Inherit the Wind Study Guide

Inherit the Wind by Jerome Lawrence

The following sections of this BookRags Literature Study Guide is offprint from Gale's For Students Series: Presenting Analysis, Context, and Criticism on Commonly Studied Works: Introduction, Author Biography, Plot Summary, Characters, Themes, Style, Historical Context, Critical Overview, Criticism and Critical Essays, Media Adaptations, Topics for Further Study, Compare & Contrast, What Do I Read Next?, For Further Study, and Sources.

The following sections, if they exist, are offprint from Beacham's Encyclopedia of Popular Fiction: "Social Concerns", "Thematic Overview", "Techniques", "Literary Precedents", "Key Questions", "Related Titles", "Adaptations", "Related Web Sites".

The following sections, if they exist, are offprint from Beacham's Guide to Literature for Young Adults: "About the Author", "Overview", "Setting", "Literary Qualities", "Social Sensitivity", "Topics for Discussion", "Ideas for Reports and Papers".

BOOKRAGS

Contents

Introduction

In the blistering hot summer of 1925, two nationally-known legal minds, Clarence Darrow and William Jennings Bryan, battled in a tiny courtroom in Dayton, Tennessee, and, for a time, captured the attention of the world. The issue? A state law that forbid the teaching of evolution and a local teacher's violation of that law. The official name of this encounter was Tennessee vs. John Thomas Scopes, but it became known the world over as the Scopes "Monkey Trial."

Thirty years later, in 1955, playwrights Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee published their dramatized version of the events of the summer of 1925. In a brief note at the beginning of the play, the playwrights admit that the Scopes Monkey Trial was clearly the inspiration for their work. But, the authors emphasize "*Inherit the Wind* is not history" and that the "collision of Bryan and Darrow at Dayton was dramatic, but... not drama."

Bringing history to life through drama involves a risk that the central issues will be seen as "of the past" and of no relevance to the present. *Inherit the Wind*, however, has thrived for over three decades, suggesting an attraction for theater-goers far greater than that of a quaint look at America's past. As people search for meaning in an increasingly complex world, the different belief systems that attempt to provide some kind of understanding can, and do, come into conflict. Whether these systems wear such labels as religion, science, or politics, the struggles that exist within and between them is reflective of a cultural conflict that has yet to be, and may never be, resolved. *Inherit the Wind* then, is far more than the story of twelve exciting days in a Tennessee courtroom; it is a narrative of a nation and its people as they struggle to come to grips with the forces of change.

Author Biography

From the 1940s until Lee's death in 1994, Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee were a writing and publishing team. Together they wrote some 39 plays, including 14 Broadway productions. During World War II, Lawrence and Lee co-founded the Armed Forces Radio Services, which provided entertainment and news to thousands of troops.

Jerome Lawrence (original name, Jerome L. Schwartz) was born in Cleveland, Ohio, on July 14, 1915, the son of a printer and a poet. He earned a B.A. from Ohio State University in 1937. Although he spent the bulk of his career as both a writer and publisher teamed with Lee, Lawrence also wrote the biography Actor: *The Life and Times of Paul Muni* independent of Lee.

Robert E(dwin) Lee was born in Elyria, Ohio, on October 15, 1918. His father was an engineer and his mother a teacher. He studied at several different colleges and universities but never earned a formal degree. Lee died in 1994 after a long struggle with cancer.

Several of the pair's plays were adapted for film, most notably *Inherit the Wind, The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail, Mame,* and another courtroom story, *First Monday in October,* With *Inherit the Wind,* the Lawrence and Lee team won best play honors at the New York Drama Critics Poll and the Tony Awards (formally known as the Antionette Perry Awards) in 1955. The play also won the British Drama Critics Award in 1960. The pair would win a Tony Award nomination in 1966 for *Mame* and the Emmy Award for best comedy/ drama special for a 1988 television presentation of Inherit the Wind.

In an interview with Nina Couch in *Studies in American Drama*, 1945-Present, Lawrence related: "Almost if not all of our plays show the theme of the dignity of every individual mind and that mind's life-long battle against limitation and censorship." The Lawrence and Lee collection is maintained at the Lincoln Center Library for the Performing Arts in New York City.

Plot Summary

Act One, Scene I

Inherit The Wind opens just after dawn on a July day that "promises to be a scorcher." The story centers around a schoolteacher who is on trial for teaching evolution the theory that man evolved from lower primates such as monkeys in his classroom, a violation of Tennessee's Butler Law. The lines are already drawn in this sleepy Southern town of Hillsboro, Tennessee. Creationism or evolution? Religion or science? The local minister's daughter, a young teacher named Rachel, visits her imprisoned colleague, Bert Gates, at the local jail. The Baltimore *Herald* newspaper has sent E. K. Hornbeck, the country's most famous columnist, to cover the trial, along with the nation's most famous trial lawyer, Henry Drunnmond to defend Bert. The town is abuzz with the impending arrival of the prosecution's lawyer, three-time Presidential candidate and self-proclaimed Bible expert Matthew Harrison Brady. It is clear from the BIBLE" banner strung across Main Street and the frequent singing of hymns that many of the townspeople are creationists the religious belief that man was created, fully-evolved, by God and are against Bert.

Hornbeck, cynical and condescending, supports the merits of Evolution while mocking the views of Creationism. When Brady arrives by special train, the townspeople fawn over him, name him an honorary Colonel in the state militia, and feed him a hearty dinner. Both Brady and the town express surprise and concern when they learn that Henry Drummond will represent the defense. And, when Drummond enters at the end of the scene, he is greeted by Hornbeck with the words, "Hello, Devil. Welcome to Hell."

Act One, Scene II

At the jury selection phase of the trial a few days later, Brady and Tom Davenport, the local District Attorney, trade barbs with Drummond over several potential jurors.The air in the courtroom is more like a circus than a legal proceeding, with numerous spectators and reporters crowding the room. After court adjourns for the day, Rachel begs Bert to stop fighting. Bert wavers, and Drummond agrees to settle the case with Brady if Bert honestly believes he committed a crime "against the citizens of this state and the minds of their children." Bert decides to see things through, leaving Rachel shaken and confused. Drummond is satisfied that he is on the right side.

Act Two, Scene I

That same evening, Rachel's father Reverend Brown leads a bible meeting. With the nationally known orator, Brady, seated near him on the platform, Brown launches into a "hellfire and brimstone" speech denouncing Bert and the evil that he has taught. When Rachel attempts to defend Bert, Brown calls for divine retribution against his own daughter. Brady intervenes, advising the overzealous Reverend with the Biblical

quotation from *Proverbs* that provides the play's title: "He that troubleth his own house shall inherit the wind." After the meeting disperses, Brady and Drummond once good friends and colleagues speak briefly, Brady asks why their relationship has drifted apart. Drummond responds that maybe it is Brady who has moved away by standing still. This rebuke stuns Brady, literally knocking him off balance as he exits, leaving Drummond alone on stage.

Act Two, Scene II

The trial is in full swing. Howard, a student from Bert's class, is on the witness stand. Brady skillfully manipulates Howard's testimony to favor the prosecution, ending his examination with an impassioned and overtly biased speech against the "evil-lutionsts." Drummond's cross-examination shows the whole point of the defense Howard, or anyone else, has the right to listen to new ideas and the right to think about what those new ideas mean. Later, Rachel is called to testify. Brady questions Rachel about Bert's faith in God and then manipulates her into repeating Bert's observation that God created Man in His own image, and Man returned the favor. Realizing that everything she says makes Bert appear even more guilty, Rachel breaks down in tears and leaves the witness stand before Drummond can cross-examine her. Brady rests the prosecution's case. Drummond begins the defense by calling three prominent scientists to the stand, but the court rules that their possible testimony is irrelevant to this particular case.

Drummond appears to have no witnesses to testify for the defense. He seizes on the idea that if the court refuses to allow testimony on science or Charles Darwin (the scientist whose work supports the evolution theory), it should allow testimony on the Bible. He calls Brady to the stand as an expert on the Bible, over the objections of D.A. Davenport. At first, Brady fends off Drummond's questions about Biblical events with pious platitudes. As Drummond continues, however, Brady is forced to admit that the first day of creation was "not necessarily a twenty-four hour day." When Drummond gets Brady to admit that he believes God speaks to him, telling him what is right and wrong, the prosecutor's credibility is destroyed. He is left on the stand, ignored, reciting scripture, as the court adjourns for the day.

Act Three

Bert and Drummond discuss the possible outcome of the trial. Drummond tells Bert about a toy rocking horse he received as a childhood birthday present from his parents. The horse, which he named Golden Dancer, was beautiful, yet when he tried to actually ride the horse, it broke in two. This, Drummond asserts, illustrates that many things are not what they appear to be, that a beautiful, strong-looking toy horse may in fact be cheap and weak just as an age-old belief may in fact be false. Back in court, the jury returns a verdict of guilty and the judge fines Bert $100. Brady objects, claiming that, the penalty is too lenient. Drummond shocks the court by declaring that he will appeal to the state Supreme Court and would do so even if the fine were a single dollar. Vexed at not winning a more decisive victory, Brady tries to have his views read into the record, but

he is rebuffed by the judge, ignored by the people in the court, and cut-off by a radio broadcaster. Brady suddenly collapses and is rushed from the courtroom, leaving Bert, Drumraond, and Rachel to discuss the case. When the judge returns to announce that Brady has died, Hornbeck cynically attacks Brady and his views. Drummond turns on him angrily, denouncing Hornbeck's attitude as self-serving and without compassion. Hornbeck leaves, confused, and Bert and Rachel make plans to depart together on the afternoon train. Drummond picks up Rachel's copy of Darwin's *The Origin of Species* a sort of bible to evolutionists which she has forgotten, but Bert and Rachel are out of earshot. Drummond spots the court's Bible on the judge's bench, weighs them against each other in his hands, slaps the two volumes together, and jams them into his briefcase side by side. He walks out of the courtroom and across the town square.

Act 1, Scene 1

Act 1, Scene 1 Summary

The play opens on the lawn of the Hillsboro Courthouse. The stage is set with the inside of the courtroom to one side of the stage, with the Courthouse Square and town Main Street on the other side of the stage. A character named Howard enters with a fishing rod and tin can, hunting for worms. A girl named Melinda enters looking for him.

The two discuss the weather and Howard finds a worm. He frightens Melinda with it, and then tells her she was a worm once. The two argue over whether people originated from worms, and Melinda threatens to tell her father about his opinion. Howard says that her father was once a monkey, and Melinda runs away. Howard continues searching for worms, and the action shifts to the courthouse.

Rachel, the daughter of the town religious leader Reverend Brown, has entered the area, clearly hoping not to be noticed. She heads into the courthouse and calls for the bailiff, Mr. Meeker. He enters and has clearly been shaving and getting ready for the day. Rachel asks to see Bert Cates, and urges Meeker not to tell her father she has come. Meeker agrees and brings Cates up to the courthouse. Meeker notes that Cates, who is a schoolteacher, is not the usual type of prisoner he deals with in the Hillsboro Jail.

Meeker leaves the two alone to talk. Cates tells Rachel she should not have come, but Rachel says she wanted to come. She is worried about Cates, so Cates tries to make her feel better by telling her that conditions in the jail are good. Rachel urges Cates to apologize for breaking the law, and Cates tries to change the subject by noting that someone named "Brady" is coming to town.

Rachel says the town is excited to see Brady, and again urges Cates to admit his mistake. She is clearly worried that Brady, whom she says is running for president and is "the biggest man in the country," will put Cates in jail. When she asks Cates why he committed his crime, he tells her it was because he believed he was right. He goes on to say that he was teaching Darwin's "Origin of Species," which describes how the planet evolved over a long period of time rather than being created in seven days by God.

Rachel tells him there is a law against teaching this, and that the whole town is against Cates. Cates says that the issue is complicated. Rachel reacts angrily to this and asks him why he "can't be on the right side of things?" Cates responds that her view of right comes from her father, and Rachel runs away. Cates chases her and the two hug each other.

Meeker re-enters, interrupting their embrace, and Rachel leaves. Meeker begins sweeping and then stops, telling Cates how excited he is that Brady is coming to

Hillsboro. He adds that he voted for Brady twice in presidential elections. He adds that he once heard Brady speak, and notes that he was impressed by how loud Brady was. He asks if Cates has a lawyer, and Cates tells him that a Baltimore paper is sending him a lawyer. Cates then decides to return to his jail cell, and Meeker leaves with him.

