

Recall This Book
161 One Battle After Another: A West Newton Cinema Discussion
December, 2025

John Plotz (JP):

Hello, I'm John Plotz.

Welcome to Recall This Book, where we invite scholars and writers from different disciplines to make sense of contemporary issues, problems and events. Always something new under the sun, even in the podcast booth.

Today's episode about the new Paul Thomas Anderson film, *One Battle After Another*, was recorded live before an audience at the storied West Newton Cinema on opening weekend back in September of 2025.

And it was a conversation between two experts, two consummate experts in the worlds of Paul Thomas Anderson and of Thomas Pynchon. With that alluring introduction, let me draw the curtain up on an excellent conversation.

Today we're really lucky enough to have watched this film in the company of two experts whose expertise together, like peanut butter and chocolate, adds up to a single perfect confection for today's event.

I'm just going to quickly introduce you and then my role is more or less gentlemen start your engines.

The writer and playwright, Ethan Warren, modestly describes himself as the author of *The Cinema of Paul Thomas Anderson, American Apocrypha*, which was released in 2023 by Columbia University Press.

Really enjoyed your book and look forward to hearing your thoughts.

With Ethan, we're going to have Peter Coviello, who's head of English at University of Illinois Chicago, the author of six books, including *Make Yourself Gods*, *Vineland Reread*, *Longplayers*, which is a memoir, and most

recently, *Is There God After Prince?* Dispatches from an Age of Lost Things. So welcome to you both in your dramatic roles here as the yin and yang of one battle after another studies.

So I'm going to ask you some questions, and I'm actually going to invite you also, if you want to ask one another questions, perhaps it let the conversation flow.

And then after a decent interval of listening to our experts, there's going to be time as well for questions from the audience. So Pete, let me start you off with a tiny question. How would you introduce this audience to Thomas Pynchon's *Vineland*?

Peter Coviello (PC):

Thomas Pynchon's *Vineland*, that's a great question He's very famous for writing *Gravity's Rainbow*, this 70s epic. In 1990, this weird book came out, which was about the afterlife of 68 hippies who lived in Northern California in Arcada where that movie was filmed.

What you don't know from watching the movie is that it's a hysterically, anticlically, cartoonishly funny book. While being the funniest novel you've ever read in your life, my hand to god, it's also a novel about the police state.

It's very seriously a novel about American governance organizing itself more and more entirely on the model of counterinsurgency. That there are insurgent elements of the nation and they need to be eliminated by any means necessary.

It thinks of '68 as a moment of solidification of that. That's why it's thinking about the 60s. This movie obviously moves that presciently and smartly if you're asking me into the 21st century. That would be my pitch.

JP:

Awesome. I love the description you're making of the carryover of the logic of the police state. Is there a single moment from the movie that jumps out at you as catalytic and ignition point?

PC:

I'll just say very briefly in the novel, which is again, antically hugely funny. There's a campus revolution and a professor is like ambling through it and he watches a cop beating a student. It's not funny.

He says, in that moment the picture of the police was revealed to him. Every shot of post September 11th security in this movie, seems to me to get that extremely right. It could be very fateful attention in that sense. That's what I would say.

JP:

That's great. Ethan, you are, please don't deny it. You're a dyed in the wool PTA expert, okay? And that's who I need you to be. And you're the man who persuaded me to go back and watch Hard Eight, which I love. And so, you have chronicled his brilliance and also his peccadilloes. So, can you just position this film for us within what you see as the PTA arc?

Ethan Warren (EW):

Yeah, I think what is really crucial here, first and foremost, is that it's his first movie set in the 21st century since PunchDrunk Love, which was 23 years ago. This is a movie that really tries to engage with the American moment in a way that I have suggested in the book. He has shied away from in the past as he has told more and more stories that are farther and farther from his lived experience. He's now getting into the mess. And this is a messy movie about how messy it is to be alive in 2025. It's his first movie with significant non-white characters in a long, not long time.

And it's a movie that engages with racism pretty directly. I was alarmed by that, surprised by that. I think it is to his credit that he's getting into the ugly sides of life in America.

JP:

Can you say more about *alarmed by that*? Well, you know, he's a white guy and he's making his first movie with non-white characters in a really long time and what he's choosing to deal most directly with white supremacy. It just took me by surprise.

JP:

So you're thinking about the Christmas Adventurer's Club because I thought when you first started talking about the rawness and the messiness, I thought you were talking about sort of the immigrant plot, like the question of borders.

