Burton and August expand on her habit to reflect her competitive nature. A.O. Scott suggests that “Violet Beauregarde (AnnaSophia Robb) is not merely an obsessive gum chewer, but a ruthlessly competitive power-pixie with a matching mom and shelves full of trophies in her suburban Atlanta home” (2). Anita L. Burkham adds that “Violet’s record-breaking gum-chewing streak has become only one aspect of her competitiveness, nurtured by her pushy, trophy-hoarding stage mother” (1). Expanding on the character’s

competitive nature provides a logical explanation for her gum-chewing obsession that consequently leads to her downfall and not to the grand prize.

The Mike Teavee character has also been expanded on to better reflect the current nature of children. Though Dahl and Stuart maintain Mike's obsession with television, this film expands the obsession to all media, including video games, a contemporary popular media platform that did not exist in Dahl's and Stuart's time. Scott points out, "Mike Teavee's antisocial tendencies, fed by the television Dahl loathed, have been compounded by video games. Far from a couch potato, the boy [...] is a sociopathic embodiment of the currently vogueish theory that such entertainment makes children smarter" (2). Furthermore, Burkham argues that "The updated know-it-all Mike Teavee, airbrushed (as are all the Golden Ticket holders except Charlie) into a parody of the hyper-perfect modern media child, now adores first-person-shooter video games and sneers at the ease with which he hacks into the Golden Ticket system ('A retard could figure it out,' he says)" (1). He seems more sarcastic, rude, and angrier than the previous Mike. It can be argued that he has become the worst child on the tour. Not only has he hijacked the system, but he abuses those around him, including his father, Wonka, and the Oompa-Loompas. By expanding on these characters, the film responds to the current ways in which some contemporary children behave and comments that the parents are to blame. Mrs. Beauregarde makes her daughter competitive, and Mr. Teavee subjects his child to violent video games and does not properly discipline his son.

With all of the additions, deletions, and faithfulness that surrounds Burton's adaptation, it nonetheless represents a failed adaptation because of its faithfulness, its casting, and the addition of wrong elements. Though this film remains closer to Dahl's original novel, the faithfulness, overall, derails the film. August, who has adapted many books into films, states that "And this is

the only book where I could highlight entire sentences and say, “I can use that exactly as it is” (Horn 4). It does not allow the remake to stand on its own merit. Readers love to use their imagination in order to bring Dahl’s world to life in their minds. However, that love does not happen. Those readers who come to view the remake can not use their imaginations because the film does the work for them. It seems that whatever Dahl has written will somewhere appear on the screen in due time. This version takes the fun out of interpreting, the joy of imagining, and the love of reading.

In the same way as being too faithful hurts this adaptation, so does the casting of Depp as Wonka. In terms of casting, Desmond and Hawkes find that an adaptation can fail because of the miscasting of specific roles. According to them, it is important “to choose actors who fit the literary character well enough so that they do not create a new emphasis that undermines the coherence of the story” (240). Depp’s casting does create a new emphasis because of his appearance and personality. Though Burton praises Depp, some critics, on the other hand, criticize Depp’s performance. Jeff Otto observes, “Depp is over the top and manic. Depp’s performance is so psychotic at points that it could be considered almost homicidal” (5). Nashawaty notes that “For most of the \$150 million film, he wears his hair in a Prince Valiant bob, has a powder white face, sports lavender contact lenses, and carries a see-through cane filled with candy” (1). The way Depp appears as Wonka makes the character look strange and unwelcoming. Furthermore, Horn argues that “With his oversized teeth and bobbed hair, he looks a bit like an asexual Anna Wintour, with a touch of Oscar Wilde” (4). By having him look like a mixture of these two individuals, Wonka has no sense of originality. Thus, the choices in Depp’s appearance make this Wonka seem strange, which make audiences hesitant to connect to this character.

Besides these two famous figures, Depp also manages to capture the essences of Michael Jackson and Howard Hughes in order to show Wonka's personality. Scott notes the "debate about possible real-life models for Wonka. The preternaturally smooth features and high-pitched voice – as well as the fantasy kingdom into which selected children are invited – may suggest Michael Jackson" (2). However, both Burton and Depp dispute this claim. In an interview with John Head, Burton insists that this connection does not exist because whereas Jackson had a fondness for children, Wonka does not share the same feeling ("Interview: Tim Burton" 2). In another interview, Depp does not make the connection, but concedes to Head's allusion by suggesting "I guess I can on one level because of the make-up and the children and the fantasyland kind of thing" ("Interview: Johnny Depp" 1). The claim that this Wonka channels Jackson can be found within the film because of Wonka's appearance, the factory mirroring Jackson's home at the Neverland Ranch, and that Wonka and Jackson both create products that children or young adults consume with little or no restraint, candy and music.