Action on the stage shifts to the town square, where a storekeeper is opening his store for the day. He and Mrs. Krebs discuss the weather and the two joke about the devil and the warm weather. A grumpy Reverend Brown enters and shouts offstage for a banner to be put up. Workmen enter and Brown tells them that he wants Brady to see the community's spirit. The workmen immediately put the banner up, while the townsfolk and Brown discuss the excitement of the day.

Bollinger enters and notes that the train is on its way with Brady on board. The townsfolk note that when he comes many others will also come to town, bringing much needed business. Melinda enters selling lemonade, and the audience is finally able to see that the banner says. "Read Your Bible." Other enterprising citizens appear, selling hot dogs and fans. Mrs. Blair appears and tells Howard to pay attention to Brady, then starts combing his hair.

The colorful Elijah enters. He is described as a "holy man" and he sets up a stand selling Bibles. Hornbeck then enters and looks with "contempt" at the small town with its colorful people. Mrs. Krebs asks him if he has a place to stay, and he replies that he is staying at the Mansion House. He then chooses a hot dog rather than a Bible and begins talking to Elijah, who asks if he is an evolutionist. Hornbeck introduces himself as a newspaper writer, and tells Elijah that he has read his "stuff" (referring to the Biblical Elijah). Elijah says he does not read or write, clearly missing the point of Hornbeck's wit.

A monkey grinder enters with his monkey. Hornbeck calls the monkey "Grandpa" and asks whom he is testifying for. The monkey takes a penny from Melinda, and Hornbeck says that this proves the monkey is the father of the human race. Timmy notes that the train is coming, and Brown gets the townsfolk moving toward the station. Hornbeck remains, and tells the monkey (using verse) that he is about to meet a man who is perhaps the strongest of his "descendants." He adds some satirical lines about Brady's power.

Hornbeck then asks the Storekeeper his opinion on evolution, and the Storekeeper notes that opinions are "bad for business." As he hears the crowd returning, Hornbeck warns the monkey that a crowd has come to town to see its "competition" (referring to Cates). The crowd comes back singing songs and waving signs criticizing Darwin and welcoming Brady to town. Hornbeck retreats to watch from the back of the stage.

Brady enters, accompanied by his wife Mrs. Brady, Reverend Brown, and District Attorney Tom Davenport. He is described as a "gray, balding, paunchy" man. The crowd sings "Old Time Religion," and then Brady begins to speak. He greets the townsfolk warmly and the stage directions tell the reader that everyone is impressed with his power and magnetism. After discussing the weather briefly, he declares that he has

come to fight an invasion of liberal thought from the North. He asserts that he is there to protect the Bible.

A photographer enters and asks for a picture. Mrs. Brady insists that she should not be in the picture. Brady and the Mayor pose for a picture, and the Mayor makes a nice speech congratulating him on his achievements. These include helping to get Woodrow Wilson elected as president and helping women get the vote. The Mayor is interrupted by the photographer, who snaps a picture. Mrs. Brady urges her husband to put his jacket on, and Brady arranges another picture with Brown and the Mayor by his side. The Mayor then finishes by giving Brady an honorary commission as a colonel in the state militia.

The group then moves toward a buffet table. Davenport introduces himself, and Brady promises to work as a team in prosecuting Cates. Brady flatters the women who have worked to prepare the buffet and proceeds to eat a big meal despite his wife's warnings. Brady asks about Cates, and Davenport and the Mayor reply that he is well known. Rachel starts to defend Cates and then becomes embarrassed. Her father urges her to speak more, and the audience learns that she is also a schoolteacher.

Brady calls Cates a heathen, and when Rachel defends him Brady calms her down. The two then move to one side and speak quietly. Bannister and Davenport discuss who the defense attorney will be. When the Mayor boasts to Mrs. Brady that the person will have a hard time against Brady, Hornbeck re-enters the scene and argues that this is not so. Continuing to speak in verse, Hornbeck announces that his paper (the Baltimore *Herald*) is sending himself to report on the trial and Henry Drummond to act as Cates' lawyer.

The assembled crowd is shocked by this news, and Bannister notes that Drummond represented two child murderers in Chicago. Brown denounces him as an agnostic and a "godless man." Hornbeck walks offstage. Brown says that they cannot let Drummond into the town, and the mayor promises to check the town ordinances to find a way to keep him out. Brown says that he saw Drummond in court using an affirmative defense, or in Brown's words "perverting the evidence to cast the guilt away from the accused." Brown goes on to describe Drummond as a kind of devil. His graphic description soon scares Melinda away.

Brady and Rachel re-enter, and Brady learns that Drummond is coming. After showing concern at first, Brady soon puts on a brave face and notes that Drummond will attract attention to the case. He compares himself as a kind of David up against the Goliath of evolutionist thought. He goes on to say that Rachel will be the prosecution's "star witness" against Cates. Brady then proposes a toast to their success. Mrs. Brady then notes that Brady needs a nap, and the two move off.

The scene once again shifts to the courtroom, where Hornbeck is looking around while eating an apple. He hides when Rachel enters in obvious distress, and Hornbeck offers to give her advice. He then goes on to ask her whether she is on Cates' side, and tells her how he has been writing about Cates as a hero fighting against an unjust law.

Rachel is surprised that he is supporting Cates, and Hornbeck offers her a bite of his apple. He reassures her that he is not the Biblical serpent offering Eve the forbidden fruit.

Rachel is impressed with Hornbeck's article, and she expresses hope that locals could read about evolution. She expresses surprise at his support given his cynicism, and Hornbeck reports that he is always a fan of the underdog. Rachel notes that he makes "it sound as if Bert is a hero," and then notes that she thinks Cates should have followed the rules set out by the school board. Hornbeck asks if she teaches her students about the nature of existence and she replies that "All the answers to those questions are in the Bible."

Hornbeck cannot believe she is this napve, and Rachel responds that she must be right if an important person like Brady comes to their little town to maintain the law. Hornbeck replies that Brady is in Hillsboro for publicity and little else. She notes that Brady is a champion of "ordinary people," and Hornbeck replies that progress has made these people obsolete.

The scene shifts to the town square once more, where the Storekeeper is closing up and discussing the heat with Mrs. McCain. Melinda enters and watches the monkey and the organ-grinder. They then leave, and Melinda is left alone on stage with Hornbeck watching from the shadows. Drummond then enters casting a long shadow, which terrifies Melinda, who she believes is the Devil. She runs off and Hornbeck steps out to welcome Drummond "to Hell."

Act 1, Scene 1 Analysis

The play begins with a seemingly innocent exchange between Howard and Melinda, but their talk is actually a symbol of the central conflict of the play. Howard has clearly been taught about evolution (presumably by Cates) and he represents the evolution side, while Melinda reflects the traditional Christian side that has been taught to her by her parents and her church. By using this symbol the playwrights are able to introduce the evolution versus creation fight playfully, and show from Melinda's reaction just how horrifying the thought of evolution is to the fundamentalist Christian town of Hillsboro.

The exchange between Rachel and Cates develops the theme further by showing that Rachel cares for Cates even though she believes that what he did was wrong. Her urging for him to apologize for his joke reflects that she cannot understand why he would believe the theory of evolution is possible. During the same exchange Cates scores a symbolic point when he tells her that all of her ideas about what is right in the world come from her father, rather than from any learning on her part. His reaction provides an example of the dangers of fundamentalism as shown in the play - the figures who reject Darwin's teachings do so without having read or tried to understand them, just as Rachel rejects them because her father says she should.

The character of Hornbeck is essential to the play. He is in a sense the narrator, providing insights into the events of the story. He also adds critical commentary, in particular when he discusses the difference between rural and urban beliefs and thought patterns. Hornbeck speaks in verse in parallel to the choruses in Greek drama. In this scene his exchange with Elijah allows the audience to see how ridiculous the idea of an illiterate prophet selling Bibles is, and further develops the theme of blind beliefs versus considered learning.

The character of Brady is both literally and figuratively larger than life, and he becomes a symbol of the power that Christian fundamentalist thought can have on a rural population. His message throughout this first scene is that he is there to champion the Bible in the face of an attack by evil forces; and the townsfolk quickly agree that he is right even though they admit that they have known Cates and liked him. Only Rachel tries to defend Cates and Brady resolves to use her knowledge of him to the prosecution's advantage, foreshadowing later events at the trial.

The final figure introduced in the chapter is Drummond, although we do not get to meet or hear from him. Instead he is introduced through the dire warnings about him exchanged by various townsfolk and by Brady. These exchanges serve to set up the trial as a titanic battle of good versus evil. It is an example of irony that Brady views himself as the underdog in this fight, given that the whole town and apparently the letter of the law stand against Cates. When Drummond finally does appear on the stage he is deliberately portrayed in a fiendish red light, but is again ironic that what the townsfolk view as an evil influence is in fact the intrusion of modern values into their sheltered community.

Act 1, Scene 2

Act 1, Scene 2 Summary

The scene begins in the courtroom, where the two sides are selecting the jury for Cates' trial. Davenport and Brady are interviewing Bannister, asking him if he goes to church. He responds that he does, and Davenport accepts him on the jury. Bannister heads for the jury box and the judge calls him back so Drummond can question him. Bannister notes that he wanted the front seat in the jury box. Drummond asks him why he wants the seat, and Bannister replies that he has heard the trial "is going to be quite a show."

Drummond goes on to ask Bannister whether he has read about evolution, and Bannister says no. He also asks whether he has read the Bible, and learns that Bannister cannot read. Drummond accepts him as a juror. The judge calls for another potential juror, and Brady proposes that they be allowed to remove their jackets because of the heat. The judge asks if Drummond objects to "Colonel Brady's motion" and Drummond says he is worried about the "dignity" of his suspenders, which turn out to be bright purple. Brady asks if they are fashionable in Chicago, and Drummond replies that he bought them in Brady's hometown in Nebraska. The crowd laughs, which visibly irritates Brady.

Meeker then presents Dunlap as a potential juror. Davenport asks if he believes in the Bible, and Dunlap responds that he believes "in the Holy Word of God" and in Brady himself. Davenport accepts him as a juror, and Drummond rejects him without asking any questions. Brady asks if Drummond is rejecting Dunlap because he believes in the Bible, and Drummond responds that Brady is free to reject any Evolutionists for their beliefs. Brady insists Drummond ask Dunlap a question at least, so Drummond asks Dunlap how he is before he rejects him once more.

Brady objects to "the note of levity" Drummond is bringing to the trial, and the judge notes his agreement "in spirit." Because the judge refers to Brady as a "Colonel" once more, Drummond objects to this term given Brady's lack of military service. The Judge explains Brady's honorary commission, and Drummond says that the title introduces prejudice against his client by making Brady appear heroic. The Judge asks what he can do, and Drummond proposes taking the commission back. The Judge asks the Mayor for guidance, and the Mayor says the commission cannot be revoked. Instead, he makes Drummond a "temporary Honorary Colonel" as well.

Drummond is stunned, and the Mayor tells him it will be permanent once the Governor signs the right form. The judge then invites both Colonels to talk to the next potential juror, George Sillers. Davenport asks Sillers whether he is a religious man. He says yes, and Brady begins to ask what Sillers would do if he had a child who told him about "a Godless teacher." Drummond cuts him off, objecting that Brady's question labels Cates. The judge agrees, and Brady then asks if he has any "opinions" about Cates. Sillers

responds, stating he does not really know about Cates, except for one business transaction. Brady then accepts him as a juror.

Drummond asks if Sillers is very religious. Sillers replies that he is busy at work, but his wife attends church regularly. Drummond then makes a comment implying that Sillers is concerned with this life, while his wife worries about going to Heaven. Davenport objects. Drummond shifts his questioning, asking Sillers if he knows anything about Darwin and whether he would have dinner with Darwin. Brady objects to the hypothetical question, and Drummond responds that he is helping the prosecution by discovering whether Sellers is "working at Evolution." Sillers responds that he works at a feed store, and Drummond accepts Sillers.

Brady notes that he is now not sure about Sillers, and he and Drummond have a quick exchange about having a fair trial. Brady makes the point that he wants a jury that "conforms to the laws and patterns of society," and Drummond points out that Brady wants a jury that all hold the same views. Brady tells Drummond that he is aware of how he tries to "twist and tangle" the thoughts of a jury, and mentions a case in which Drummond defended a publishing company in an immorality case. Drummond says that in that case he was defending free speech against "clock-stoppers" who wanted to keep society from moving forward.