EW:

Yep. Is that to they lay siege to this whole community and you see the Harriet Tubman efforts. Yeah, it's both.

JP:

You have a wonderful model in your book about the thesis and antithesis of PTA and you put *Inherent Vice*, which is a movie I hope we'll get to, the Thomas Pynchon, the earlier Thomas Pynchon adaptation (I feel more comfortable saying adaptation for that one). You see him coming back and undoing things that he had done or mirroring things that he'd done in earlier films. Do you have a hot take here about the thesis and antithesis synthesis?

EW:

I broke it down to this is his 10th movie. Yeah, I had nine to play with beforehand and I made it. Thesis is the first three, *Hard Eight*, *Boogie Nights*. I say that is him in the way that some young filmmakers do, putting his foot down and saying, *this is who I am, this is what I'm about. I make movies that feel like Robert Allman movies*. I make movies that have a ton of expressiveness that are just screenplays that are overflowing with dialogue.

And then his next three are very inward movies: *Punchdrunk Love*, *There Will be Blood*, the *Master* are movies with protagonists who are very

internal and inexpressive. And then I use the next three, which is Inherent Bite, Phantom Threat, and Licorice Pizza as the synthesis.

These are movies that are less concerned with what came before and less concerned with stating their own purpose and more just content to let themselves sprawl. This, if I'm going by that model, is the start of what I would hope is a new mirror. And it will remain to be seen what emerges from this.

JP:

Pete, can I turn this back to Pynchon but in an oblique way? I want to really pick up Ethan's point about the presentness of this.

And so, for those of you who haven't had a chance to read Vineland, written in 1990, but a Reagan era novel, a novel about his own day, I think he has a line in it: "drugs, sacrament of the 60s, evil of the 80s."

He's interested in a kind of mirroring between the past and the present that he brought to life in 1990. So, here we are in 2025, we've already talked about white supremacy, the sort of migration crisis and the raw politics of policing nowadays. Is there something you saw here that seemed to you to really ring true for like a Pynchon preoccupation?

PC:

Yeah, Pynchon's great preoccupation. I will go to the map for he's a career-wide anti-fascist, and he's been thinking about fascism since he was 27. He wrote a book, Gravity's Rainbow, about World War II, which is about, for Pynchon, I would argue over at 700 sprawling insane pages about the sort of non-antagonism between capital. The story that one wants to tell of World War II, that democracy, i.e. capitalism, conquered fascism, that's not Pynchon's story. This book is very interested in what he thinks of as the fascist potentials of American life.

And he thinks of '68 not as a moment of initiation, but of like solidification. And he's thinking of that through 1984 and through 1990 when he is

ready. Anderson has read it very well. And he wants you, its viewers, to think about the shape of fascism in the 21st century.

JP:

Okay, and it won't shock you that I also want to ask you the flip side of the same question. Is there something you want to either object to or note as something that the film is doing that you don't think is Pynchon-esque?

PC:

It's not as funny, but of course it's the novel. The novel is so full of puns and songs and silliness. The novel's antique and silly and cartoonish.

JP:

You could put that in a movie if you wanted to.

PC: I was very happy with that. I was very moved by that. I found myself moved by that, extremely moved by a movie that is fundamentally thinking about the fascism of the present tense movie. I think it did a lot, so I'll probably have objections later, but at the moment, I think, wow.

Not as an objection, but in terms of thinking about something that's there that really stuck with me. You know, this movie ends with Tom Petty's American Girl. It ends with a family romance resolution, including the phantom presence of the mother. I kept waiting for her to reappear ver Paid, but she doesn't. She reappears, like, her indexicality is like that letter.

So that resolution of the family feels, like, in some kind of interesting tension with Vineland, and Pete, you and I talked about this just yesterday, actually. Like, there's a way in which Pynchon is interested in how Brock is, like, a genuine other romantic possibility.

PC:

Yeah, he's the other father.

JP:

Yeah, but not so much Sean Penn

PC:

But Pynchon also in the novel is kind of interested in the family unit. Parodically funny, like, the, the, the, in the movie is Brock confronts, in the, in the book, it's Brock and Prairie, and he says, but *Prairie, I'm your father*.

It's a Star Wars joke. The whole movie is filmed where Star Wars was filmed, and everyone talks about that. And she produces a very complex insult back to him.