While instances of Jackson appear in Depp's performance, suggestions of Hughes also make their way into the performance. Burton comments, "Yeah, I think of Willy as sort of the Citizen Kane or Howard Hughes of candy – somebody who was brilliant but then was traumatized and then retreats into [his] own world" (Salisbury 228). Roger Clarke adds to this claim by arguing that "Here Depp plays Wonka as a possible compulsive-obsessive, horrified by germs, like Howard Hughes. He is also a man-child repulsed by the sexual blandishments of one of the mothers and more comfortable, one suspects, with little boys than [with] little girls" (1). Hence, the use of the gloves, something Gene Wilder as Wonka does not use. Although the gloves protect Wonka from germs, they also guard him against physical human contact. Finally,

Ann Hornaday acknowledges the channeling of other individuals and the various faults found in Depp's performance:

Sashaying through a performance that seems to be more about his teeth than anything else, Depp has chosen some odd spirits to aid him in his journey to find his inner Willy. There's a smidgen of Mr. Rogers here, a bit of Dana Carvey's Church Lady there; the exaggerated top hat, foppish coat and waxy green pallor suggest a creature worthy of Dr. Seuss, and those prosthetic choppers can't help but recall Depp's own performance as the title character in Burton's 1994 movie "Ed Wood." And that hair--a lacquered pageboy with wisps of Mamie Eisenhower bangs -- that hair can bring to mind only one person these days, and that's the currently incarcerated New York Times reporter Judith Miller. The cumulative effect isn't pretty. Nor is it kooky, funny, eccentric or even mildly interesting. Indeed, throughout his fey, simpering performance, Depp seems to be straining so hard for weirdness that the entire enterprise begins to feel like those excruciating occasions when your parents tried to be hip." (1)

With so much going on with his appearance, personality, and the channeling of fictional and real individuals, audiences find this Wonka too weird and confusing to accept as the candy man. Page suggests that "Gene Wilder's depiction of Wonka is also much closer to Dahl's original version, being energetic, friendly, quirky, and having blue, sparkling eyes" (223). Therefore, if audiences want to see a true characterization of Wonka on film, then they need to watch Stuart's version.

While the faithfulness and casting cause the film to fail as an adaptation, so does the addition of specific wrong elements, including the flashbacks, subplot, and CGI. Even though the flashbacks help provide information on the plot and characters, they break the pace of the film.

The film has a gradual and steady pace, until it shifts back in time. For example, Burton includes an elaborate flashback on how Wonka acquired the Oompa-Loompas. In order to maintain the film's pace, Wonka might have only mentioned where his workers came from so that the group could move along to the next part of the tour as in Stuart's version. However, Burton makes the choice to be as faithful to the original novel and thus employs this and other flashbacks.

The flashbacks also open space for the additional subplot regarding Wonka and his father, another element of the adaptation that does not work for Burton's film. Though critics such as Page praise this addition, other critics find faults in the new material for it does not go along with Dahl's work and provides another chance for Burton to further explore similar issues that can be found in some of his past films. Scott suggests:

I'll grant that it was clever to make Wonka's dad a mad, sugar-hating dentist (and to cast the unmatched sinister Christopher Lee in the role), but to force a redemptive story of father-son reconciliation onto this story is worse than lazy; it is a betrayal of a book that the filmmakers seem otherwise to have not only understood, but also honored. Sentimentality about family relationships does not feature heavily in Dahl's world. (2-3)

As Scott finds this subplot unnecessary, the film has to force an explanation of Wonka's behavior onto the audience instead of letting them draw their own explanations; sometimes things are better left unwritten or left on the cutting room floor.

The father and son issue that developed in this subplot is also found in other Burton films. According to Gilbey, "It is in the flashbacks that Burton forcefully imposes his personality, not only because these scenes didn't originate with Dahl, but also because they revisit the parental tensions present in *Batman* (1989), *Edward Scissorhands* (1990), and *Big*

Fish (2003)”. For example, Bruce Wayne, in *Batman*, grew up without his parents who were killed. Burton uses that film and *Charlie* to explore the ways in which boys grow up without parents and wonders how they turn out as adults. Bruce becomes a masked crime-fighting vigilante, and Willy becomes a sheltered candy maker. While these issues appear in films targeted for older audiences, why does Burton include such a dark issue in a film targeted to children? As this issue develops in Burton’s adaptation, it becomes darker and depressing in tone. Audiences are eager to see a modern-day Cinderella story with a young boy who starts off poor but becomes rich beyond his wildest dreams, but not another story about a father and son relationship. If they want to see such a story, they should watch one of Burton’s other films.

