



Universidad  
Zaragoza

## Trabajo Fin de Grado

*One, Two, Three:*  
a political satire and the Cold War.

*One, Two, Three:*  
una sátira política y la guerra fría.

Autor/es

Fernando Lavilla Romeo

Director/es

Celestino Sigifredo Deleyto Alcalá

Facultad de Filosofía y Letras  
2021

## Introduction

Cinema is entertainment, but it is also much more. Among its many goals, cinema and films are tools to express or defend ideologies and opinions. However, this characteristic is not usually associated with every genre. There is a genre in particular, which, due to its simplicity and entertaining nature, in both spectators' and critics' eyes, is not often associated with ideology. I am talking about comedy. But the reality is quite different. Comedies are one of the genres in which social critique and the defence of ideologies positions are most prominent. This potential could arise from these films shielding behind the characteristic that makes them seem harmless, their simplicity and their merely entertaining nature, and allows them to carry out that critique from a safe position. Geoff King discusses this idea in his book *Film Comedy* (p.2):

" In general, however, comedy is often taken to be the epitome of light relief or 'just entertainment' on film... Comedy, by definition, is not usually taken seriously, a fact that sometimes gives it license to tread in areas that might otherwise be off limits. "

But before commenting on other aspects relevant for this essay, I would like to focus on the idea mentioned before, the critical character of films. As said previously, films and generally cinema have been a device used to represent real situations through fiction. But they are also used with another purpose, to comment on those different aspects of real life. These observations may be intended to only comment on any idea or merely voice an opinion. However, in some cases, the comment intends to criticise or defend an ideology or conviction and make the spectator reflect on those ideas. Also as mentioned before, one of the genres typically used for this purpose is comedy, since people usually consider comedy a 'safe' genre associated with mere entertainment. However, as explained before, in many cases it is the opposite. xFilmmakers use comedies as a critical tool in environments that do not allow that critique or in a way that might, indirectly, make the spectator reflect on the ideas criticised or defended. In conclusion, we can say that comedies, in many instances, go

beyond their entertaining nature and are used to comment on some aspects of the real world and to influence the spectator's attitude and beliefs.

A particular clear instance of this function of comedy is the case of political satire, the subgenre in which we can locate the film analysed in this essay. As Andrew Stott argued, already the earliest forms of comedy dealt with politics and the state, defaming or insulting political figures and their policies (2005, pp.99 & 100). Comedy creates humour in many ways. The main one is "by departing from the particular kind form what is considered the normal routines of life of the social group in question" (King, 2002, p.5). In other words, it departs from the norm. Other techniques, along with this departure, are incongruity and exaggeration, which, like a departure from the norm, create a contrast with reality and, consequently, produce comedy. The best example of this would be, in a film, finding things being out of place. And what about satire. "Satire is comedy with an edge and a target, social or political" (Film Comedy, 2002). In conclusion, political satires use those ideas of incongruity, exaggeration, and departure from the norm, to criticise political ideologies or regimes, and to "intervene in affairs of state" (Stott, 2005, p.100) as is the case, of the film analysed in this work, *One, Two, Three*.

Having commented on the critical character of films, now I will focus on the film that I will be analysing in this essay. It will discuss the film *One, Two, Three* (1961), directed by Billy Wilder. The aspect analysed will be the cold war and the conflict between the ideologies of the two nations involved in this conflict. I am making reference to the fight for supremacy between capitalism and communism. "Films in this period served up politically pointed messages" (Grant, 2008, p.62), and *One, Two, Three* is no exception. The film portrays the fight between ideologies, both being represented and criticised, even if the critique occurs to different degrees. But to comment on them, it is necessary to comment on the symbols used to portray them. Among these symbols, we can find Coca-Cola, clothing, and cars. These symbols will be explained in detail later in this work.

However, when analysing a film, it is also necessary to look at the background and context surrounding the years when the film was made. In this case, this film was

filmed and released during the years of the cold war. The cold war, as said previously, was a conflict between the USA and the Soviet Union (USSR) that lasted four decades, from 1947 to 1991 (Foner, 2005). It was a conflict between these two powers of the world, but also, as we will see in the analysis of the film, it was a war between two ideologies (American capitalism and Soviet communism). It was named the cold war because, even though it lasted more than 40 years, neither of the countries established a direct conflict against the other. However, the fear of an attack was present in the population of both countries. And most important was; the fear of losing the war and having to live according to the ideology of the winning country.