So the movie is more sentimental in that sense, but also, God bless, there are insurgents in the movie, and they're armed, and the movie is not against them. And the girl in the movie...

JP:

Insurgents are filmmakers in the book. They aren't. We have Friends 75, but in the book, it's F/24, right?

PC:

Yeah, they're guerrilla filmmakers.

JP: Yeah, do you have a thought about that?

PC: In other words, you turn to make a film about people where you have heroic makers at the center of the novel, but they don't appear.

I mean, I would love to hear Ethan about that. Yeah, I would too. In the movie, Frenzy is part of a film group, and that's their radicality.

They're being beaten up by the police, and they're around violence, but they are not armed. In this movie, the insurgents are armed and the movie just is unblinking about that. Yeah.

EW:

My only thought is they lose. They all lose. I don't know how optimistic it is, except that when Willa gets that letter in the end where the mother says, *maybe you'll be the one to fix it all*. So then she goes out into the world with

that sense of hope, but it strikes me as often as somewhat pessimistic, really.

JP: Actually, can we kind of go with that? Because I was thinking about the potency of the word rat, like informer, betrayer, double-crosser. But there's a way in which, and this I feel much more in the novel, but I got to think about how it works in the film: Complicity, collaboration, selling out, yes, compromising, changing. I don't know. How do you think about that?

You see it as pessimistic, Ethan?

EW:

Not necessarily, but it's the first word that comes to mind. Perfidia is the one who leads to the downfall of everybody. She fires on the bank, securing her, and that sets in motion his entire chain of events that the movie then follows. And it's somewhat dark to take the mother figure here and make her, yeah, explicitly a paternity vote. She does what she has to do to protect herself, but she is following in a history of Anderson mothers who are not fulfilling a typical mother role.

If you look at Dirk's mother in Boogie Night, she is this absolute sort of screaming harpy of a woman who rejects her son, sends him running out into the world of the porn underworld. Here we have this mother who is explicitly selfish.

She says to Bob, Pat, I only care about myself and that strikes me. I don't know how PTA sometimes feels about mothers. He has a complicated relationship with his own.

JP: In other words, to revisit the point I was trying to make about the family romance, you think I'm burring off the edge there. Actually, it's a romance that has a missing side to it.

EW:

She certainly does. She chooses to leave her family.

PC:

For me, that's super interesting to know. Because I don't know much about Anderson, truthfully. So knowing that about mother stuff. I think for Pynchon in the novel, certainly, the family romance is always being subordinated to a different romance. It's the romance of a long revolutionary tradition. In the book, Frenese is the daughter, she's the granddaughter of Wobblies and daughter of people who were blacklisted.

And the book begins and ends being revolutionary traditions inside of which the family romance is small, is administered. And the thing that's being carried on by Prairie or by the kid is a revolutionary tradition that is not located in or isolable in the family. It was read in the '90s as an optimistic book because of that, I would say.

JP:

Maybe I can connect the blacklist to one of the early reviews, which I believe, at least according to the article I read, comes from Steven Spielberg. And he said I haven't seen a movie that is so tonally a relative to Stanley Kubrick's Dr. Strangelove. Does that resonate for you guys?

EW:

As a madcap closed-room drama or comedy, and this is a goofy, goofy movie in a lot of respects, but it's also incredibly dark and bleak.

PC:

And warm-blooded, Kubrick is so famously, interestingly, fantastically cold. The Coen brothers are just borrowing his violent coldness all the time. And I don't know, I just watched it now, like you guys, but this seemed to me a very warm-blooded movie. It's funny when Leonardo cries, but it's less funny when he's afraid.

The looks of people being afraid were very moving in that movie for me, you know, like when the police are there, however brave you are, you're frightened. And I thought that was very moving in a way Kubrick would not be.

JP:

Pete, you would say that's a movie about power, right? I mean, it's really a movie about the system behind. But in some ways, it's also about very strong individuals as well.

PC: I mean, I don't know that I think we probably disagree a little bit about that. I also think that the incredibly moving parts of that movie were about solidarity and systems. It's very moving when Sensei is not acting alone, man. He's got a network of people. Leonardo is not acting alone.

They've got a network of people. One of the things that I find to admire. There's an underground power. There's an underground power Pynchon is super interested in. There's a moment in the book that I love. It's very small when one of the characters who's not in the movie is breaking her out of prison. And she sees who's in the prison camp. Says, can I get you out?