The judge finally rules that both attorneys are out of order. He accepts the jury, and recesses the court for the day. He then announces a prayer meeting outside the courthouse that evening. Drummond objects, calling Brown's announcement a "commercial" for Brown's product (religion). He then objects to the "Read Your Bible" sign on the courthouse, and asks that it be taken down or that a "Read Your Darwin" sign be put up as well. The judge rules him out of order. When the judge leaves, many people come to shake Brady's hand. Drummond stands by himself until Rachel runs over to Cates and Drummond. She pleads with Drummond to call off the trial, noting that Cates will apologize.

Drummond asks Cates if he wants to quit, and Cates tells him he was not prepared for the spectacle of the trial. He notes that he is being treated worse than a murderer who was once caught in Hillsboro. He says the town treated the murderer as a curiosity, but that they are treating him like a Devil. Drummond responds that killing a wife is not as bad as killing an "old wives' tale, and that people who attack religion get special treatment. Rachel accuses him of making too many jokes, and Drummond says that laughter is essential to clear thinking. Cates says that he is too scared to laugh. Drummond says he would be a "damned fool" not to be scared.

Rachel then says that Drummond is making matters worse by swearing. Drummond responds that he thinks language is not working for communication, so he thinks all words should be used to help aid communication. Rachel accuses him of not caring about Cates, and Drummond says he does care about what Cates thinks of the issues. Rachel says she worries about what the town thinks of Cates, and Drummond says that she will not help him by making Cates appear to be a coward by apologizing. Drummond states his understanding that Cates must feel isolated and picked on. He

says he will allow Cates to plead guilty and apologize if he really believes he has committed a crime.

Rachel says that Cates does believe this, but Cates is not sure. After asking Drummond for advice and receiving none, Cates decides not to quit. Rachel is upset, and tells the two about Brady's plan to use her as a witness. Cates is shocked and notes that he has told her personal things. He adds that his questions about science were just questions, but that Brady will use them like they were opinions or beliefs. Meeker then ushers him out.

Drummond asks Rachel her name, and she asks if she can be forced to testify. He tells her she can be, and advises her not to be afraid of Brady. Rachel says she is afraid of her father, and that as a child she was afraid to go him when she was afraid of falling off the Earth. She adds that she was even more afraid of him than she was of falling. Drummond asks about her mother and learns that Rachel never knew her. She asks Drummond if Cates is a criminal, and Drummond tells her that he is probably a great man and that she is also strong for loving him. She replies that she is confusing Cates, and Drummond says that only fools are not confused and that it takes a strong man to say, "I don't know the answer!"

Act 1, Scene 2 Analysis

The second scene of the play takes place in the courtroom, which becomes the arena for the battle about to take place. As such, this scene establishes many of the central traits of both Drummond and Brady. To do so, the playwrights introduce three characters who represent the type of people found in Hillsboro. All three are conservative people who claim to be Christians, but each has a different degree of faith, as well as different reasons for wanting (or not wanting to be on the jury.

The first juror, Bannister, says that he is religious, but he is more interested in getting a good seat to watch the trial. This shows that not everyone in Hillsboro is as religious as Brady or Reverend Brown. This is also shown by the third potential juror, Sillers, who is more focused on work than religion. Dunlap is separated from the two by his zealous religious beliefs. He also professes a deep admiration for Brady; this is of course acceptable to Brady, but forces Drummond to reject him while making a point about the town's unique bias against Cates.

The styles of the two lawyers are not really all that different, and this means that they both play off of each other's strengths and weaknesses. Brady feels that the crowd in the courtroom is with him, and tries to use humor to keep this 'home court advantage' when he makes fun of Drummond's suspenders. His attempt is foiled, however, by Drummond's own sense of humor in noting that the suspenders were purchased in Brady's hometown.

While Brady tends to use pointed verbal jabs that make fun of Drummond based on the fact that the crowd will be critical of the big city lawyer, Drummond seems to always

have an answer and be able to turn Brady's words against him. This strategy proves to be very effective in frustrating Brady. Drummond's use of irony to defeat Brady's sense of entitlement or moral righteousness will prove to be a very important factor in the outcome of the trial.

The second example of this ironic "bubble-bursting" comes when he launches an attack on Brady's honorary title. While Drummond's objection to the title seems to be based on combating an unfair advantage, he is really attacking the sense of self-importance that Brady exudes. He is surprised when the Mayor rewards him with a similar title, but the effect is the same as if he had been successful in stripping Brady of his title: Drummond is made the equal of his highly respected opponent, thus humiliating Brady.

The exchange between Rachel, Drummond and Cates at the end of the scene is important for several reasons. First, it allows Drummond to see Brady's strategy of using Rachel against Cates. Second, it shows a more serious and dedicated side of Drummond, who has to this point appeared merely to be sarcastic and almost mean. Drummond's "pep talk" gives Cates strength and reassures Rachel, who is struggling to break free of her father's expectations of her. Finally, it shows the audience that Cates has strong convictions. The arrival of Drummond and Hornbeck may have caused the audience to think that external forces were driving Cates' trial. Cates declaration that he will fight the charges shows that he himself has started the fight and plans to finish it.

Act 2, Scene 1

Act 2, Scene 1 Summary

The scene opens on the lawn of the courthouse. Two workmen are building a platform for the prayer meeting. One asks the other whether he thinks they should take down the "Read Your Bible" banner, as Drummond has suggested. The other replies that they will leave it up because, "The Devil don't run this town."

Brady enters, giving a speech for a group of reporters. While the other reporters are hanging on every word, Hornbeck is simply listening. A reporter from England asks Brady about Drummond. Brady notes that he and Drummond were friends at one time. This friendship included Drummond helping Brady in his campaign for the presidency in 1908. Brady goes on to say, however, that he would oppose anyone who was challenging the Bible, even if the person was very close to him.

After the other reporters leave, Brady tells Hornbeck that he does not like the bias he sees against him in Hornbeck's articles. Hornbeck tells him that he is not an objective reporter of the facts. Instead he sees himself as a critic. Brady suggests that he attends Brown's prayer meeting for "enlightenment," and Hornbeck responds that as a member of the press he wants to see the entire "show."

Reverend Brown escorts Mrs. Brady into the town square, and Mrs. Brady immediately starts trying to keep Brady warm. Brown is all business, assuring Brady that the townsfolk are "fervent in their belief" and starting his meeting on time. As he is ready to speak, Drummond joins the crowd to watch. Brown begins by retelling the story of Genesis, with the crowd chanting responses and a man singing supporting verses. When he finally reaches the creation of man the crowd has reached a fever pitch. He asks them to affirm their beliefs, and they respond with a crescendo of cheering. Rachel has entered during his speech, and she has watched and listened at the edge of the crowd.

Brown then asks the crowd if they "curse" anyone who defies the word of God, indicating the jail nearby. The crowd is with him as he continues to denounce Cates. Rachel begins to shake and turn pale as her father calls on God to strike down Cates as an unbeliever. Finally she bolts into the midst of the crowd, pleading with her father to forgive Cates. Brown is caught up in the frenzy, and tells the crowd that God should curse his own daughter for defending Cates.

Brady intervenes, urging Brown to back off of his hard stance. Brady then preaches forgiveness to the crowd, and urges them to go home. Finally, just Brady and Drummond are left on the stage. Brady asks his old friend why he has "moved so far away" from him, and Drummond replies that it is possible that Brady has moved away "by standing still." Brady goes out, leaving Drummond alone on stage as the scene ends.

Act 2, Scene 1 Analysis

The worker's discussion at the beginning of the scene shows that Drummond is still viewed as a Devil after the first day of the trial. By contrast Brady is portrayed as a kind of angelic leader with a flock of sheep-like reporters in his wake. His confrontation with Hornbeck shows a kind of arrogance that symbolizes his character. He challenges Hornbeck to defend his bias, and instead of listening he urges Hornbeck to see the light by attending the meeting. Hornbeck fires back quickly, likening the meeting to a "show" or farce.

The prayer meeting itself is frightening in its intensity. It shows just how deeply the townsfolk accept Brown's words and their meaning, but it also shows that the town seems to have no other form of entertainment. Their "fervor" as Brown had called it is extreme, but the playwrights use this scene to make it clear that there really is only one acceptable line of thinking in the play - that of fundamentalist Christianity.

Even Brady is made a little uncomfortable by Brown's words, and he quickly gets the crowd to accept that forgiveness is equally Christian. This demonstration of how the crowd can be changed by adding new thoughts foreshadows their sudden change when they are enlightened by some of Drummond's questions and suppositions later in the play.

The exchange between Drummond and Brady that ends the scene can be seen as a symbol of the battle between progress and "old-fashioned values." While Brady cannot accept that his old friend does not share the same beliefs and ideas, Drummond tells him that he has merely been learning and changing as a person, which Brady has not done. His words foreshadow his later insistence that the way of life that Brady champions has already been replaced in most of America.

Act 2, Scene 2

Act 2, Scene 2 Summary

The scene opens in the courtroom two days later. The weather is still hot, and Howard is on the witness stand looking "wretched in a starched collar and Sunday suit." Brady questions Howard about what Cates taught, and Howard relates some of the basics of evolution. He starts with the idea that life evolved from cells over several million years. He goes on to say how humans evolved from monkeys. Brady ridicules the idea of "Evil-ution," and then asks if Cates ever taught the story of creation from the book of Genesis.

When Howard says that Cates did not, Brady looks as though he is preparing for a speech. Drummond objects, but without waiting for an answer from the judge, Brady goes into his speech. He begins by summarizing Howard's testimony, and argues that Howard has been confused by Cates's teachings. He goes on to say that "Evil-utionists" are actually selling poison in the books they write and teach. He tells the jury that if Cates is not punished Howard may become a Godless person, but that if he is punished the "faithful" will call the courtroom "blessed."

As he comes to cross-examine, Howard Drummond jokes that he is glad Brady did not make a speech, but the crowd is against him. He asks Howard if Cates had taught him that the world was once thought flat. Howard tells him about Darwin's book, and Drummond asks Howard if he thinks there is anything wrong with that book. Davenport objects that Drummond is asking Howard to comment on morality. Drummond responds that he is showing that people have a right to think. The judge tells him "the right to think is not on trial," but Drummond argues that it is on trial and is in danger from this court case. Brady insists that it is Cates who is on trial, and Drummond responds that he is on trial because he "chooses to speak what he thinks."

Drummond asks Howard if the "fuss and feathers" over evolution has hurt him in any way. Howard says he does not think it has hurt him. Drummond asks if Howard has murdered anyone, and Davenport objects. Brady urges Drummond to ask about Howard's faith. Drummond dismisses Brady and asks Howard if he believes what Cates taught. Howard says he is not sure. Drummond then asks him if he thinks a tractor or telephone is evil because they are not mentioned in the Bible. Brady objects, and accuses Drummond of trying to bewilder Howard by confusing "material thinks with the great spiritual realities of the Revealed World." He asks Drummond if "right" has meaning for him.

Drummond responds that right "has no meaning to me whatever," and that Truth is more important to him. He goes on to say that he does not like the way society measures the things people do against an arbitrary "grid of morality." He then asks Howard if he understands, and the young man is clearly confused by Drummond's words. The Judge ends Howard off, and Davenport calls Rachel to the stand. As she comes in, the stage

directions note that Cates looks at her with a "hopeless expression" like his last friend in the world has turned against him.

Brady asks if she and Cates went to the same church, and Rachel responds that Cates left her church after her father preached a funeral sermon for a young boy who drowned. Since the boy was un-baptized, Rachel says her father preached that the boy died not "in a state of grace." Cates interjects that Brown had said the boy was going to Hell, and Dunlap rises, calling Cates a "sinner." Cates continues, arguing that religion is supposed to be comforting rather than frightening. The judge calls for order, and Drummond asks that Cates' words be taken off the record. When the Judge agrees, Brady notes that Cates' "bigoted opinions" cannot be stricken from the community's memory.

Brady asks Rachel for Cates' opinions of religion. Drummond objects, calling this hearsay, but the judge allows the question. Brady asks Rachel to repeat some of Cates' words about God. Rachel hesitates, and Brady reminds her of their conversation on the day of his arrival. The judge tells Rachel she must answer. When Rachel cannot bring herself to answer, Brady asks about her own reaction when Cates told her that "Man created God!" Drummond objects, but Rachel now tells Brady that Cates had said that "God created Man in His own image - and Man, being a gentleman, returned the compliment." Brady continues to press Rachel, asking about his views on marriage as being similar to "the breeding of animals." Rachel is stunned and becomes speechless. Brady asks that she be dismissed. Drummond objects, but Cates urges him to leave Rachel alone. The judge dismisses Rachel, and Brown comes to help her leave the stand.

