

Africa, Buddies, Diamonds, Politics, and Gold: A Comparison of the Films *Blood Diamond* (2006) and *Gold!* (1974)

By Richard Voeltz

Hollywood has rediscovered Africa again in such recent films as *Beyond Borders* (2003), *Tears of the Sun* (2003), *Hotel Rwanda* (2004), *The Constant Gardener* (2005), *The Last King of Scotland* (2006), and *Blood Diamond* (2006). All of them portray Africa as the most violent, scary, and apocalyptic hell on earth, teeming with tribal rivalries, unimaginable atrocities, genocide, murderous dictators, poverty, disease, corrupt governments, and children transformed into brutal, stoned killers.ⁱ *Blood Diamond* is an adventure story set in Sierra Leone during the civil wars of the 1990s and it surpasses the other films in portraying gut-wrenching violence and sadism, yet it also sets out to give a history lesson on child soldiers, conflict diamonds, and the complicity of the diamond monopoly in helping to create these horrors that still plague Africa, or as film reviewer William Arnold wrote, it is a “multicaret message movie.”ⁱⁱ *Gold!* (1974) a film made thirty-two years earlier, deals with another commodity that has transfixed humanity since it was first brought out of the earth, and along with diamonds, a crucial part of the mineral revolution that transformed the history of South Africa. This action-adventure thriller set in the greed-ridden and dangerous world of South African gold mining also features a story of capitalist villainy. An international syndicate plots to flood a gold mine in South Africa thus forcing up the price of the precious commodity on the world gold markets. Glitter, greed, adventure, action, violence, evil international cartels, love-interests, black-white buddies, and South African filming locations mark both films. They are also well intentioned about showing how Africa’s mineral resources are exploited and used for the benefit of the developed world. *Blood Diamond* uses a little guilt trip political message, while *Gold!* ignores the grim realities of mine life and glosses over the white-black relationships in apartheid South Africa.

Peter Hunt’s *Gold!* was the first of Roger Moore’s trio of South African films, along with *Shout at the Devil*(1976) and *The Wild Geese*(1978). It’s very much a film of its time, the mid-seventies—where the villains are easy to spot—they wash their hands, don’t smoke and aren’t any good in the sack, i.e., Bradford Dillman as Manfred Steyner (also recognizable as “Dirty Harry’s” priggish boss

in *The Enforcer*, 1976). While the good guys—Roger Moore as mining engineer Rod Slater—are not afraid of getting dirty or sleeping with the boss's wife, Susanna York as Terry Steyner. John Gielgud does a turn as Farrell, head of the syndicate that wants to corner the gold market. Ray Milland plays Harry Hirschfield, the mine owner. About this part, Milland said, "I added up my films the other day, and they've got to be nearly 200, I've done six in the past 20 months. This (*Gold!*) is the kind of part I like, a good easy role without too much hard work in it. A little character to it. I'm not after any more Oscars, hell no!"ⁱⁱⁱ *Gold!* is a Michael Klinger production, with Peter Hunt as director, and the screenplay by Stanley Price and Wilbur Smith (from his novel *Goldmine*). Along with Moore and Hunt the credits are littered with many of the regular James Bond team most of whom would go through the same flooding the mine routine again in *A View to a Kill* (1985). The hiking up the price of gold premise is also borrowed from *Goldfinger* (1964), although a tad more credible than setting off a nuclear bomb in Fort Knox. Moore took the role of Rod Slater after his first James Bond film, hoping the part would cement his credentials as an action star. One interesting piece of trivia involves Roger Moore's initial reluctance to accept the part, owing to the character being a cigarette smoker (he had recently stopped smoking cigarettes and switched to Monte Cristo cigars). As it was necessary for Rod Slater's character to smoke cigarettes rather than cigars, Moore's objection was overruled, though his smoking scenes were reduced to a bare minimum.^{iv} In the fall of 1973 Roger Moore, accompanied by his wife Luisa and their three children flew to Johannesburg to begin location filming. The actors and technicians were luxuriously quartered at the President Hotel in the city, and from there traveled to locations in the surrounding area. Moore along with director Peter Hunt and other members of the cast and crew actually filmed deep down in the stifling heat of a gold mine in Buffelfontein. Hunt recalls: "We had to drop down two miles which was horrendous. It was great to start with, and I got tremendously enthusiastic about the mine, but after ten days down there it got very claustrophobic."^v For the climax of the film it was necessary to flood the mine, and initially it was the intention of the company to film the scenes at the South African location. A mock-up of a section of the mine was built above ground but it proved impossible to contain the water, and it was decided to film the sequence at Pinewood Studios in London. This was not the only problem which arose during the production of *Gold!* Technicians union, ACTT, in England wanted the film banned in Britain because they felt it was wrong for a British crew to work in a country that supported apartheid. The union suggested that a mine in Wales

could easily double for the mine in South Africa, but the cast and crew supported Michael Klinger, who would not give up location shooting in South Africa, despite the banning threat. Roger Moore and other members of the cast and crew stated quite clearly that their filming in South Africa was in no way intended to show support of apartheid, which they abhorred, but this was in the interests of making the film as realistic as possible.^{vi}