But he says, no, no, no. They're going to get me back in tomorrow. And she says, all right, brother. And it's a moment of you are my revolutionary comrade. And we share a revolutionary world together. And I think that it's played as close to straight as you can get.

EW: Anderson picks up on something of that because these strong characters are networked. I do see it really as a story about individuals because something that is so often present in Anderson's movies are two central men who in some way oppose each other, starting with Punchdrunk Love, and go through and, you know, it's always comes down

to two guys who are the flip side of each other's coin. And here we have the two fathers, and one is hyper violent, one is generally gentle, it's Bob never kills anybody.

JP: Can we go back to the question that you guys began with, which is the question of setting this in the present and not the past?

I mean, you know, maybe Ethan, I could start with you because as you said, I mean, PTA really loves not just the past and the California of the past.

EW: And he gives you, I mean, even the past with which this begins, which is, I guess, 2008 or 2009 doesn't feel very past, right? It feels pretty

present. Yeah, I mean, what comes to mind for me is people have accused him of being scared of cell phones.

You know, *Punchdrunk Love* is a movie that is about handheld phones and power and the terror of those. And it's a movie that falls apart with cell phones in the mix. And then he veers off into the past of the exact minute that we all started carrying phones in our pockets. So the fact that this one engages with what it means to carry a phone and the paranoia of that is interesting to me.

JP:

Can I just ask if you guys have things you want to say to one another? I mean, you know, you have your matching expertise here.

PC:

So Ethan did you like it because it's getting so celebrated and everything?

EW:

Yeah, I was hoping not to have to say directly. I don't like this movie that much. It's not it's not my favorite PTA movie by any stretch. It may be last in line for me at this point. Below *Hard Eight*, a movie that I lived with for so long that I love *Hard Eight* as an addiction.

PC:

My opinions are different.

EW:

I always say that anybody who says anything aside, if you put anything aside from *Hard Eight* at the bottom of your ranking, you're just trying to make a point. And maybe I'm trying to make a point. I don't know.

I find this a really grim and unpleasant movie with politics that I think are a little bit fuzzy. And I don't think he engages as directly as he could with, but anti-fascism actually means. It's just a sort of a little part that underneath this story of a father and a daughter is always so concerned stories about a father's children.

This reminds me so much of *There Will Be Blood*, their story about a found family, a father raising a child, that he's sort of unclear whether Bob knows Will is not his, or he suspects that biologically. Yeah, biologically. I think the craft is impeccable. There's so much to admire if it's not a movie, and I like that much, and that's something I've wrestled with in the last two watches. So my question for you is, have you seen, you have seen *Inherent Vice*?

Yeah, yeah. So what's your preferred flavor?

EW:

I think we very strongly disagree about this movie. I think its politics are smart in the sense of anti-fascism for him requires like networks of opposition that are armed, and he's not fucking playing around about that.

Other one was so good because he read this *Bonkers* novel. Some of you have seen *Inherent Vice*, kind of a *Bonkers* funny novel, and he made a coherent film out of it. When I was young, and this he didn't do that.

But you'll read *Vineland* and it's a different novel. But he said, I can hang something on, I do that because I think this was one of my favorite writers, thinking hard about anti-fascism in its cyclical moments between 68 and 69, 84, 85, 90, 91, and that matters to me now, between whatever it was,

JP:

So I think this might be a good time to turn and see if there are audience questions. So the question is why immigration and abortion as the key mobilizing anti-fascist topics for this film, as opposed to something like environmentalism.

PC:

That's not hard. When armies are being mobilized against insurgencies from within, the insurgencies within at the current moment look like immigrants. There is no army that's literal armies larger than every local police force. They're being mobilized against immigrants. And I think Anderson knows that. That's not to say that one cannot think about other things, but for the purposes of counterinsurgency as a mode of governance via the police, I think immigration was a smart choice.

EW:

I mean, I think those are just easy handles for him to grab as a screenwriter. It's easy to go after the anti-abortion politician and to talk about the immigration. It's harder to visualize, I think, freedom of expression, whatever the other example was.

PC:

For capital, it's hard to make a movie. *There Will Be Blood* is one version of it, but yeah.

JP:

I think I see another hand in the middle here. So just to rephrase that really quickly, it's a question about the fact of the armed insurgency that we see in the film as opposed to the less armed or almost unarmed, I guess, of *Vineland*, and that connecting that question to the 60s versus the 70s.