Davenport then rests the prosecution's case. Drummond begins his case by calling a zoology professor, and Brady objects, arguing that zoology is irrelevant. Drummond argues that he wants the professor to explain the theory of evolution, but Brady argues that it is against the law for this testimony to be heard. He adds that it is not allowed in school and it should not be allowed in a courtroom. The judge agrees.

Drummond then tries to call a professor of geology and archaeology, and is again refused. He asks the judge if the court will dismiss all of these sciences, and the judge says that these sciences "do not relate to this point of law." Drummond then tries to call an anthropologist and philosopher, and Brady objects once more. Drummond then argues to the judge that all of the defense's witnesses are important for Cates' defense because they show that what Cates taught is not a crime but is instead scientific fact. The judge responds that the court does not need experts to question the validity of the law. Drummond asks if this means he cannot call any experts on Darwin, and the Judge says that this is the case.

Drummond then appears to have a thought, and asks if he could call an expert on the Bible. Brady welcomes this idea, and Drummond then surprises the courtroom by calling Brady to the stand. Davenport objects, but Brady agrees to do so. Davenport and the judge advise against this, but Brady says that he will speak out "on behalf of the

Living Truth of the Holy Scriptures." Drummond starts by asking if Brady is an expert, and Brady notes that he has studied the Bible intensively and tried to follow its words.

Drummond asks if he has memorized the whole Bible, and Brady responds that he has memorized a few parts. Drummond then asks if he has memorized any of Darwin's "Origin of Species," and Brady says that he has not. Drummond learns that Brady has not read the book, and then asks how Brady can lead a "holy war" against a book he does not even know is incompatible with the Bible. Drummond then tries to read from "Origin of Species," and Davenport objects that Drummond is trying to go around the judge's earlier ruling. The judge agrees.

Drummond picks up a Bible and asks if Brady is an expert on it, and whether everything in it should be taken literally. Brady says, "Everything in the Bible should be accepted, exactly as it is given," so Drummond asks if the story of Jonah should be accepted as true. Brady says that he believes that God can make anything happen. Drummond then asks whether Joshua really stopped the sun, and when Brady nods he compares this to a magic trick. Drummond then presses Brady on this point, questioning whether Brady believes that the Earth rotates around the sun. Brady reiterates his faith in the Bible, and notes that the sun stopped. Drummond notes that if this had happened there would have been catastrophic natural disasters on Earth, with the Earth stopping its rotation and crashing into the sun.

Brady replies that this did not happen, and Drummond notes that natural law says that it must have. He then asks if Brady dismisses all scientific thought, including Copernicus' teachings about orbital mechanics. Brady notes that God created science and can "cancel it" as he sees fit. Drummond then asks how Cain had a wife when God only created Adam and Eve. Brady says that he never questioned this part of the Bible. Drummond asks if he thinks "somebody pulled off another creation, over in the next county," but Brady maintains that he believes in the Bible.

Drummond goes on to ask about the many passages in the Bible describing the lineage of important figures, and asks whether people "begat" in the same way then as now. Brady replies that they did, and Drummond then asks Brady's opinion of sex as an expert on the Bible. Brady tells him that sex is "original sin." Drummond then notes that the people in the Bible all seemed to be pretty sinful. Davenport objects and Drummond insists that he must be allowed to examine his one allowable witness. Brady states that he is willing to "endure" Drummond's questioning because his old friend is proving the prosecution's case "by his contempt for all that is holy."

Drummond objects to Brady's accusation, noting that as an agnostic he holds that the human mind is holy. He adds that a child's power to learn is more of a miracle that all of Christianity's symbols, and asks whether the progress that has been made as a result of science must be stopped because of the Bible. He tells the jury that all progress has come at a cost, such as telephones destroying privacy and the "charm of distance." He argues that Darwin has provided another such advance, and that the cost is the belief in the "pleasant poetry of Genesis."

Brady argues that people must keep their faith, and Drummond asks why God gave man the "plague" of the ability to think. He asks whether Brady agrees that thinking is what separates humans from animals, and compares mankind to other animals, including elephants, mosquitoes, and the sponge. He asks Brady if a sponge thinks, and Brady says that he does not know. A stage direction at this point notes that the crowd is "slipping away from Brady and aligning itself more and more with Drummond." Drummond asks again and Brady replies that a sponge obeys God's will and can think if God wants it to. Drummond then asks if man has the same privileges as a sponge, and then says that Cates "wishes to think" just as a sponge is allowed to by God. The crowd reacts with support for Drummond, and Brady is surprised.

Brady objects that Cates is wrong because he has no faith. Drummond replies that Cates just does not have the same notion of right that Brady has. He takes a rock from one of his witnesses and asks Brady how old it is. Brady makes a joke, but Drummond tells him that one of his scientists says the rock is 10 million years old. Drummond shows Brady a fossil in the rock, and Brady replies that the Bible says that the world is not more than 6,000 years old. Brady notes that a Biblical scholar has determined that Creation occurred in 4004 BC. Drummond replies that this is an opinion, and Brady says that it is solid fact based on mathematical computations.

Drummond belittles this theory, and then asks how long the first day was. He proposes that the first day could not have been 24 hours because the sun was not created yet. Brady says he does not know and begins to appear flustered, saying that he does "not think about" these types of questions. Drummond then gets Brady to admit that the "first day" could have been 25 hours long, and once Brady admits this Drummond then proposes that the first day could even have been 10 million years long.

Davenport objects and the judge threatens to clear the courtroom. Brady and Drummond then start arguing back and forth. Brady accuses Drummond of trying to "destroy everybody's belief in the Bible, and in God." Drummond says that he wants to keep the religious community from "controlling the education of the United States!" Their argument eventually leads to Brady telling Drummond that he follows orders he hears directly from God. Drummond then ridicules Brady by stating that he has been chosen by God to pass on "God's orders" to the rest of the world. A stage direction indicates that the crowd is laughing at Brady, and that Brady is pained by this laughter.

Drummond then proposes that if anyone is "against Brady" they are "against God." Brady responds that people have freedom of choice, and Drummond immediately asks why Cates is then in jail. The crowd cheers, and Drummond asks what would happen if Cates was able to get a law passed insisting that "only Darwin should be taught." Brady calls this ridiculous, and Drummond then equates Brady with God to applause from the crowd. Brady continues to object, but Drummond is in full oratory now. He extols Brady's holiness, and asks what would happen if another person (such as Cates or Darwin) dared to oppose Brady's thoughts. As Brady stands, Drummond says that a "Book of Brady" should be added to the Bible.

Brady then attempts to speak, and Drummond says that he is finished with the witness. Brady continues to try and "win back" the support of the audience. He starts listing the names of the books in the Bible, and the judge finally tells him he is excused. Brady continues to speak, and the judge adjourns the court. The spectators congregate around Drummond, and the reporters start writing down what he says. Davenport and the Judge leave together, with Davenport asking for Brady's testimony to be stricken from the record. Mrs. Brady comes to comfort Brady, who is upset because the crowd has laughed at him. She "cradles" her husband in her arms and rocks him gently to comfort him.

Act 2, Scene 2 Analysis

This scene contains the central action of the play, which includes both the central witnesses for the prosecution and Drummond's case in defense of the play. The scene shows significant changes in the characters of both lawyers. Brady begins the scene with great confidence, sure that he has the moral high ground, while Drummond starts out with an almost defeatist attitude as he watches Brady do whatever he wants in the courtroom. Their positions change by the end of the scene, however, with Drummond pressing hard to show that Brady is a self centered man rather than the popular leader he claims to be.

The first witness on the stand is Howard, who becomes a significant symbol of how the creationism versus evolution battle plays out in the real world. While Brady makes it clear that his position is that Cates has poisoned the young man's mind with heretical thoughts, Drummond tells the court that Cates is merely giving Howard the right to think about the issues. By trying to get the court to consider an individual's right to think Drummond is trying to make the case more about freedom than it is about breaking the law, since Cates has clearly violated the law by teaching material not approved by the school board. In a sense, Drummond is not trying to say that Cates did not break the law, but is rather trying to show that the law is foolish.

One of the chief differences between the two lawyers (and their respective "sides") becomes clear throughout the scene: while Brady thinks in terms of absolute right and wrong, Drummond tends to take a more thoughtful view. Although Brady had stopped Reverend Brown from damning his own daughter in the previous scene, he has no trouble in exploiting Rachel's obvious emotional distress to show that she thinks that Cates is wrong for his actions. Drummond, on the other hand, listens to Cates and refuses to torture Rachel with any further questions.

Rachel's retelling of the young boy's funeral also shows how Cates has developed from a religious person to a person who thinks a bit more freely, which helps to explain why he has chosen to defy the law. Indeed, Cates rises and speaks out in defiance of Rachel's father and argues that a church should be comforting. His words make the reader think of Brady's message of forgiveness in the earlier scene, thus making Cates appear less like an evil "Bible-hater" and more like a considerate Christian.

Drummond faces an uphill battle when he starts to present his case, since the judge and Brady refuse to allow the law itself to be put on trial. When he cannot follow through with his original plan of presenting scientific evidence to show the Bible is wrong, he decides instead to show that even the Bible's greatest defender cannot refute scientific evidence. He has two great advantages in pursuing this line of assault. One is the arrogance of Brady, who feels that his own moral certainty will help refute Drummond's claims. The second advantage he has is the crowd, which he works hard to win over to his cause.

The reason that the crowd is so important has a great deal to do with Brady's character. Throughout the play he is described as a character who feeds off the support of others, and the stage directions make it clear that he considers this trial as the most important moment of his life. When Drummond shows that Brady can have doubts about the Bible and that the support of the populace can be turned to jeers and humiliation, Brady loses his credibility as a leader. Brady also loses popularity with the crowd, and this hurts him deeply.

The central idea that emerges from Brady's testimony is a question of time. What Drummond achieves with his examination of Brady is not that the Bible is wrong, but that Darwin's theory is not incompatible with the Bible. When he is able to do this in an amusing and charming way, without showing disrespect for the Bible itself, he manages to convince the spectators that Darwin's theories may just be acceptable. He also manages to get Brady to admit that human beings can think and choose for themselves, which proves the point he is trying to make in his case. By the end of the scene, Drummond has won a kind of moral victory; even though he knows he cannot defend Cates' actions against the law, he has shown that the law is somewhat foolish.

Act 3

Act 3 Summary

The act begins in the courtroom, where the lawyers and the defendant are waiting for the jury to return a verdict. The stage directions indicate that Drummond is calm and "meditative," while Brady "escapes from reality" by eating a box lunch like an alcoholic taking a drink. Hornbeck enters and asks Brady about the jury. He then moves to Drummond and notes that he will be sad when the trial ends and they have to leave Hillsboro.

Cates then asks Drummond whether he will be going to prison. Drummond says that "They could," and Cates worries that he will not be allowed visitors. Drummond replies cryptically that the conflict ("fire") over Cates' case has spread far and wide, and that "a lot of people's shoes are getting hot." This is a clear reference to Brady, who leaves the courtroom. Cates then says that Brady seems sure of the verdict, and Drummond tells him that no one can tell what the jury will do but that as a lawyer he can "smell the way a jury's thinking." When Cates asks what he thinks, Drummond tells him about a friend who only takes sure winners and wins every case, like a jockey who only rides the fastest horses.

Cates comments that Drummond picked a long shot. Drummond notes that he thinks the law is like a horse race. He comments that he feels like he rides very fast and gets nowhere. He compares the situation to a "merry-go-round, or a rocking horse." He then reminisces about Golden Dance, a rocking horse he wanted as a child but was not able to afford. His parents eventually bought it for him as a present, and he broke it the first time he rode it. It turned out that the wood was rotten and the horse was "all shine, and no substance." He advises Cates to look for these kinds of deceptions in life and always expose them.

The judge and a radio man then enter, discussing where to put a microphone. The Mayor enters and advises the judge that politicians in the state capitol are worried that the trial will upset voters in an election year. The radio man then tests his microphone, and Drummond asks why he is there. The radio man tells him that he will be announcing the verdict on Chicago radio once the jury returns. Drummond then uses the words "God" and "hell" near the microphone, causing the radio man to worry about him swearing on the radio. Brady then enters, and asks the radio man to ensure that the microphone is picking up his voice while he is speaking.