The CGI also contributes to the film’s failure as an adaptation. Otto argues that Burton “overuses the CG[I] work, and although the final film still works on the whole, the CG[I] sometimes doesn’t look right and takes you out of the film” (4). Though Otto does not give a specific example, the Wonkavator and the Oompa-Loompa scenes represent such examples. Audiences realize that Wonka’s elevator does not really exist and when he and his tourists travel around the factory, nothing they see exists in the real world. Everything has been digitally created and when this happens, audiences understand that they are no longer in the real world.

CGI was also used on Roy to capture the hundreds of Oompa-Loompas, instead of having eight small actors portray the Oompa-Loompas as in Stuart’s version. The film has shortened Roy to appear so small that audiences have to wonder how people that small can do so much work around a gigantic factory, and how one adult can care for and keep track of so many people. Furthermore, as Roy has to play every worker, he has to do so much additional work as an actor. If this version did not rely on so much CGI and used simpler camera effects, then the budget could have been smaller or have been used in other areas of production, including the

sets.

While Burton's film remains closer to Dahl's original novel than does Stuart's, overall it fails as an adaptation. Audiences can find pleasure in this version since it does include sequences found in the novel and not in the first version. However, because of the excessive faithfulness, the casting, and the inclusion of wrong elements, the film fails to live up to Dahl's original work about a boy named Charlie and his adventure to meet Wonka, explore a chocolate factory, and have his life changed for the better. Therefore, in order to truly see Dahl's work come to life on the screen, a person should watch Stuart's version.

LOOKING BACK AND TO THE FUTURE OF FILM ADAPTATION STUDIES

From William Shakespeare to Stephen King, Hollywood frequently relies on literature as sources for potential film projects. Whatever the genre, these stories have built-in audiences who will pay to see their beloved characters brought to life by a specific director. These films also spark interest in movie buffs who have either not heard of or read the book. When an adaptation takes place, people often ask and debate about which is better, the book or the film and the conversation usually stops with the consensus that the book trumps the film. More information on this topic can be discovered by studying film adaptations, including the types of adaptations, what the adaptation maintains, deletes, and adds/expands on from the original material, and the relative success or failure as an adaptation.

The first step involves categorizing the type of film adaptation the film has used. Though numerous theorists, such as Dudley Andrew, have their own suggestions, John Desmond and Peter Hawkes provide the clearest explanations of the different types of adaptations. With three categories, close, loose, and intermediate, the adaptation can go in any direction. If the adaptation appears close, then it has maintained the majority of the original material (Desmond 44). Films such as Kenneth Branagh's *Hamlet* (1996) or Christopher Columbus's *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone* (2001) function as two such examples. Though these films maintain the faithfulness from their original texts, they do not allow for individuality and creativity beyond what the original authors have written on the page.

The second category, loose, allows for such individuality and creativity to appear in these types of adaptations. When a loose adaptation comes to the screen, it throws out the majority of the source material and creates new material (44). Another Shakespearean adaptation, Gil Junger's *10 Things I Hate About You* (1999), serves as an example of a loose adaptation. This

version of Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* revolves around a group of modern-day high school students who, unlike their dramatic counterparts, do not end up married by the end of the plot. The film also takes liberty in changing the setting and the character names, adding new characters, and altering the ending. Arguably, these types of adaptations spark the greatest debate because critics, scholars, and students can talk about what alterations the film makes and why. For example, Junger may have modernized the Shakespearean plot in order to reach the teenage market.

The final category, intermediate, operates somewhere in the middle between the previous two categories. These adaptations add, delete, and maintain the essential elements of the original material (44). With this type of adaptation, I discovered that Roald Dahl's *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* (1964) novel functions as a perfect example to discuss as the focus of my master's thesis project. According to Deborah Cartmell, "[G]iven the number of adaptations of children's literature to screen, the area has attracted very little critical attention" (168). Dahl's novel stands out in the field of adaptation studies because of its origin in the children's literary genre, one such genre often ignored by critics and scholars because of its juvenile nature. Meanwhile, Dahl's text also parallels any given Shakespearean text in that more than one adaptation has been made.