As stated before, the film *One, Two, Three* portrays the cold war, a conflict between two nations and between two ideologies, capitalism vs. communism. In this essay, I will analyse and comment on that juxtaposition of the ideologies. I will comment on how the film sides with capitalism while it criticises communism through mocking and parody. By the end of the essay, this idea just mentioned will be discussed and supported via an analysis of the film and by commenting on different theories about filmmaking and comedy and the background surrounding the years when the film was released.

### **Historical background**

As said previously, when analysing a film, having knowledge of the historical moment surrounding the film is essential. And its importance increases when we are commenting on a film that, not only was made in a very agitated period but also treats it in the way *One, Two, Three* does, siding with one of the blocs that took part in the conflict that this film is about, the cold war.

The cold war was the conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union, known officially as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). The hostilities lasted more than four decades (1947 - 1991). However, during this time, there was no direct confrontation between the two nations. This characteristic is what gives this conflict its name, the cold war. The war was fought in third countries, and never between the

USSR and the United States directly. There is another characteristic that gives this war the importance and the relevance it had. It was a war about dominance, not territorial, but ideological. It was a war between capitalism and communism. And this conflict is the one portrayed in *One, Two, Three*, a fight of an ideology against the other. If we comment on the film's particular historical context, the story takes place in the year 1961, the year in which the wall of Berlin, one of the symbols of this war, was built (Foner, p.1041). This is prominent from the beginning of the film, with the restrictions when crossing from one side of the city of Berlin to the other side, the German democratic republic (East Germany) and the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany). These were the years with the most tension between the two nations and between the two ideologies. Both war and tensions were present in daily life, for instance, the fear of an attack and the fear of living with the enemy. William H. Chafe says in his book *The Unfinished Journey*, " an aura of inevitability about bipolar confrontation in the world... suspicion and hostility rather than mutual accommodation." (Chafe, 1995, p.65). The tension within the countries themselves reached such levels that, for example, in the United States, there was a committee to look for communists or supporters of communism and fascists ideologies inside the country (Foner, p.896). It was called the House Committee on Un-American Activities, active from 1938 to 1975.

To summarise, we can say that the cold war was the conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union, that lasted half of the 20th century without any direct confrontation between the two world powers, and that transcended the line and turned into a war of ideologies between American capitalism, and Soviet communism.

## **Methodology**

There are several points I would like to mention regarding previous work before writing the dissertation and bibliography and also about the procedure to analyse the film and to capture it in the text. First of all, concerning the bibliography used for the theoretical part of the work, I have used three books for film and comedy theory and two books for the historical background and contextualization of the film and the period it represents. All books and works will be mentioned in the bibliography

section. Regarding the work previous to the analysis of the film, I have watched and analysed (not as in-depth as the film that this dissertation deals with) several films of Billy Wilder to have a global context of his way of making films instead of an isolated view of just the film analysed in this work, *One, Two, Three*. This previous work also aimed to familiarise myself with some usual topics he treats in his films and how they are represented.

And finally, concerning the analysis itself, it follows the typical norms of analysis of the film. Firstly, the film and its topics will be summarized, so there is a context for the scenes analysed. Regarding this analysis of the different clips, it will focus on a few segments that have been previously chosen to comment on and to justify or exemplify the idea argued in this writing. Regarding the scene analysis, it will follow the following scheme or structure. To start with, I will describe the different scenes, as well as the aspect or aspects of each particular scene that is considered remarkable for the analysis. Afterwards, I will comment on those aspects and their meaning and how they are related to the topic of this essay. Finally, all the ideas extracted from the different scenes and analyses will be summarized and commented on in the conclusion of the dissertation.

### **Analysis of *One, Two, Three***

The following part of this dissertation will focus on analysing the film and commenting on the thesis of this work. It will argue in favour of the idea that the film, a political satire, sides with the capitalist ideology and how it mocks communism through comedy. However, before beginning the analysis, I will briefly summarize the plot.