Meeker then enters and brings back the jury. Cates asks Drummond if he can read the jurors' expressions. Drummond does not answer, and Cates looks around for Rachel who is not there. The radio man then announces that he is reporting from the courtroom of the "Hillsboro Monkey Trial case." The judge asks the jury for a verdict, and Sillers hands it to the judge. The judge announces that Cates has been found guilty. The crowd reacts with "some cheers, applause, 'Amens,'" and "some boos." Brady is happy, but the

stage directions indicate that Brady has been changed from the powerful figure he once was.

Hornbeck invites the crowd to by "tickets for the Middle Ages." The judge calls for Cates to rise for sentencing, and then starts to announce the sentence. Drummond objects and asks if Cates can make a statement. The judge agrees, and Cates starts to speak. He tells the judge that he thinks he has "been convicted of violating an unjust law," and promises to continue to fight against the law. The stage directions note that part of the crowd applaud his words, and that Brady is very upset that his victory has not been as triumphant as he had hoped.

The judge then announces that Cates is guilty, and that since no one has been convicted of breaking this particular law he has to decide on a sentence himself. He orders Cates to pay a $100 fine, which causes surprise in the crowd and upsets Brady. Brady calls for a "more drastic punishment," and Drummond announces Cates' intention to appeal to the state Supreme Court. The judge agrees to give Drummond 30 days to prepare for the appeal. Brady asks to read some "remarks" he has prepared. Drummond objects, noting Brady can say anything he wants in other forums. The judge agrees, and adjourns the court.

The stage directions indicate the crowd is confused, and Melinda asks Howard who won. Howard notes that he does not know but that "the whole thing's over!" A Hawker enters, selling Eskimo Pies and lemonade. The judge calls for everyone to be quiet and listen to Brady, and then speaks to Hornbeck, who pays Cates' bond. The Judge then tries again to get the remaining spectators to listen to Brady. Some of the crowd quiets down, but others do not pay attention. Brady starts to speak, gathering some more attention from the crowd. The stage directions indicate that the crowd is not as interested as it once was.

He begins speaking about how the anti-evolution law is almost Biblical. The radio man interrupts and moves him closer to the microphone. Brady is described in the directions as a kind of statue or inanimate object, and the crowd starts to drift away. Brady begins to rally all his powers of speech, but the crowd starts leaving. The radio man ends the broadcast and leaves. Brady continues trying to speak, but eventually he falls down with heart attack-like symptoms. Davenport calls for a doctor, and a woman prays to God for help. Meeker shoves her aside, and some men carry Brady away.

As they do so, Brady begins giving a speech accepting the Presidency. The stage directions describe this speech as a kind of secret treasure that Brady has kept hidden. The crowd leaves, leaving Hornbeck, Cates and Drummond. Drummond comments that it must have been sad for Brady to lose the presidency three times. Hornbeck then responds in verse that an "also-ran" is almost always an orator like Brady. Meeker enters without news on Brady's condition, saying that he is surprised more people haven't passed out in the heat. Hornbeck responds again expressing the opinion that Brady will be back on his feet after he sweats out some of the food he has eaten.

Cates then acts worried, and Drummond asks what is wrong. Cates asks whether he won or not and Drummond tells him that he did win, despite the jury's verdict. Drummond tells him that he "smashed a bad law" and will become famous, but Cates wonders what he will do in the short term. Drummond tells him he will have difficulty for a while but that he will help "the next fella" who faces the same situation. Cates then asks Meeker if he has to be locked up, and Meeker tells him that Hornbeck has paid his bond (bail). Hornbeck tells Cates jokingly that his newspaper gives a year of freedom to every new subscriber.

Rachel then enters and tells Cates she is leaving her father. She tells him she has read Darwin, and that although she does not agree with it she thinks it is "beside the point" (indicating that free speech is more important.) She then apologizes to Drummond and explains that she has not really used her thinking powers before this point because "it seemed safer not to think." She adds that she now believes that ideas need to come out, whether people agree with them or not. She and Cates share a tender moment, and the stage directions indicate that Drummond thinks she is very impressive.

The Judge then re-enters and tells them that Brady has died. Drummond and Cates seem upset, but Hornbeck asks Drummond why they should mourn for him. He goes on to call Brady a "Barnum-bunkum Bible-beating bastard!" Drummond calls Hornbeck a "smart-aleck" and tells him not to spit on Brady-s religion. Hornbeck is surprised that Drummond is defending Brady, and Drummond tells him that Brady had greatness. Hornbeck then proposes an obituary "For a man who's been dead thirty years," and turns to the Bible looking for a line Brady had quoted.

Drummond then quotes it from memory: "He that troubleth his own house shall inherit the wind: and the fool shall be servant to the wise in heart." Hornbeck is surprised that an agnostic can quote the Bible. Drummond then accuses Hornbeck of writing only destructive things. Hornbeck then accuses Drummond of only being kind to Brady because he is dead. Drummond says again that Brady was once great, but that he lost his way by looking for God "too high up and too far away." Hornbeck accuses him of being more religious than Brady, and says that he is going to write a story exposing Drummond's hypocrisy.

Cates then tries to pay Drummond, and Drummond says he did not do it for money. He announces his intention to leave on the next train. Rachel suggests that she and Cates leave as well, and the two run off to get Cates' belongings. Drummond notices that they have left the copy of Darwin behind. Drummond then weighs the Darwin book against the Bible, and eventually takes both books with him when he leaves.

Act 3 Analysis

This act sees the development of two of the play's main characters, Cates and Rachel. For Cates, this development comes when Drummond uses the story of his childhood rocking horse to illustrate that Brady's appearance of confidence does not always lead

to success. To Cates, who has been worried about losing to the charismatic Brady, this represents a real confidence boost.

The "Golden Dancer" becomes a powerful symbol in the play, showing how something that is popular and attractive on the outside can be rotten to the core. This symbol is equated with Brady's oratory, and while the playwrights do not explicitly say that fundamentalist Christianity is wrong, they are able to make the case that old ideas are not always the best ideas. The play develops both as a result of the Scopes Monkey Trial but also as an expression of confidence in the idea of progress and development, which are especially important in the 1960s environment of social change in which Lawrence and Lee wrote the play.

The action around the verdict and Brady's collapse shows that Drummond has achieved a final and complete victory over his old friend, even if Brady has won the case against Cates from a legal standpoint. While he has won in the courtroom, Brady has lost his ability to inspire and preach to the crowd, and the playwrights make it clear that the loss of support is what causes Brady to collapse. In a sense, the powerful lawyer dies of a broken heart once he sees that he has been beaten and humiliated by Drummond, and that the crowd no longer cares about what he says. By contrast, it is almost as though Drummond has been able to turn on the lights for the people of Hillsboro, opening their minds to new thoughts and idea.

Rachel's development comes full circle in the play. At the beginning she tries to persuade Cates to apologize, and it is clear that she subscribes to her father's fundamental Christian point of view. But in this act she makes it clear that she has broken free of the fear that her father has inspired in her and has begun thinking for herself. Her development has resulted partly from Drummond's passionate defense of Cates, and partly from her father's and Brady's attacks on her. Once her own father has damned her it is not hard to see why she decides to leave Hillsboro and start a new life with Cates.

The last image of the play, with Drummond balancing the volume of Darwin against the Bible, is an important symbol. It shows the playwrights' conviction that people should take a balanced approach to any new ideas. Although Hornbeck has described Drummond throughout the play as an agnostic, he takes both books with him. This combined with his demonstration of his knowledge of the Bible in both the second and third acts shows that he is the kind of thinker that can appreciate ideas from different sides. It also shows that while he worked to humiliate Brady, he is still able to respect the ideas that Brady tried to express through his oratory and his love of the Bible.

Characters

Matthew Harrison Brady

Matthew Harrison Brady has run for the Presidency of the United States three times all unsuccessfully. But, that does not detract from his power as an orator and a politician. His experience with national politics has made him enjoy being in the spotlight, especially hearing the sound of his own voice and the adulation of an audience of devoted followers. Despite his losses in three national elections, Brady remains popular among the rural citizenry because of his staunchly conservative and fundamentalist interpretation of the Bible. Although it is never expressly stated, there is a suggestion that Brady will use the publicity of this trial to launch a fourth run for the country's highest office.

Sarah Brady

Although she is Brady's wife, she seems more like his mother. She is constantly looking out for his welfare, reminding him not to overeat, to watch his activity level, to take a nap, and to be careful of the "treacherous" night breezes. She gathers him into her arms and comforts him after his humiliation at the hands of Drummond at the end of Act II.

Rachel Brown

Rachel Brown is, like her accused boyfriend, Bert, a schoolteacher. She is also the daughter of the fiery Reverend Brown, a staunch defender of creationism. Rachel is squarely in the middle of the central argument of the play. If she sides with Bert because she loves him, she abandons her father and her religious faith. If she sides with her father's beliefs, she deserts the man she loves. A kind and gentle person who would rather give in than fight, Rachel must confront her own beliefs and doubts and discover what is most important in her life.

Reverend Jeremiah Brown

Reverend Brown is the voice of unyielding fundamentalism. If Bert is the representation of freedom of thought, Brown is his opposite. He believes that everything in the Bible is true "as written" and that anything that calls that truth into question is blasphemy. When Rachel protests his damnation of Bert during an impassioned sermon in Act II, Reverend Brown's religious fervor provokes him to curse his own daughter.

Bert Gates

Bert Gates is a quiet, reserved schoolteacher. Even though he disagrees with the Reverend Brown's view of religion, Bert taught evolution because he thought that it was unjust to keep new ideas from people simply because they might be in conflict with someone's religious views. He is not a rabble-rouser. In fact, he does not like all the hoopla his case has stirred up and nearly admits defeat so that he can return his life to normal.

Henry Drummond

The attorney for the defense, Henry Drummond, has defended some of the most notorious criminals in America. His courtroom demeanor passionate, charming, and witty seems at odds with the quiet and reserved behavior we see in private. He sees the law as a vehicle to search for the truth. He has the heart of an idealist but knows full well the reality of the law. His purpose in coming to Hillsboro is not to represent a schoolteacher who has broken a law but to defend the rights of an individual to think and reason without interference from the government.

E. K. Hornbeck

A cynical big-city reporter, Hornbeck enjoys lampooning the simple life of Hillsboro as well as their skeptical view of evolution. He takes particular pleasure in skewering Brady and his ideas. He views himself as the sole possesor of the "real" truth and scoffs at any and all who don't see the world as he does. As an element in the play itself, Hornbeck represents the "intellectual elite," while, at the same time, he serves as the comic relief.

Themes

Individual vs. Machine

Jerome Lawrence said in an interview with Nina Couch that "almostif notall of our plays share the theme of the dignity of every individual mind." The machine in this case is a combination of government and traditional thought, which are allied in *Inherit the Wind* to serve as adversaries against the right to think freely and exchange or teach those thoughts. In the exchange with Brady on the witness stand, Drummond asks the witness if he believes a sponge thinks and if a man has the same privileges that a sponge does. When Brady responds in the affirmative, Drummond raises his voice for the first time and roars that his client "wishes to be accorded the same privileges as a sponge. He wishes to think." Drummond explores this idea further when he offers the supposition that "an un-Brady thought might still be holy." Drummond further illustrates his belief in the dignity of the individual mind after Brady's death when he asserts to Hornbecfc that Brady had just as much right to his strict religious views as that the reporter does to his liberal ideals.