Upon researching, reading, and reviewing the two adaptations of Dahl's text, I noticed that though they both serve as examples of intermediate film adaptations, they do have their fair share of differences. Stuart's version takes more liberties with the novel. Due to a low budget, he had to change certain elements, delete minor characters, and remove smaller scenes. He also makes it more like a musical with characters bursting into songs and performing dance routines. Despite these and other liberties, the film succeeds as an adaptation and has had an impact on

popular culture because of performances by actors including Gene Wilder, the overall story, and the memorable musical numbers.

As Stuart's version takes more freedom with Dahl's novel, Burton's film remains more faithful. With a bigger budget and advancement in technology, Burton was able to include certain elements, characters, and scenes not seen in Stuart's earlier adaptation. We see Vercua being overpowered by squirrels, Mr. Bucket becomes part of the family, and Wonka takes a trip to build a chocolate palace for a Prince. To provide the audience with more context on Wonka's character, Burton and his team create a brand-new subplot about Wonka and his troubled and complicated relationship with his dentist father, a character who is not in Dahl's novel. Because of this subplot, the flashbacks, and the reliance on CGI, this version fails as an adaptation.

When it comes to determining the success or failure of an adaptation, I believe it comes down to two aspects. On the one hand, individuals who have read the original novel and then seen the adapted work ask themselves three key questions: what do they think about the film; what works and does not work with it; and what elements have been included/removed/added? After answering these questions, they can judge the merit of the adaptation. On the other hand, they can conduct research on the adaptation. First, they can read critical reviews in newspapers, magazines, or internet sites. Second, they can read secondary sources about the adaptation or the director if such works exist. Finally, they could, if possible, conduct a poll or survey of people who have seen the film to discover how they respond to the adaptation. By conducting such research, they will not only learn more about the adaptation, but will acquire evidence to support their claims about the success or failure of a specific adaptation.

Hollywood has relied on literature and its numerous genres as sources for potential films and will continue this tradition for years to come. While Shakespeare remains a continuous

source for film adaptations, other authors have had or will have their works transformed into filmable works. As Cartmell stated, there is a lack of critical attention with adaptations of children's literature. Perhaps this lack happens because works within this genre are deemed unimportant, too simple, or juvenile. However, in the new millennium, numerous films based on children's literature have been adapted to the screen and will continue to do so for many years to come. Since 2001, the *Harry Potter* series have been adapted into big-budget and profitable adaptations that feature prominent British actors. The first three novels in the *Lemony Snicket* series have been combined into a feature film starring Jim Carrey. Meanwhile, Burton and Depp have collaborated again to create a live-action version of *Alice in Wonderland* that audiences will see in 2010. With so many fantastic works in the children's literary genre, film will continue to rely on literature for future films. Because of this reliance, this void needs to be filled and I hope that my thesis project has started to fill it.

WORKS CITED

- Andrew, Dudley. "Adaptation." *Film Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. 6th ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. 461-69.
- "Bringing Roald Dahl's Classic Story to the Screen." *Production Notes*. <<http://chocolatefactory.movie.warnerbros.com/about/production.html#>>. 28 Aug. 2009. 1-18.
- Big Fish*. Dir. Tim Burton. Perf. Ewan McGregor, Albert Finney, and Billy Crudup. Columbia, 2003. DVD. 2004.
- Burkam, Anita L. "Tim Burton's *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*." *The Horn Book*. <<http://www.hbook.com/resources/films/Charlie.asp>>. 28 Aug. 2009. 1-3.
- Cahir, Linda Costanzo. *Literature into Film: Theory and Practical Approaches*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2006.
- Cartmell, Deborah. "Adapting Children's Literature." *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen*. Ed. Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan. Cambridge: Cambridge. 167-80.
- Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*. Dir. Tim Burton. Perf. Johnny Depp. Warner Bros., 2005. Two-Disc Deluxe Edition DVD. 2005.
- Clarke, Roger. "An Improper *Charlie*." *Sight & Sound*. 15.8 (Aug. 2005): 22-25. *International Bibliography of Theatre & Dance with Full Text*. EBSCO. Pullen Library, Atlanta, GA. 17 Mar. 2008. <<http://www.galileo.usg.edu/>>. 1-2.
- Corrigan, Timothy. *Film and Literature: An Introduction and Reader*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1999.
- Dahl, Roald. *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*. 1964. New York: Puffin, 2007.
- Desmond, John M., and Peter Hawkes. *Adaptation: Studying Film & Literature*. Boston: McGraw, 2006.