The film tells the story of a high-executive manager of Coca-Cola, Mr. MacNamara, who, after bad results in a past project in the Middle Eastern, is sent to West Berlin with one objective. His goal in Berlin is to try to introduce Coca-Cola in the soviet market. During his time in Berlin, we can see how he has to deal with different problems. For instance, his family life, the negotiations with the Soviets and the

cultural clash between the United States and German people. One day, his boss calls him to inform him that his daughter, Scarlet, is going to Berlin to spend some time there, so Mr. MacNamara will have to watch after her. As a reward for this, the boss promises Mr. MacNamara that he will get a privileged position in the Coca-Cola head office in London. But things do not go well, and after spending two months in Berlin, Scarlet comes back to the west part of the city to tell Mr. MacNamara that she has married Otto, a young communist that she had met during his time in Berlin. However, MacNamara cannot allow the marriage since it could put his job at the company at risk. For that reason, he sets up a plan to get rid of Otto. Mr. MacNamara plans to frame Otto and get him arrested in East Berlin. And it works perfectly, but soon, due to the situation created as a result of Otto's arrest, which remained adverse for him, Mr. MacNamara realises that he has to go and get Otto back into West Berlin. He then arranges another plan to bring Otto back and transform the young communist boy into a wealthy capitalist aristocrat. This plan will succeed, though not perfectly for Mr. MacNamara. In the end, the position his boss had promised ends up being for the 'aristocrat' Otto, who now is and behaves as a different and capitalist man. However, we still have a happy ending since Mr. MacNamara is reunited with his family and goes back to the United States to work at the Coca-Cola headquarters.

The film deals with many different themes, always from a comic perspective but with significant background. It deals with the topic of family and family relations. As an example, we have the case of Mr. MacNamara's family. Through Mr. MacNamara and his wife, the film addresses family relations, specially the notion that what we do in our lives can affect our family. It also addresses how the family suffers from the decisions taken by one member of the family and the consequences that this might have. It also deals, like other Billy Wilder's comedies (for example, *The Apartment* or *Kiss me, Stupid*), and like almost every comedy from this period, and also with love and affairs. The best example is the case of Scarlet and Otto or the romance between MacNamara with his secretary Fräuling Ingeborg. The latter is also related to the topic of family, especially to family relations. In the film, we can also appreciate references to the cultural clash and the difference in behaviour from one country to another. The best example is the relation between Mr. MacNamara and his employees, where the

clash occurs in the habits or the behaviour of the employees towards their boss, Mr. MacNamara. And finally, we have the topics that are most relevant to this dissertation. These are the themes related to the Cold War, the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, and the dichotomy and constant opposition of capitalism and communism. As I mentioned in the introduction, films in this period of history served politically charged messages (Grant, 2008). To do it they used different techniques, that go from symbols, to a setting, to how a character is depicted, or to showing different ideas or situations in specific or comic manners, that are used to side with one of the politics. In the case of *One, Two, Three*, I am talking about capitalism. There are many examples concerning these topics. For instance, we have the border that will later become the Berlin Wall (actually, the same year in which the action takes place (1961)), the relation or negotiations between Coca-Cola and the Soviet Union (broken like the relation between the United States and the USSR in the real world), or the idea of people abandoning the USSR and communism. All of these examples are used to depict the situation, and through different techniques they are used to transmit a political message. I will expand on these topics more in depth in the analysis of the film.

As said previously, the essay will aim to demonstrate how this political satire sides with the ideology of capitalism by taunting its opposite, communism, instead of supporting it openly or directly- I will suggest the reason to do this in the conclusion of the dissertation. In the following paragraphs of the analysis, I will focus on three scenes to comment on different aspects used to mock communism through comedy. The first scene will be the one where Mr. MacNamara is crossing the border to East Berlin (minute 53-54). It is a relevant scene because this clip seems to set the first ideas of the critique towards communism. The second scene that this work will analyse is the scene of the chase as Mr. MacNamara and Otto are trying to go back to West Berlin (minute 103-107). This scene is also very relevant because of the significance of the meaning it seems to transmit. It is also related to the critique of communism. And finally, I will comment on the final scene (minute 140-end), where we can see the transformation of a 'truly' believer in communism, Otto, into a stereotypical capitalist. This scene, like the previous ones, offers the same critique towards communism but



also criticises a different aspect. It does not only put down the ideology but also those who follow it.