God and Religion

The idea of separation of church and state is as old as the American Republic itself, and it continues to be a source of controversy to this day. The central question of the play asks if the government, as represented by the city of Hillsboro and the laws of the state of Tennessee, should make decisions regarding what people can believe. Should one particular way of looking at the world be preferred over another? The question about the authority of the Bible also raises concerns: which translation or edition should be adopted as the "official" version of events? Drummond comments that the Bible is a good book but not the only resource with which to view the world. God and religion are not the antagonists in *Inherit the Wind*, however, but merely provide the raw materials that people like Brady and Reverend Brown will use to combat Bert's teaching of evolution. Like many lessons in blind faith, the play illustrates how unyielding devotion to a set of beliefs can lead a person to refute even the most obvious of truths. The play's optimism lies with Rachel and Bert, who, it is suggested, will find a balance between religion and science in their life together

Custom and Tradition

In 1925, the world was changing. Radio was beginning to replace the newspaper as a source of information. This, along with the widespread implementation of the telephone, provided a means for quickly relaying facts from one point to another. Technologies such as these brought new thought processes to once-isolated rural towns, new ways of seeing and interpreting the world. There were enormous social changes taking place as well.Women had recently earned the right to vote, and many blacks were planting the

seeds that would flower into the civil rights movement of the 1960s. To many people accustomed to a set way of life, these new developments presented a threat. One approach to dealing with this rapid change was to ignore it and retreat into their old, comfortable ways. When new modes of thinking threatened to change these traditions, people became uncomfortable, rejecting the "new" simply because it was not familiar. Not only did Bert's teaching of evolution represent a new way of thinking, to many it attacked the most sacred of all traditions, religion and thus their very way of life. Whereas many of the townfolk are fearful of this change, people like Brady and the Reverend resent it because it threatens their prosperity and power the more people blindly believe, the easier they are to manipulate. Drummond's comment that maybe Brady had moved away by standing still illustrates how the prosecutor has profited from encouraging a stagnation of thought.

Appearances and Reality

When Drummond tells the story of Golden Dancer, he outlines the characteristics of appearances and reality. A toy-store rocking horse, Golden Dancer's bright red mane, blue eyes, and golden color with purple spots dazzled the young Drummond. His parents worked extra and surprised him with the horse as a birthday present, and, when the excited boy jumped on the horse to ride, it broke in two. There was no substance to the object of Drummond's desire, only "spit and sealing wax." Drummond wants Gates, and by extension the audience of the play, to look closely at the arguments of people like Brady and Reverend Brown. They may have no more substance than Golden Dancer.

Style

Image and Irony

The stage directions call for the courtroom to be in the foreground. This is appropriate as the site of the drama's action. The directions also call for the town to be "visible always, looming there, as much on trial as the individual defendant." This "image" of the town on trial presents the central irony of the play: Bert Gates is on trial for his forward thinking, while the town of Hillsboro is on trial for its backward thinking.

Extended Metaphor

At the beginning of Act ffl, before the jury returns with the verdict, Drummond muses aloud about Golden Dancer. As a child, Drummond had seen a brightly colored rocking horse in a store window, and his parents, through extra work and sacrifice, bought the toy for the young Drummond as a birthday present. When he jumped on it to start to ride, the horse broke apart. "The wood was rotten, the whole thing was put together with spit and sealing wax! All shine and no substance." This brief monologue suggests why Drummond takes on "unpopular" cases. "If something is a lie," Drummond tells Gates, "show it up for what it really is!" By illustrating this point with a story rather than by simply having Drummond make a blanket statement, the playwrights direct the viewer/reader's attention to the idea behind the action.

Symbolism

Throughout the play, Lawrence and Lee present a variety of symbols for consideration. Much of the verbal symbolism comes from Hornbeck's cynical perspective. He refers to Brady as "A man who wears a cathedral for a cloak/A church spire for a hat" and as a "Yesterday Messiah," referring to Brady's religious position on the issue of evolution. Hornbeck's snide comments on Hillsboro as the "buckle on the Bible Belt" and "Heavenly Hillsboro" paint the town in a backward, unfavorable light. His allusion to the Biblical creation story, where he tells Rachel he is not the serpent and the apple he has just bitten does not come from the Tree of Knowledge, again focuses attention on the central argument of the play.

Artistic License

Here are some instances where Lee and Lawrence modified history so that *Inherit the Wind* would stand separate from the historical trial. (The names of the historical characters are used in this list for convenience.)

1. The trial originated, not in Dayton, Tennessee, but in the New York City offices of the American Civil Liberties Union. It was this organization that ran an announcement in

Tennessee newspapers, offering to pay the expenses of any teacher willing to test the New Tennessee anti-evolution law.

2 When a group of Dayton leaders decided to take advantage of this offer, their main reason was not so much defense of religion as it was economics. They saw the trial as a great means of publicity that would attract business and industry to Dayton.

3. Others responsible for the trial were the media who worked hard to persuade Bryan and Darrow to participate in the trial.

4. John T Scopes was not a martyr for academic freedom He volunteered to help test the law, even though he could not remember ever teaching evolution and had only briefly substituted in biology He was never jailed, nor did he ever take the witness stand in the trial The people of Dayton liked him, and he cooperated with them in making a test case of the trial.

5. William Jennings Bryan was not out to get Scopes. Bryan though the Tennessee law a poor one because it involved fining an educator. He offered to pay Scopes's fine if he needed the money.

6. Bryan was familiar with Darwin's works, and he was not against teaching evolution if it were presented as a theory, and if other major options, such as creationism, were taught as well.

7. The trial record discloses that Bryan handled himself well, and, when put on the stand unexpectedly by Darrow, defined terms carefully, stuck to the facts, made distinctions between literal and figurative language when interpreting the Bible, and questioned the reliability of scientific evidence when it contradicted the Bible. Some scientific experts at the trial referred to such "evidence" as the Piltdown man (now dismissed as a hoax)

8. Scopes dated some girls in Dayton, but did not have a steady girlfriend,

9. The defense's scientific experts did not testify at the trial because their testimony was irrelevant to the central question of whether a law had been broken, because Darrow refused to let Bryan cross-examine the experts, and because Darrow did not call on them to testify. But, twelve scientists and theologians were allowed to make statements as part of the record presented by the defense.

10. Instead of Bryan's being mothered by his wife, he took care of her because she was an invalid

11. The people of Dayton in general, and fundamentalist Christians in particular, were not the ignorant, frenzied, uncouth persons the play portrays them as being.

12 Scopes was found guilty partly by the request of his defense lawyer, Darrow, in the hope that the case could be taken to a higher court.

13. Bryan did not have a fit while delivering his last speech and die in the courtroom. In the five days following the trial, Bryan wrote a 15,000-word speech he had hoped to give at the trial before the proceedings were cut short. He inspected sites for a school the people of Dayton were interested in building, traveled several hundred miles to deliver speeches in various cities and speak to crowds totaling 50,000, was hit by a car, consulted with doctors about his diabetic condition, and conferred with printers about his last message. On Sunday, July 26, Bryan drove from Chattanooga to Dayton, participated in a church service, and died quietly m his sleep that afternoon.

These differences between the actual events of the Scopes Trial and those depicted in *Inherit the Wind* illustrate the ways in which facts can be manipulated in a drama to serve the intent of the writer(s). Lawrence and Lee wished to deliver a strong message that the real facts of the case presented but did not clearly define. The playwrights took liberties with many characters, creating broader personalities that distinctly represented each side of the issue. Likewise, many portions of the real trial were mediocre and uneventful. Through careful pacing and well-constructed conflict situations, Lawrence and Lee took the real events and created an often gripping courtroom drama that provokes thought. Often referred to as "artistic license," this is a common technique in dramatic representations of actual events.

Historical Context

After the upheaval and tension caused by World War I, a mood of collective nostalgia took hold in America. The culture heard calls to rid itself of "enemies" and to return to the simplicity and normalcy of the prewar society. In the mid-1920s, the enemy became embodied in Charles Darwin and the theory of evolution. The Fundamentalists sought to eradicate such thoughts from society, beginning with the schools. They were influential in several southern states, passing laws that prohibited the teaching of evolution in the classroom. Modernists, those who supported the study of Darwin and opposed a literal interpretation of the Bible, became increasingly wary of what they perceived as attacks on their constitutional rights. Their response was to look for ways to test these laws.

In the mid-1950s when *Inherit the Wind* was written and first produced, the country experienced a tension between the seemingly prosperous post-World War II society and a wave of anti-Communist hysteria that, led by Wisconsin Senator Joseph McCarthy, swept the nation. McCarthy's fervor for rooting Communists out of American society took the form of a set of hearings on "Un-American Activities." These "hearings" identified numerous Americans often incorrectly as Communist. Many lives were ruined because their beliefs ran counter to the majority. Another American playwright, Arthur Miller, used the Salem witch trials as a setting for his play, *The Crucible*, to explore the societal conflicts raised by McCarthy's "witch hunt.' * Lawrence and Lee, in trying to make sense of this climate of anxiety and attacks on intellectual freedom, found their nearest parallel in the Scopes Monkey Trial of thirty years prior. Because the play is a dramatization and not a history lesson, the authors can focus on a conflict in the culture that is not bound by a particular time and place, a conflict that was as current in 1955 as it was in 1925.

Beginning in the 1950s and continuing through the 1960s, the modernists transformed into progressives who sought a variety of political and social reforms that were part of a process of finding "truth." The civil rights movement expanded to include not only blacks, but women, students, and other groups who considered themselves "oppressed. " On the other side of the society, however, were those fundamentalists who believed that, in society's progress forward, much that was of value was being lost. The heightened debate over evolution and creationism intensified this apprehension as well as a longing for the perceived stability of the past.

Critical Overview

During the 1950s, America was in the process of settling in after the tumultuous years of World War n. But, beneath an air of prosperity and comfort, social tension existed. Lawrence and Lee sought to make some kind of sense of the climate of anxiety and fear fed by McCarthyism and anti-Communist sentiment. They found a parallel in the Scopes Monkey Trial of 1925. The story *oflnheritthe* Wind is a dramatization, not a history lesson, as the playwrights make clear in their foreword to the play. It is a story about conflict in American culture.

Despite the play's overwhelming popularity, *Inherit the Wind's* historical accuracy became an issue almost from the start. Those connected with the play itself (producers, directors, and other theater personnel) saw the Scopes Trial as a dramatic piece of history that could be made more dramatic by bringing it to the stage. Quoted on the University of Virginia's website*, American Studies*, Merle Debuskey, a promotional man behind the play, described the link between drama and factual events as "a vibrant, pulsating, slam-bang production, acclaimed by the critics as entertainment first and history fay incidence." Another public relations firm, Daniel E. Lewitt Associates, called the play "living drama rather than a period piece" and said that *Inherit the Wind* has significance to students because it illuminates a fragment of America's scholastic past [and] espouses important ideas dramatically."

On the other side of the issue, some had problems with *Inherit the Wind* as a history lesson for two reasons. First, there are significant discrepancies between the courtroom events of the play and the actual trial records. Even though Lawrence and Lee opened the play with a disclaimer, many viewed the play as a learning tool.

The other problem with using Inherit the Wind as historical documentation is the bias against the South that permeates the drama. The character of E. K. Horabeck consistently refers to the South in less than flattering terms. Hornbeck longs to return to the North and escape the stultifying society of Hillsboro. Additionally, the play seems to suggest that the Scopes Monkey Trial is a southern failure and a sign of stagnation and ignorance. Drummond responds to Brady when asked why the two have moved so far apart: "Perhaps it is you who have moved away by standing still." The Southerners, on the other hand, see Drummond and Hornbeck as intruders from the North. Drummond is referred to as "the gentleman from Chicago," a term not of respect but of scorn and derision.

In spite of these problems, Lawrence and Lee position themselves firmly in support of freedom of thought and tolerance. Through Drummond, the playwrights try to establish a way for a culture or society to survive with its members holding differing beliefs. They support the importance of conflict and disagreement within a society, as well the idea that each position has its own merits and validity.

Whitney Bolton, in a *Morning Telegraph* review, said: "This is a play which, in the pleasant tasting icing of excellent theatre, gets across to its audience the core of value

beneath the icing: there is no more holy concept that the right of a man to think..,. What is of importance is that from that musty little town ... came a note of hope; that men could think of themselves without censure or impoundment and that... the accused made it easier, even though by only a fractional amount, for the next accused thinker to take his stand for it."

In a review published in the Christian Science Monitor, John Beaufort wrote that "Drummond's [defense of Brady] is an indictment of all dogma whether springing from blind ignorance or blind intellectualism."

Criticism

- Critical Essay #1
- Critical Essay #2
- Critical Essay #3

Critical Essay #1

Wiles is an educator with more than twenty years of experience. In this essay he examines Lawrence and Lee's play as a historical work as well as apiece of thought-provoking theater.

There is a saying that comes from the Bible which states: "You shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free." Therein lies the problem of Inherit the Wind. Which version of the truth is it that one should know the version of *Genesis* championed by Brady and his followers or the version of Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species?* Is the answer to that question an either/or proposition? Or, as Drummond suggests by clamping the two books together at the close of the play, is there a way for the two different views of humankind's roots to exist side-be-side?