PC:

Very quickly, I think you're going to love the novel *Vineland* because it seems to me part of what *Vineland* is about being written in 1990 is what Pynchon thinks of as the anesthetizing metabolization of the 60s. So the film crew doesn't have guns, but the people they run with do. So it's not a book like they're good and bad revolutionists. It's absolutely not.

But it does think that over the course of the 70s and particularly the 80s, the 60s was metabolized in a soft focus, generation gap, counterculture kind of way in a way that completely invisibilized the world that he's invested in, which is a world

JP:

I will say that just reading it in 1990, I remember as a very young person trying to make sense of what was going on in my world, that metabolizing term was amazing. I mean, it's the present of the 60s story that it was telling.

I really loved that, which is one of the reasons that I'm trying to argue with you a little bit, Pete, about the importance of Brock, the complicity or

collaboration with Brock, the notion that the strength of the 60s also turns into a desire to emulate the power of authority, as well as rebel against it. That's the tension. So the question is whether you're, it's taking away from the message to make the- Christmas Adventurer's Club. Whether that comic supervillain quality takes away from the message.

EW: I'm going to say yes. It really, that joke just doesn't land for me. I mean, you've got what is, I mean, essentially, the Ku Klux Klan or the even broader, more centralized power. Just to wrap it in this joke, it's a wholly outlandish choice and I find it very strange.

PC:

It doesn't work for me. I agree with Ethan. That's the least, it's the moment in the movie that is most, now you're doing *X-Files*.

JP:

And Pete, it's more than a moment though.

PC:

I know. That's the thing. It's the moment I was like, oh, it's a joke, but it's not real. And that's not, I would say that is a departure from the novel. Though again, God bless, you're making a film. You need to again, picture capital in certain ways, but he's done it better. That's what I would say.

JP:

So the question is, the significance of the fact that they're all labeled *police* and not other kind of governmental authority.

PC:

Yeah. He's making a movie after 2020, right? That's obviously the catalytic part of this movie. He's thinking about the Black Lives Matter protests and stuff like that. And police is the heading of lots and lots of different forces of security.

You'll notice that it traipses across the boundary of military and non-military, of private and public. Police is a good single word for that. And I think he's smart to do that.

That would be my quick answer to that.

EW:

I'll co-sign that.

JP:

Ethan, do you have further thoughts about Paul Thomas Anderson depicts government and authority and other movies? I'm trying to think of how those figures come in. I mean, he's got a healthy skepticism of authority and all of the systems that make the world go around. The Master is his skeptical of organized religion. So is *There Will Be Blood*

The whole headline of *Inherent Vice* is you are corrupted the minute you are born. He is a skeptic while at the same time being the beneficiary of a lot of institutional and systemic power in this country. And his movies, I think, sometimes wrestle with the fact that he is so privileged and is telling stories about people who are sometimes not.

JP:

Yeah, in *Inherent Vice*, there's even a joke about, is being a PI being a cop or not, right? Do I get the discount at the strip club?

PC:

I mean, that's a Pynchon throughline. In *Inherent Vice*, the novel, he's thinking about detective fiction as being a great version of cops who are hated by cops. And so he thinks about the cinematic history of counter-policing that is the PI movie. And I think that part of probably what it attracted Anderson to it other than that he just likes Pynchon.

Oh, yeah. That's sort of a connection to Altman as well.

PC:

Yeah. No, truly.

JP:

So, there's a lot to unpack in that question, but whether the through line here is the armed anti-fascism or whether armed anti-fascism just comes back as a single rifle at the end, and it's more about the purity of the revolutionary or the question of staying true to a cause.

PC: I would just very quickly, a couple things. One, I don't think the point for either Pynchon or Anderson is guns are not necessary. The point is they're not disqualifying, that a person having a gun doesn't make them say a domestic terrorist. So that would be the first thing I'd say.

The second thing I'd say is there are a lot of guns after the first guns. They're just all held by the police. There's an innumerable number of guns in the movie that the police are holding. Third thing I would say is I don't know about purity so much as the idea that being in a movement with others laterally is going to be in tension with the family seems right, but I don't know that that's a matter of being pure of heart enough or being devoted enough.

JP:

Ethan, do you want to?

EW: I think it's really significant the question of whether Willa is equipped to be a revolutionary by virtue of being the daughter of a rat, and then says to her that the child of a rat is a baby rat.

I think there's her parents are and follow in the path and it's immediately does choose.