I will begin with the analysis of the first selected scene. In this scene, we see how Mr. MacNamara crosses the border to East Berlin to liberate Otto and bring him back with Scarlett. Before commenting on the aspects of the scene, I will describe what happens in it step by step. Firstly, we see the car of Mr. MacNamara crossing the border (see fig. 1), and as it stops, a soldier approaches them. After talking with the driver, Mr. MacNamara interrupts the conversation and tells the guard that he is crossing to see the chamber of the Russian trade commission. Then, due to the indifference or refusal of the soldier, he mentions he works for Coca-Cola, a fact that draws the soldier's attention. Next, Mr. MacNamara shows a package of Coca-Cola as proof (see fig. 1), which the soldier will 'confiscate'. He then allows the car to continue, and as the scene ends, we can see the soldier opening one of the bottles in a rough, stupid, and ridiculous manner (the soldier breaks the top against a traffic sign (see fig. 2).



fig. 1



fig.2

We can say that the comedy of this clip comes from the absurdity of the situation. And not just for the mere fact that the whole situation is ridiculous ( for instance, the request for the returning of the empty bottles ), but also for the fact that Mr. MacNamara bribes the communist soldier with one of the most famous symbols of both the United States and capitalism, Coca-Cola. Commenting on the idea of where the comedy comes from, we can say that it comes from the absurd situation created from breaking the norm and the stereotypes that spectators expect to find in that

situation. That contrast is followed by a comic gag that, as has been described above, besides creating humour, also carries a hidden critique of communism.

Besides the comedy behind this action, there is a significant meaning. It seems to imply that capitalism is at such a higher level above communism that even communists like capitalism ( in this case, capitalism hides behind the bottles of Coca-Cola) and are willing to be bought with it. In addition to inferring the idea of capitalism being above communism, the scene seems to suggest another idea. It seems to direct a slight critique towards the followers of communism. These followers are represented as not loyal or trusty followers and believers in their ideals. It also portrays them as dumb, as happens when the soldier opens the bottle. I will focus in greater detail on this last idea when commenting on the third scene of this analysis. To summarise, we can say that this scene sets a tone when talking about the clash between capitalism and communism, where capitalism is considered to be better and more efficient than communism. This tone will be the one that can be appreciated in the rest of the film, as the following analysis will try to demonstrate.

The first scene analysed is a moment of the film that set the tone for the critique of communism and the Soviet Union and of the representation of the clash between capitalism and communism (the first one always being victorious). And this second scene follows the same tone or structure. In this clip, we can see that Mr. MacNamara and the others are heading back to West Berlin after liberating Otto. However, they are chased by those whom they have tricked to get Otto free. The way in which they trick the Russians, resembles Billy Wilder's *Some Like it Hot* (1959). In order to trick the Russians, they disguise Mr. MacNamara's assistant into a woman, which resembles the cross-dressing that is typical of Billy Wilder's films. The scene continues, and we can see how the Russians are chasing Mr. MacNamara's car. As this chase continues, we see a clear difference between the two cars. Mr. MacNamara's car drives under control and without any trouble. On the other hand, the Russian vehicle drives uncontrolled, and finally breaks apart (see fig. 3). Next, we can see how Mr. MacNamara's car arrives at the border, where the soldier of the previous scene returns the empty bottles. As this happens, the Russians arrive at the border but in a very different way. Their car stops working, and they end up crashing their car against the

border building (see fig. 4). Finally, we see how Mr. MacNamara and the others cross the border and enter West Berlin.