The early years of the twentieth century brought many sweeping technological changes that those near the end of the same century take for granted. In Act II, Drummond outlines some of those changes in his examination of Brady as an expert on the Bible: "Gentlemen, progress has never been a bargain. You've got to pay for it. Sometimes I think there is a man behind a counter who says, All right, you can have a telephone; but you'll have to give up privacy, the charm of distance. Madam, you may vote; but at a price; you lost the right to retreat behind a powder puff or a petticoat. Mister, you may conquer the air; but the birds will lose their wonder, and the clouds will smell of gasoline." It is in the middle of these changes that the case of Bert Gates is argued, not only before a small-town southern judge but before the entire world. It is the changes themselves, especially those improvements in communication, that make this trial such a spectacle. Enhancements in telegraph and telephone transmission allowed reporters to send their stories quickly and efficiently to their editors back home and onto the front pages of the next edition. Radio had evolved to permit live, on-site broadcasting of the story as it happened. To many people, these changes all seemed to be happening at once, and many of them felt overwhelmed. Add to that anxiety an element that shakes their belief system and a trial of the century erupts.

The central issue in the struggle between Drummond and Brady and the forces each represents is the meaning of "truth." Brady and his followers steadfastly believe there is "only one great Truth in the world" the Bible as it is written in the King James version. Drummond, on the other hand, argues the position that, because humans have been given the power to think and question, there exists the possibility of another version of truth, a Bert Gates version or a Charles Darwin version, for example.

Truth in *Inherit the Wind* is often equated with right and everything else is equated with wrong. Throughout the play, Brady insists there is only ONE right way. But, under fierce questioning from Drummond, that way appears to be Brady's way. When Brady equates himself with God's personal messenger:

Drummond: Oh. God speaks to you. Brady: Yes.
Drummond: He tells you exactly what's right and what's wrong?

Brady: Yes.
Drummond: And you act accordingly?
Brady: Yes.

It can be seen that it is Brady's own vanity that translates into a "positive knowledge of Right and Wrong."

Drummond, on the other hand, constantly assails this attitude to make his point. In an early exchange with Brady, Drummond presents the notion that "*Truth* has meaning as a direction. But one of the peculiar imbecilities of our time is the grid of morality we have placed on human behavior, so that every act of man must be measured against an arbitrary latitude of right and longitude of wrong in exact minutes, seconds, and degrees." He also argues that "the Bible is a book. A good book. But it's not the only book." Drummond continually asks the question "what if?" Can there be a way of looking at the world that is different from Brady's version? "What if ... an un-Brady thought might still be holy?" That is the key question of the entire play.

In addition to questions about truth and right, *Inherit the Wind* presents a struggle between urban and rural societies, as well as between the cities of the industrialized North and towns of the agrarian (farm-based economy) South. The E. K. Hornbeck character, modeled after Baltimore newspaperman and noted literary critic H. L. Mencken, speaks about the people and town of Hillsboro in condescending and pejorative tones. Referring to Hillsboro as "Heavenly" and the "buckle on the Bible Belt," Hornbeck reveals an attitude that the trial and its attending hoopla is a sign of the region's ignorance and stagnation. His cynical commentary indicates that he hates the suffocating society of Hillsboro and desperately wants to return to the "big city." (As he tells a woman who offers him a "nice clean place to stay": "I had a nice clean place to stay, madame /And I left it to come here.") It is not only the Northerners who harbor attitudes toward others. The Southerners, particularly represented by Tom Davenport, the attorney assisting Brady, regard Drummond and the North in general as "intruders." Davenport's constant references to Drummond as "the gentleman from Chicago" in a voice laced with utter scorn reveal an unwillingness to look beyond a label to the actual human being across the room. Drummond recognizes this antagonism between North and South, urban and rural, in the play's most comical moment. When Drummond removes his suit coat revealing wide, bright purple suspenders (often called "galluses"), Brady asks with "affable sarcasm" (as the stage directions indicate) if this is the latest fashion in "the great metropolitan city of Chicago?" Drummond responds that he bought these at a general store in Brady's own hometown "Weeping Water, Nebraska." This blending of urban and rural symbols makes it difficult to cast Drummond as a complete enemy of the South and its rural inhabitants.

From all these conflicts, which sides do Lawrence and Lee and their play support? None. The play does not take sides. Instead, amid the polarization and heightened tension, Lawrence and Lee use the drama to argue in favor of tolerance and freedom of thought and belief, for some form of mutual respect. Society must search for ways to survive despite different beliefs of its individual members. The importance of conflict and the value of each argument must be recognized. When he slaps Bert's copy of Darwin

and the judge's Bible together and jams them into his briefcase side by side, Drummond shows that there is no single right or wrong way of looking at the world, only different perspectives.

Source: William P. Wiles, in an essay for *Drama for Smdenis*. Gale, 1997,

Critical Essay #2

The following excerpt from a brief review of the I960 film adaptation of Inherit the Wind emphasizes the real-life events upon which the drama is based.

Although Stanley Kramer, who produced as well as directed this film version of a Broadway play about the 1925 trial of John Thomas Scopes in Dayton, Tenn., for teaching Darwin's theory of human evolution, doesn't use the names of the real-life characters, his publicity for the picture stresses the fact that the film is about the so-called "Monkey Trial."

Therefore, and for the benefit of all who are too young to remember that bizarre occurrence, I would like to point out that Kramer's film departs from truth on two fundamentally important points. First, Scopes was not arrested in the course of persecution by bigots but as the result *of volunteering* to make a test case of a newly enacted Tennessee statute forbidding the teaching of evolution in Tennessee-supported institutions. Second, Clarence Darrow, Arthur Garfield Hayes and Dudley Field Malone volunteered to defend Scopes for the same publicity-chasing reasons that inspired William Jennings Bryan to volunteer to aid the prosecution....

Some of the most interesting occurrences at the trial have not been used, and one of them is badly muffed (Bryan, knowing the press of the entire country would make a fool of him for saying it, nevertheless declared, with a bravado that was not without nobility, that he believed Jonah could have swallowed the whale if God had wanted him to). A sub-plot involving a minister, anachronistically wearing a clerical collar, and his daughter, is clumsy and unnecessary. The Scopes character is almost as much of a forgotten man in Inherit the Wind as the real-life Scopes was at the actual trial....

Source: "Hors D'Oeuvre" *in Films in Review,* Vol. 11, no. 7, August/September, 1970, p. 427.

Critical Essay #3

In the following review, Gillett offers a mixed assessment of the film version o/Inherit the Wind.

It was clearly only a matter of time before some enterprising producer turned his attention to Tennessee's famous "Monkey Trial" of 1925, when Clarence Darrow defended a schoolteacher accused of teaching Darwinism against the hell-fire attack of the noted attorney and presidential candidate, William Jennings Bryan. Its theatrical potentialities were clearly demonstrated in the play written around the trial by Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee. And, apart from historical interest, it was easy to draw a contemporary parallel, with the latent forces of McCarthyism standing in for the bigoted fundamentalists of thirty-five years ago.

Stanley Kramer's *Inherit the Wind* takes full advantage of all these conflicts and adds some of its own. Its best scenes conjure up an atmosphere of passionate polemics, of stubborn convictions and old-fashioned loyalties. At its worst, it reveals Kramer's main limitations as a director: a weakness for caricature and a certain banality in the handling of emotional relationships. But this is not a stylist's film. Rather, it provides a field-day for two of Hollywood's great veterans Spencer Tracy (as the film's Darrow) and Fredric March (Bryan), Dominating the central court-room scenes, they provide the film with its real excitements a battle between two elderly giants who, at their most intense, look strangely like their Mr. Hydes of many years ago.

If Tracy can be said to win on points, this may be due to the fact that March has been slightly over-directed. This kind of flamboyancy can be made to work on the stage, but a close-up view inevitably emphasises the essential theatricality of the writing; and Kramer's own handling has its inflationary aspects. Yet the fascination remains. Both actors have marvellous timing, they weave and attack like experienced boxers, and even their mannerisms (which are all on display here) are made to play their full part. Curiously, perhaps, the power of these two performances contributes a little to the feeling that the exploitable nature of the material attracted Kramer at least as much as its undertones of contemporary meaning. Sympathies are more or less equitably distributed; and although there is plenty of excitement and passion in it, the film's very enclosure somehow makes it difficult to reach out into life itself.

Source: John Gillett, in a review *of Inherit the Wind,* in *Sight and Sound,* Vol. 29, no. 3, Summer, I960, p 147.

Adaptations

Inherit the Wind became a film in 1960. Produced and directed by Stanley Kramer, this version is available from CBS/Fox Video. It stars Spencer Tracy as Henry Drummond, Frederic March as Matthew Harrison Brady, and Gene Kelly as the acerbic E. K. Hornbeck.

In 1965, the *Hallmark Hall of Fame* and George Schaefer produced a television movie version of *Inherit the Wind*. It starred Melvyn Douglas as Drummond and Ed Begley, Sr. as Brady. (Douglas had replaced Paul Muni during the play's original run on Broadway.)

A different television production of *Inherit the Wind* surfaced in March, 1988. This version starred Jason Robards in the role of Henry Drummond, Kirk Douglas as Matthew Harrison Brady, and Darren McGavin as Hornbeck.

Topics for Further Study

Investigate the current debate between creationists and evolutionists. The World Wide Web and the Index to a major newspaper, such as the *New York Times*, can provide a number of specific instances of this discussion.

Research instances of censorship in schools. What types of material have different groups tried to remove from public school classrooms over the past five years? Discuss why an attempt to ban materials might be successful m one community but unsuccessful in another. The events in Kanawha County, West Virginia, during the late 1960s can provide some interesting parallels to the climate surrounding the fictional Hillsboro.

Read further about the lives and careers of the historical people around whom *Inherit the Wind* revolves Clarence Darrow, William Jennings Bryan, and H. L. Mencken. Compare and contrast the histoncal and dramatic personalities.

Investigate the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). What is the mission of this organization and how effective is it in carrying out that mission? List some famous trials in which the ACLU played a pivotal role.

Compare and Contrast

1920s/1930s: After World War I, the country seemed to change. Idealism was replaced by cynicism. Some authors began to question both authority and tradition. Moral codes changed along with hemlines and language. The sense of connection to the past appeared to be deteriorating.

1950s/1960s: After World War II, the country did change. Women who worked in the factories during the war were reluctant to return to their traditional pre-war domestic roles. Men who had seen the horrors of battle wanted to return to the way things were before they left. The technology that was to be for the benefit and improvement of humankind destroyed cities and ushered in a sense of helplessness and disonentation.

Today: With the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War, relative peace reigns. However, uncertainty about the future still holds people in its grasp. Authority and tradition are still under attack, and moral codes, or lack of them, occupy the interest of many.

1920s/1930s: The Scopes Monkey Trial raised issues about what should be taught in public school classrooms. Several states, including Tennessee, passed laws proscribing the presentation of certain topics, such as the origin of humans, and how they could or could not be presented to their schoolchildren.

1950s/1960s: The issue of what should be taught in public schools extended to individual books. The issue of human origins remained a hot topic but was gradually replaced by issues concerning sexuality (specifically sex education in the classroom) as a topic of debate and discussion.

Today: Special interest groups, each with its own agenda, regularly attack school textbooks and curricula. The issue of sexuality has been broadened to include homosexuality, and the debate between those who favor creation theory and those who favor evolutionary theory rages on. Several states have introduced legislation that requires creation theory to be taught alongside evolution. The Tennessee Senate considered a bill that would allow school boards to fire teachers who taught evolution as fact. The billed failed to become law by only seven votes.

1920s/1930s: The newspaper was the primary source of information about the world at large. Radio began to make inroads, but more people turned to radio for entertainment than for news. Extensive newspaper coverage of not only the Scopes Trial but other courtroom dramas such as the Fatty Arbuckle trial, Sacco and Vanzetti, Leopold and Loeb, and, later, the Lindbergh baby kidnapping trial, captured the imagination of the nation.

1950s/1960s: The Cold War brought fear and anxiety to new heights. The advent of television as the medium to bring news into America's homes began with the broadcasts

of hearings chaired by Wisconsin Senator Joseph McCarthy that purported to seek out Communists in the government of the United States.

Today: The nation watches the murder trial of sports star O.J. Simpson from opening arguments to the verdict either as it happens or through nightly updates on the local and national news. Cable channels devoted exclusively to live broadcasts of trials can be received by many American households.

What Do I Read Next?

To Kill A Mockingbird, Harper Lee's 1960 novel about justice in a small southern town during the Depression. Of particular interest for reader of Inherit the Wind are the courtroom scenes, as well as the attitudes of the townspeople.