JP:

I think there was another hand. So the second question about a different through line that we could see and the importance of the Benicio del Toro

character, the sensei, and his whole family-based solidarity alliance where everybody is under threat and everybody responds on a mutual aid way.

PC:

I will give a very quick answer, which is that's such a great observation.

I would say that for this movie and for Pynchon and for Anderson particularly, especially in a movie that's interested in unions and Wobblies, the opposite of fascist organizing isn't violence necessarily, it's organizing, organization. Does that mean, does that preclude the possibility of violence? No, it does not. But both of these outfits are organized, you know what I mean? And they're organized in different ways. And the mother understands the state could be at war with her.

EW:

I mean, I think Anderson seems to just be saying, this is the reality of it. If you are an immigrant in America in 2025, you may be called upon to mobilize in some way. And I mean, it's also a comedy beat. Bob is tumbling around trying to find somewhere to plug in his phone while this is all happening around him. But, you know, I said earlier that I was sort of surprised and distressed by the racism angle. And it's I think the counter to my own point is just he's not ignoring the ugly realities of what you're going to have to do.

PC:

Can I ask you guys how old is he?

EW:

He is about 55 at this point.

So he's like my age exactly. He's like perfectly my generation. We're dialed to the same susceptibilities.

JP:

Can we turn over this mobilization question one more time? I think it's really interesting because I really hear what you guys are saying. I really appreciate that question about the about sensei and his group. I still feel

and Pete, maybe I just want you to kind of correct me or amplify this for me: When I read Pynchon and I go way back to like *Crying of Lot 49* and the moments of paranoia about these underlying systems that are controlling us that we don't know it, I see in Pynchon a lot of what I see in people like Ursula Le Guin or Buster Keaton to go back further: a distrust of mobilization. I see a worry about mobilizing and getting co-opted. I think that's why I tried to put the implication or collaboration into play.

PC:

I totally hear what you're saying. I think he outgrows them. The 60s are totally that. Even in the whole sick crew, he's worried a lot about them as they call the rainbow. But 17 years later, he wants to talk about the wobblers. He wants to talk with almost sentimental admiration about the various kinds of unions he encounters. He sort of never leaves that. The later books are not big rips about paranoia in the same way. And you can see it drift in *Mason and Dixon*, which is probably my favorite Pynchon

But he writes it over 20 odd years, right? And some of it at the beginning, they're paranoid about the holding company. It's not where it ends. It ends being about like imperial capital.

JP: So Ethan, can I kind of ask you, you have a wonderful phrase to describe his PTA's work generally as decidedly apolitical. And clearly, I think one of the reasons you put this at the bottom is that you don't see it as decidedly apolitical. I guess the question would be, say this is the beginning of a new phase for him. Is there something that you can imagine growing to love about this phase too?

JP:

Absolutely. I mean, if he is now more willing to open the door to explicitly talking about now, I think that's something to be heralded. And I think that's something I complained about in my book is that his movies have become increasingly snow-globed worlds.

And this is this is exploding the snow globe a bit. And if he is more interested in doing that, I think that's great. And I think to talk a little bit about the mobilization thing.

Inherent Vices is the Pynchon that I'm most familiar with, just from rereading it to talk about the movie. It seems to be a story that is about the strength of individuals and the individual choice as the only thing we have faith in.

Doc realizes that America and the world are seemingly hopelessly corrupted by the Golden Fang. And the only thing he could do is go out there and save one family, make one individual choice to save one individual person, extract them from the Golden Fang and return this family to normalcy. And so that does not seem to be a story that has a lot of positive to say about mobilization.

JP: I think maybe we should just thank our amazing experts.

Thank you all.

Thank you so much, West Newton, for organizing this. Thanks, Jamie.

Thank you.

And your sister was awesome.

Also, we didn't even talk about the most important scene in the movie, which is between Leo and the history teacher.

Yeah, she was great.

She crushed it.

It's a great honor.

Thank you. I appreciate you all coming out to support this cinematic scene.

Recall This Book is the creation of John Plotz and Elizabeth Ferry. Sound editing is by Kamiya Bagla, and music comes from a song by Eric Chaslow and Barbara Cassidy.

We gratefully acknowledge support from Brandeis University and its Mendel Center for the Humanities. We always want to hear from you with your comments, criticisms, or suggestions for future episodes.

Finally, if you enjoyed today's show, please forward it to five people or write a review and rate us wherever you get your podcasts. Thanks for listening.