fig.3



fig.4

Concerning the comedy of this scene, it differs a bit from the previous scene. In this case, we find a slapstick comedy whose source relates to the physical part of the action. Stott defines slapstick as physical humour that involves falls, blows, mishaps and accidents (2005, p.147), exactly what we find in this scene. And we can say that this sequence relies on a more physical comedy as opposed to the situation we found in the previous scene, where comedy is based on the context or the dialogue and the absurdity of the scene (even if the slapstick comedy of this scene also results in a ridiculous situation). The slapstick is emphasized by the use of music and the mise-en-scène, in the sequence where we can see the car breaking apart. However, the significant part of this scene is the intention behind it. Regarding the meaning, this scene is even more direct than the previous one, and the same happens to the critique that goes with it. The chase might represent the war and the conflict between the nations and the ideologies. And the winners are clear, capitalism and the United States. The critique is not only based on the fact that one wins, and the other loses. The mockery of the scene goes a step further. We see that the film not only presents communism as losing but also taunts them in that loss. We can appreciate this clearly in how the Russians are tricked by Mr. MacNamara, with the cross-dressing trick (103'28"), which, as happened in the previous scene with the guard, portrays the Russians as fools, in this case due to the simplicity of the trick and the fact that it worked perfectly (as happened in the film *Some Like it Hot* with the gangsters). We can

also appreciate it in how during the chase, their car is breaking apart to the point that it stops working and crashes.

To conclude this analysis, we can say that the scene transmits several ideas. Firstly, that capitalism or the United States is the better choice and will win. And secondly, that the Soviets will not simply lose, but that they will crash. It also transmits the feeling that communism has no chance of winning: for instance, how the Russians, since the beginning, had no option to catch Mr. MacNamara's car. The reference to the guard in the previous scenes is also significant. The moment when he returns the empties (see fig. 5) seems to remind the spectator of what had happened previously, and might be used to remark that what happened was not a temporary lapse, but a lack of ideology that lasts in time, like that specific comic gag.



fig.5

The last scene analysed in this dissertation gathers characteristics and ideas that we could see in the two previous sequences. These characteristics are the idea of capitalism overcoming communism, which is the basis of the film and this essay, and the idea of criticising communism through its followers. As

with the other two scenes, first of all, I will describe the action. We see how Mr. MacNamara, Otto, and Scarlet are going to the airport, where Scarlet's parents and Mr. MacNamara's boss are arriving. On their way to the airport, we can see the final steps of the transformation of Otto into a capitalist aristocrat. As everyone meets at the airport, we can see how Otto, who until that moment was a little resistant to change, effortlessly and without pressure, turns immediately into the aristocrat Mr. MacNamara intended to transform him. After a brief conversation with Otto, Scarlet's father gives Otto the job in London he had promised to Mr. MacNamara due to Otto's remarkable new character. Then Scarlet's father offers Mr. MacNamara another job at Coca-Cola headquarters back in the United States. Mr. MacNamara accepts, and as he does it, he sees his family, who were leaving, boarding a plane. Then we see how he is

reconciled with his family (see fig.6). The film ends with a scene of Mr. MacNamara buying Coca-Cola from a vending machine, but it turns out that what he gets is not Coca-Cola but Pepsi-Cola.



fig.6

Regarding comedy, we can appreciate that it has moments of slapstick comedy ( for example, on the way to the airport or, once at the airport, when Otto is putting his pants on (see fig. 7)). But it also has that comedy based on dialogue and

the absurd of the situation since it is breaking the expectations as we saw in the first scene. For instance, the conversation between Otto and Scarlet's father, which breaks all the expectations that the spectator could have. And concerning meaning, it also shares characteristics of the previous parts. We have that critique towards communism and the portrayal of capitalism overcoming communism: for instance, Otto going from a communist to a capitalist and how, in just a few minutes as a capitalist, he has a high position in one of the biggest companies. All of this portrays capitalism as more suitable for people and as better than its



fig.7

rival, communism. And we also have the critique against followers of communism, as happened with the soldier at the border. In this case, this critique revolves around Otto. He seemed a loyal believer in communism, but in a matter of hours, he turns himself into the opposite that he hated at the beginning, a capitalist aristocrat. The principal aspect that relates to the critique of communism is the one related to the loyalty of its followers. I think that it is the most remarkable aspect of this scene not just because it is a great critique towards communism, but because it is an idea that is

repeated through the film in several moments and with several characters. In this analysis, we have seen two, but we can see this idea in many other characters in the film, such as those who chased Mr. MacNamara in the second clip. This way of criticising or mocking an ideology through their followers and their behaviour can be appreciated in other Billy Wilder's films, for instance, in *The Apartment* (1960). In this film, Billy Wilder focuses on the executives of a company, and on their behaviour and actions, to criticise some of the ideas of capitalism related to excess and their attitude and hypocrisy towards love and relationships. To sum up, we can say that the scene, rather than criticising different aspects of communism, emphasizes those aspects criticised through the film, the idea of capitalism being more appropriate than communism, which also relates to the battle between the two ideologies, and the portrayal of communists as disloyal believers, always in contrast to the capitalists in the film, who never doubt or abandon their ideals.