Gilbey, Ryan. "Charlie and the Chocolate Factory." *Sight & Sound*. 15.9 (Sep. 2005): 58-59.

International Bibliography of Theatre & Dance with Full Text. EBSCO. Pullen Library, Atlanta, GA. 15 Mar. 2008. <<http://www.galileo.usg.edu/>>. 1-11.

Grigsby, John L. "Roald Dahl." *British Short-Fiction Writers, 1945-1980*. Dict. of Lit.

Biography. 139. Ed. Dean Baldwin. Detroit: Gale, 1994. 40-48.

Head, John. Interview with Tim Burton. *IGN*. 8 July 2005. <<http://movies.ign.com/articles/632/632453p1.html>>. 28 Aug. 2009. 1-5.

---. Interview with Johnny Depp. *IGN*. 13 July 2005. <<http://movies.ign.com/articles/633/633236p1.html>>. 28 Aug. 2009. 1-2.

Hindle, Maurice. "Tragedies." *Studying Shakespeare on Film*. New York: Pelgrave, 2007. 167-218.

Horn, John. "A Nutter 'Chocolate'." *Los Angeles Times*. 6 Feb. 2005, E1. *ProQuest*. Pullen Library, Atlanta, GA. 17 March 2008. <<http://www.galileo.usg.edu/>>. 1-5.

Hornaday, Ann. "Sorry, Charlie." Rev. of *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*, dir. Tim Burton. *The Washington Post*. 15 July 2005. <<http://www.washingtonpost.com>>. 28 Aug. 2009. 1-3.

Hutcheon, Linda. "Beginning to Theorize Adaptation: What? Who? Why? How? Where?

When?" *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2006. 1-32.

McMahan, Alison. "Burton's Reimaginings: *Ed Wood*, *Planet of the Apes*, and *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*." *The Films of Tim Burton: Animating Live Action in Contemporary Hollywood*. New York: Continuum, 2005. 157-92.

"Movie Connections for *Willy Wonka and the Chocolate Factory*." *Internet Movie Database*. 12 Aug. 2009. <<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0067992/>>.

- Nashawaty, Chris. "The Truth about 'Charlie'." *Entertainment Weekly*. 30 June 2005. 08 July 2005. <<http://www.ew.com>>. 28 Aug. 2009. 1-5.
- Otto, Jeff. "Double Take: *Wonka* Vs. *Charlie*." *IGN*. 15 July 2005. <<http://movies.ign.com/articles/634/634005p1.html>>. 1-6.
- Page, Edwin. "Charlie and the Chocolate Factory." *Gothic Fantasy: The Films of Tim Burton*. London: Marion Boyars, 2007. 210-26.
- Pulliam, June. "Charlie Evolving Moral Universe: Filmic Interpretations of Roald Dahl's Charlie and the Chocolate Factory." *Fantasy Fiction into Film*. Ed. Leslie Stratyner and James R. Keller. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2007. 103-14.
- Rees, David. "Dahl's Chickens: Roald Dahl." *Children's Literature in Education* 19.3 (1998): 143-55.
- Salisbury, Mark, ed. "Charlie and the Chocolate Factory." *Burton on Burton*. London: Faber & Faber, 2006. 223-45.
- Schulz, William Todd. "Finding Fate's Father: Some Life History Influences on Roald Dahl's *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*." *Biography* 21.4 (1998): 463-81.
- Scott, A.O. "Looking for the Candy, Finding a Back Story." Rev. of *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*, dir. Tim Burton. *The New York Times*. 15 July 2005. <<http://movies.nytimes.com>>. 28 Aug. 2009. 1-3.
- Seiter, Richard D. "The Bittersweet Journey from *Charlie* to *Willy Wonka*." *Children's Novels and the Movies*. Ed. Douglas Street. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1983. 191-96.
- Stuart, Mel and Josh Young. *Pure Imagination: The Making of Willy Wonka and the Chocolate Factory*. New York: St. Martin's, 2002.

Treglown, Jeremy. "Chronology." *Roald Dahl: Collected Stories*. New York: Knopf, 2006. xxiv-xxxvii.

---. "Introduction." *Roald Dahl: Collected Stories*. New York: Knopf, 2006. ix-xxi.

---. *Roald Dahl: A Biography*. San Diego: Harvest, 1994.

Willy Wonka and the Chocolate Factory. Dir. Mel Stuart. Perf. Gene Wilder, Jack Albertson, and Peter Ostrum. Warner Bros., 1971. DVD. 2001.