The Night Thoreau Spent in Jail, Lawrence and Lee's 1970 drama that focuses on the right of another individual to think.

John T. Scopes, the historical person behind the *Inherit the Wind's* Bert Gates, published an autobiography in 1967 (written with James Presley) titled, *Center of the Storm.*

L. Sprague deCamp wrote an account of the events of that hot July, 1925, in *The Great Monkey Trial* published by Doubleday in 1968.

Irving Stone's riveting biography, *Clarence Darrowfor the Defense,* Doubleday, 1941, provides a compelling portrait of the best-known lawyer of the early part of the twentieth century.

Further Study

Cornelius, R M "William Jennings Bryan, The Scopes Trial, and *Inherit the Wind,*" http-//www.concentric net/ - paulvon/wjbinfo html], 1996.

A World Wide Web site written by an English professor from William Jennings Bryan College in Dayton, Tennessee. Provides a resource for the discrepancies between the actual Scopes Trial and the proceeding depicted in the play.

Hanlon, Kathy. *Inherit the Wind Currcdum Unit,* Center for Learning, Brown Publishers, 1990

A curriculum unit for the play with excerpts from-*Natural History* by Stephen Jay Gould, 1981, *Center of the Storm* by John T Scopes and James Presley, Holt Remhart and Winston, 1967; *A Treasury of Great Reporting* edited by Richard Morris and Louis L, Snyder, Simon and Schuster, 1949; and *Thru the Bible with J. Vernon McGee* by J Vernon McGee, Volume III, Thomas Nelson, Inc.

McCabe, Lyndsey. "Inherit the Wind" on the University of Virginia's *American Studies* website, http://xroads.Virginia edu/~UG97/inherit/mtro html, April, 1996

A World Wide Web Site that presents a chronological layout with links to relevant reviews, contemporary news events, and other background information Some photos from the 1960 and 1965 film versions

Bibliography

Bolton, Whitney. Review of *Inherit the Wind* m *the Morning Telegraph*, April, 1955.

Beaufort, John Review of *Inherit the Wind* in the *Christian Science Monitor,* April, 1955

Couch, Nina. *Studies in American Drama, 1945-Present*

Copyright Information

This Premium Study Guide is an offprint from *Drama for Students*.

Project Editor
David Galens

Editorial
Sara Constantakis, Elizabeth A. Cranston, Kristen A. Dorsch, Anne Marie Hacht, Madeline S. Harris, Arlene Johnson, Michelle Kazensky, Ira Mark Milne, Polly Rapp, Pam Revitzer, Mary Ruby, Kathy Sauer, Jennifer Smith, Daniel Toronto, Carol Ullmann

Research
Michelle Campbell, Nicodemus Ford, Sarah Genik, Tamara C. Nott, Tracie Richardson

Data Capture
Beverly Jendrowski

Permissions
Mary Ann Bahr, Margaret Chamberlain, Kim Davis, Debra Freitas, Lori Hines, Jackie Jones, Jacqueline Key, Shalice Shah-Caldwell

Imaging and Multimedia
Randy Bassett, Dean Dauphinais, Robert Duncan, Leitha Etheridge-Sims, Mary Grimes, Lezlie Light, Jeffrey Matlock, Dan Newell, Dave Oblender, Christine O'Bryan, Kelly A. Quin, Luke Rademacher, Robyn V. Young

Product Design
Michelle DiMercurio, Pamela A. E. Galbreath, Michael Logusz

Manufacturing
Stacy Melson

For more information, contact
The Gale Group, Inc
27500 Drake Rd.
Farmington Hills, MI 48334-3535
Or you can visit our Internet site at
http://www.gale.com

Introduction

Purpose of the Book

The purpose of Drama for Students (DfS) is to provide readers with a guide to understanding, enjoying, and studying novels by giving them easy access to information about the work. Part of Gale's□For Students□ Literature line, DfS is specifically designed to meet the curricular needs of high school and undergraduate college students and their teachers, as well as the interests of general readers and researchers considering specific novels. While each volume contains entries on □classic□ novels

frequently studied in classrooms, there are also entries containing hard-to-find information on contemporary novels, including works by multicultural, international, and women novelists.

The information covered in each entry includes an introduction to the novel and the novel's author; a plot summary, to help readers unravel and understand the events in a novel; descriptions of important characters, including explanation of a given character's role in the novel as well as discussion about that character's relationship to other characters in the novel; analysis of important themes in the novel; and an explanation of important literary techniques and movements as they are demonstrated in the novel.

In addition to this material, which helps the readers analyze the novel itself, students are also provided with important information on the literary and historical background informing each work. This includes a historical context essay, a box comparing the time or place the novel was written to modern Western culture, a critical overview essay, and excerpts from critical essays on the novel. A unique feature of DfS is a specially commissioned critical essay on each novel, targeted toward the student reader.

To further aid the student in studying and enjoying each novel, information on media adaptations is provided, as well as reading suggestions for works of fiction and nonfiction on similar themes and topics. Classroom aids include ideas for research papers and lists of critical sources that provide additional material on the novel.

Selection Criteria

The titles for each volume of DfS were selected by surveying numerous sources on teaching literature and analyzing course curricula for various school districts. Some of the sources surveyed included: literature anthologies; Reading Lists for College-Bound Students: The Books Most Recommended by America's Top Colleges; textbooks on teaching the novel; a College Board survey of novels commonly studied in high schools; a National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) survey of novels commonly studied in high schools; the NCTE's Teaching Literature in High School: The Novel;and the Young Adult Library Services Association (YALSA) list of best books for young adults of the past twenty-five years. Input was also solicited from our advisory board, as well as educators from various areas. From these discussions, it was determined that each volume should have a mix of □classic□ novels (those works commonly taught in literature classes) and contemporary novels for which information is often hard to find. Because of the interest in expanding the canon of literature, an emphasis was also placed on including works by international, multicultural, and women authors. Our advisory board members□educational professionals□ helped pare down the list for each volume. If a work was not selected for the present volume, it was often noted as a possibility for a future volume. As always, the editor welcomes suggestions for titles to be included in future volumes.

How Each Entry Is Organized

Each entry, or chapter, in DfS focuses on one novel. Each entry heading lists the full name of the novel, the author's name, and the date of the novel's publication. The following elements are contained in each entry:

- Introduction: a brief overview of the novel which provides information about its first appearance, its literary standing, any controversies surrounding the work, and major conflicts or themes within the work.
- Author Biography: this section includes basic facts about the author's life, and focuses on events and times in the author's life that inspired the novel in question.
- Plot Summary: a factual description of the major events in the novel. Lengthy summaries are broken down with subheads.
- Characters: an alphabetical listing of major characters in the novel. Each character name is followed by a brief to an extensive description of the character's role in the novel, as well as discussion of the character's actions, relationships, and possible motivation. Characters are listed alphabetically by last name. If a character is unnamed□for instance, the narrator in Invisible Man-the character is listed as □The Narrator□ and alphabetized as □Narrator.□ If a character's first name is the only one given, the name will appear alphabetically by that name. □ Variant names are also included for each character. Thus, the full name □Jean Louise Finch□ would head the listing for the narrator of To Kill a Mockingbird, but listed in a separate cross-reference would be the nickname □Scout Finch.□
- Themes: a thorough overview of how the major topics, themes, and issues are addressed within the novel. Each theme discussed appears in a separate subhead, and is easily accessed through the boldface entries in the Subject/Theme Index.
- Style: this section addresses important style elements of the novel, such as setting, point of view, and narration; important literary devices used, such as imagery, foreshadowing, symbolism; and, if applicable, genres to which the work might have belonged, such as Gothicism or Romanticism. Literary terms are explained within the entry, but can also be found in the Glossary.
- Historical Context: This section outlines the social, political, and cultural climate in which the author lived and the novel was created. This section may include descriptions of related historical events, pertinent aspects of daily life in the culture, and the artistic and literary sensibilities of the time in which the work was written. If the novel is a historical work, information regarding the time in which the novel is set is also included. Each section is broken down with helpful subheads.
- Critical Overview: this section provides background on the critical reputation of the novel, including bannings or any other public controversies surrounding the work. For older works, this section includes a history of how the novel was first received and how perceptions of it may have changed over the years; for more recent novels, direct quotes from early reviews may also be included.
- Criticism: an essay commissioned by DfS which specifically deals with the novel and is written specifically for the student audience, as well as excerpts from previously published criticism on the work (if available).

- Sources: an alphabetical list of critical material quoted in the entry, with full bibliographical information.
- Further Reading: an alphabetical list of other critical sources which may prove useful for the student. Includes full bibliographical information and a brief annotation.

In addition, each entry contains the following highlighted sections, set apart from the main text as sidebars:

- Media Adaptations: a list of important film and television adaptations of the novel, including source information. The list also includes stage adaptations, audio recordings, musical adaptations, etc.
- Topics for Further Study: a list of potential study questions or research topics dealing with the novel. This section includes questions related to other disciplines the student may be studying, such as American history, world history, science, math, government, business, geography, economics, psychology, etc.
- Compare and Contrast Box: an □at-a-glance□ comparison of the cultural and historical differences between the author's time and culture and late twentieth century/early twenty-first century Western culture. This box includes pertinent parallels between the major scientific, political, and cultural movements of the time or place the novel was written, the time or place the novel was set (if a historical work), and modern Western culture. Works written after 1990 may not have this box.
- What Do I Read Next?: a list of works that might complement the featured novel or serve as a contrast to it. This includes works by the same author and others, works of fiction and nonfiction, and works from various genres, cultures, and eras.

Other Features

DfS includes □The Informed Dialogue: Interacting with Literature,□ a foreword by Anne Devereaux Jordan, Senior Editor for Teaching and Learning Literature (TALL), and a founder of the Children's Literature Association. This essay provides an enlightening look at how readers interact with literature and how Drama for Students can help teachers show students how to enrich their own reading experiences.

A Cumulative Author/Title Index lists the authors and titles covered in each volume of the DfS series.

A Cumulative Nationality/Ethnicity Index breaks down the authors and titles covered in each volume of the DfS series by nationality and ethnicity.

A Subject/Theme Index, specific to each volume, provides easy reference for users who may be studying a particular subject or theme rather than a single work. Significant subjects from events to broad themes are included, and the entries pointing to the specific theme discussions in each entry are indicated in boldface.

Each entry has several illustrations, including photos of the author, stills from film adaptations (if available), maps, and/or photos of key historical events.

Citing Drama for Students

When writing papers, students who quote directly from any volume of Drama for Students may use the following general forms. These examples are based on MLA style; teachers may request that students adhere to a different style, so the following examples may be adapted as needed. When citing text from DfS that is not attributed to a particular author (i.e., the Themes, Style, Historical Context sections, etc.), the following format should be used in the bibliography section:

□Night.□ Drama for Students. Ed. Marie Rose Napierkowski. Vol. 4. Detroit: Gale, 1998. 234-35.

When quoting the specially commissioned essay from DfS (usually the first piece under the □Criticism□ subhead), the following format should be used:

Miller, Tyrus. Critical Essay on □Winesburg, Ohio.□ Drama for Students. Ed. Marie Rose Napierkowski. Vol. 4. Detroit: Gale, 1998. 335-39.

When quoting a journal or newspaper essay that is reprinted in a volume of DfS, the following form may be used:

Malak, Amin. □Margaret Atwood's □The Handmaid's Tale and the Dystopian Tradition,□ Canadian Literature No. 112 (Spring, 1987), 9-16; excerpted and reprinted in Drama for Students, Vol. 4, ed. Marie Rose Napierkowski (Detroit: Gale, 1998), pp. 133-36.

When quoting material reprinted from a book that appears in a volume of DfS, the following form may be used:

Adams, Timothy Dow. □Richard Wright: □Wearing the Mask,□ in Telling Lies in Modern American Autobiography (University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 69-83; excerpted and reprinted in Novels for Students, Vol. 1, ed. Diane Telgen (Detroit: Gale, 1997), pp. 59-61.

We Welcome Your Suggestions

The editor of Drama for Students welcomes your comments and ideas. Readers who wish to suggest novels to appear in future volumes, or who have other suggestions, are cordially invited to contact the editor. You may contact the editor via email at: ForStudentsEditors@gale.com. Or write to the editor at:

Editor, Drama for Students
Gale Group
27500 Drake Road
Farmington Hills, MI 48331-3535