This last scene also shows an idea that I have mentioned previously. It is the idea that the film also criticises capitalism. Talking in a general way about all the scenes analysed, it is clear that the comic part always points towards taunting communism. This idea may relate to the ideological point of the film, to support capitalism in a period of conflict, the Cold War. This support towards capitalism can be extrapolated, in a different way, as support or backing the United States during the war. However, it is relevant to mention that the film also criticises capitalism. It seems to do it more lightly and outside the confrontation between capitalism and communism that always surrounds the mocking the latter. We can say that the critique towards capitalism is made from a more affective or friendly point of view, even though the critique is present throughout the film. This critique usually revolves around the idea of excess and the pride, or rather, the arrogance of the capitalist. The best example would be the transformation of Otto, how he changes his appearance ( his new clothes exemplify that excess), and his attitude ( when pretending to be the young aristocrat, he changes his attitude to a more confident and arrogant person than when he was a communist). The critics towards capitalism is also appreciated in the affair between Mr. MacNamara and Fräuling Ingeborg. This topic, the affair, is also one of the main topics, as I have mentioned, of other Billy Wilder's films, for instance *The Apartment*

(1960), where it is criticised alongside with the figure of the capitalist, or in *Kiss me, Stupid* (1964), where it, instead of being the topic criticised, is used a tool to produce comedy and critique. However, as I said previously, this critique is lighter and more indirect than that concerning communism. We could say that comedy, regarding capitalism, does not intend to humiliate it, but it seems to merely make a friendly critique, while with communism, it seems more direct and more taunting. In conclusion, even though it criticises both ideologies, it does it in different degrees and ways and always siding with or supporting capitalism.

Once I have analysed the scenes and ideas, I want to focus briefly on another aspect - the symbols used in the film. Symbols play a significant role in films, and more importantly, in the critical area of comedy since they are the way to imply meaning indirectly. And if we relate the analysis of *One, Two, Three* to the field of symbols, we realise that in this film, they play a relevant role, since, as I just mentioned, the critique, or mockery towards communism, is made indirectly through them.

The first symbol is Coca-Cola. It represents pure capitalism and also the United States. We can see that the company is trying to find its way into the Soviet market. And it seems that even though there are some problems and some resistance, it is achieving its goals. For instance, the scene where Mr. MacNamara bribes a soldier with a package of Coca-Cola. Or the way Otto falls for the new job and opportunities that capitalism and especially Coca-Cola are giving him. We can say that Coca-Cola is used to represent capitalism and its victory over communism. Another meaningful symbol, especially in the last scene of the film, is clothing. This symbol creates a contrast between the communist and capitalist characters, as is seen in the case of Otto. When turning into a capitalist, he goes from old shabby clothes to an elegant new suit. Therefore, we can understand it as a critique against communism since the film depicts it as untidy, old, and inferior. However, the film also uses clothing to critique the excesses of capitalism. And finally, the last symbol which plays a relevant role in the taunting of communism is cars. In the second scene analysed, it is clear that the cars represent the two ideologies or countries, and it is clear who is the winner, not only because of the outcome of the scene but also because of how they are depicted. While

the American car is elegant and controlled, the Russian vehicle seems old, messy, uncontrolled, and not trusty since it ends up destroyed. In conclusion, symbols, along with comedy and other aspects used to criticise communism, play a significant role in the way the film shows its ideology and makes the spectator side with capitalism.

## **Conclusion**

As a result of the analysis and the commentary of the different scenes from the film, several ideas may be outlined. Firstly, the film shows a constant clash between capitalism and communism. We can see this not only in the scenes analysed in this essay but in the entire film. We can also say that the clash or quarrel between ideologies always points to capitalism as the winner. Regarding this idea of the conflict, we could say that there is a parallel between the conflict presented in the film, behind all the symbols and the confrontation between Mr. MacNamara and the Russians, and the reality of the period that surrounds the film. I am referring to the Cold War and the conflict between the United States and the USSR. And we can also state that within this conflict, the film seems to side with capitalist ideology while it criticises and discredits communism. It is remarkable that the film also criticises capitalism. However, in the way it does it differs from the way it criticises communism. On one side, when criticising capitalism, we see a friendly critique and comedy. On the other hand, when the critique and humour point towards communism, they are more profound, and they seem to have a clear objective, to ridicule it, and to portray capitalism as the winner and standing at a higher level. It is also remarkable how the critique of communism also points towards the followers of the ideology, depicting them as disloyal to the cause and their own ideals. As we mentioned above, this way of mocking or criticising by pointing the critique towards the followers of an ideology or their behaviour can be appreciated in other Billy Wilder's films, for instance, in *The Apartment* (1960). And there are other aspects of this film, for instance the cross-dressing or the affair, mentioned in the analysis, that are seen in other films by Billy Wilder (*Some Like it Hot* and *Kiss me, Stupid*). To summarize, we can say that the film is constantly taunting communism. The goal is not only to criticise it



but to make capitalism and the country associated with it look like the most suitable option.

We also can state that the film, to make that critique, uses different aspects of comedy, some of them recurrent in Billy Wilder's way of film-making. We can say that several elements from slapstick comedy, music, and some other ideas, related to the breaking of stereotypes, create a connection between critique and comedy. We can also find this connection between comedy and critique in the field of dialogues that, together with the other elements, creates the absurd situations that lead to humour and the critique. Other elements that have a significant role are symbols. The film uses them not only to create comedy but also to transmit a clear idea. Each one shows the clash between communism and capitalism and portrays the latter as the winner or the better option in that dichotomy. In the film, we have seen three main symbols. These are clothes, cars, and, especially, Coca-Cola. In conclusion, we can say that the film, using different elements of filmmaking, supports capitalism and the United States.

But why does it? It is clear that the film is a political satire that focuses on the situation of that period: the cold war. And as we said, the war was not only between countries, but also between ideologies. We also know that comedies, and specially this type of satire, were films with a huge amount of political charge. And what is the objective of doing this? The answer is not simple, since there might be many reasons for it. It can merely be due to the idea that the film simply aims to support one of the sides of the war or to merely offer its ideas concerning the two ideologies. However, I think that there is another reason for it. As we know, films, and any art that reaches the public, are a tool to influence people and try to create a feeling or an idea in them. And in the case of films, comedies are a valuable tool since they transmit ideas more indirectly than other genres. This entails that; the possibility that what they say or infer might get to people; could increase since people are not expecting comedies to be ideologically charged films. However, usually, it is different, since comedies are usually ideologically charged films, and more so if we are talking about a moment of history in which ideology and people played such an important role, as happens to be the case with this film and era. Therefore, we can say that the objective of the film is not merely

to taunt communism or to support capitalism, or to just entertain, but that it has another objective. It also aims to influence spectators and make them realize that they should support capitalism, since from what you can see in the film, communism has no chance, not of winning, but of just working. To conclude, we can say that the film criticises communism to try to influence the people that watch the film and make them side with the same ideology that the film supports, capitalism. This idea also shows us the degree that a war can reach, not only between countries but also between ideologies, to the point that it becomes not just a topic for a film, but an aspect of daily life, and of constant discussion.

## **Bibliography**

Chafe, W. H. (1995). *The Unfinished Journey. America since the World War II*. (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Foner, E. (2005). *Give me liberty. An American History* (3.<sup>a</sup> ed.). New York & London: W. W. Norton & Company.

Grant, B. K. (Ed.). (2008). *American Cinema of the 1960s. Themes and Variations*. New Brunswick, New Jersey & London. Rutgers University Press.

King, G. (2002) *Film Comedy*. New York and London: Wallflower.

Stott, A. (2005) *Comedy*. New York: Routledge.