The film begins with a tunnel collapse at the Sonderditch mine, in a scene that establishes the courage of Slater and his chief miner, “Big King” (actor Simon Sabela), and the bond of trust between them. This is contrasted with the contempt other white managers hold for black miners. It is soon revealed that the collapse is no accident but part of a plan by a London based criminal syndicate, which includes the mine owner’s son-in-law, Manfred Steyner, to destroy the mine so that the syndicate members can profit from share-trading. This will be accomplished by drilling through a deep underground wall or dyke which is all that prevents an adjacent reservoir of water from flooding the mine. The mine’s general manager, an accomplice in the plot, is killed in the tunnel collapse. Steyner interviews Slater, who is the underground manager, for the post of General Manager, although the owner Hirshfield wants an older, senior man. At this point Slater first meets Steyner’s wife Terry and is attracted to her, but she shows little interest. However, Steyner arranges for them to meet again, in the hope that Terry will influence her father in Slater’s favor. The plan works, Slater becomes general manager and he and Terry are off on a love affair. Slater, unaware of any plot, agrees to carry out the drilling but is cautious enough to plant a safety charge that will block the tunnel in case of a water leak. Steyner knows that Slater is having an affair with his wife, but allows it to continue because it will keep Slater away from the mine, so that the safety charge can be disabled without his knowledge. While Slater and Terry are holidaying together at a Safari Camp, the final breach is made in the underground dyke and the mine begins to flood, trapping a thousand workers. Slater hears of the disaster on the radio, and Terry flies him back directly to the mine. There is a final dramatic scene in which Slater and Big King descend the mine, amidst the rising flood waters, to repair the safety charge. They succeed, but only because Big King sacrifices his own life to detonate the charge, letting Slater escape. Meanwhile as Steyner watches the mine from a bluff, his driver, acting on orders from the syndicate should anything go wrong, murders him with his own Rolls-Royce. Of course this leaves Slater in a position to not only get the girl but perhaps the gold mine also.

Big King is the only black miner to have a name, John Nkulu, and with the exceptions of a soccer game and black miners getting a medical exam, they are completely anonymous. At one point Slater is asked why they –African miners--would want to work in a mine, and he responds by saying “They do it for the same reason we do—for the money.” And that is about it for any sense of social justice. Clearly this is a white domain with scenes of country clubs, Rolls Royces, and posh Safari clubs, and a beautiful African landscape that Slater and Terry fly over to the accompaniment of an Academy Award nominated song, *Where My Love Takes Me*. (*Blood Diamond* also has an “Out of Africa” flight near the end, reminiscent of *Cry Freedom* (1987)). Peter Davis has observed that what we have here “...is a classic Faithful Servant situation”: The two men have acted like buddies to save the mine, Slater supplying the brain, Nkulu the brawn. But tradition demands the sacrifice of the faithful servant, for this enhances the stature of the white hero. The Faithful Servant thinks highly enough of the hero to save his life at the cost of his own. And not only does the white hero not have to share glory with a black man, but the black man’s deeds accrue to him, as the sole survivor—it is reported over the loudspeaker that ‘Slater has saved the mine.’ As a bonus, Slater gets the girl, an option never open to the Faithful Servant. ^{vii}

Although a successful and well received box office hit, the avoidance of apartheid puts the film in the general Hollywood category of ignoring the subject altogether in the nineteen seventies.

Movie critic William Arnold has written that, “Edward Zwick is one of the few Hollywood directors of the past two decades whose name has come to stand not just for quality, but for a specific kind of movie: an ambitious, issue-oriented, historical epic, (*Glory*, *Courage Under Fire*, *The Last Samurai*.) *Blood Diamond* is very much in this tradition.”^{viii} Few directors give as many interviews as Edward Zwick does about his films and their meanings and messages. About *Blood Diamond* Zwick said, “To me, this movie is about what is valuable. To one person, it might be a stone; to someone else, a story in a magazine; to another, it is a child. The juxtaposition of one man obsessed with finding a valuable diamond with another man risking his

life to find his son is the beating heart of this film.”^{ix} Zwick became fascinated with so-called “Conflict Diamonds”; stones that are smuggled out of countries at war and used to support that war, by paying for more arms, increasing the death toll and furthering the destruction of the region. They may be a small percentage of the world’s sales, but, nonetheless, in an industry worth billions of dollars, even a small percentage is worth many millions and can buy innumerable small arms. The country of Sierra Leone has been particularly plagued by these “blood diamonds”^x. In the late 1990s, people from NGOs such as Global Witness, Partnership Africa-Canada and Amnesty International gave them that name in order to help bring the crisis into the public consciousness. Zwick had only a passing knowledge of the term and its meaning when Producer Paula Weinstein first sent him the script. “I had heard the phrase, but I didn’t fully understand its implications,” he offers. “The more I learned, the more fascinated and horrified I became, and the more I realized this was a story that needed to be told.”^{xi} Weinstein developed the screenplay with screenwriter Charles Leavitt and executive producer Len Amato. South African producer Gillian Gorfil had initiated the project with C. Gaby Mitchell, who shares credit with Leavitt. When they came on board Zwick and producer Marshall Herskovitz continued to develop the story with Weinstein. Zwick believes in entertainment as rhetoric. “It has been my belief that political awareness can be raised as much by entertainment as by rhetoric,” asserts Zwick. “There is no reason why challenging themes and engaging stories have to be mutually exclusive—in fact, each can fuel the other. As a filmmaker, I want to entertain people first and foremost. If out of that comes a greater awareness and understanding of a time or a circumstance, then the hope is that change can happen. Obviously, a single piece of work can’t change the world, but what you try to do is add your voice to the chorus.” Working on the script, the filmmakers found that they themselves gained a better awareness of the issues at hand. Zwick notes, “It seems that almost every time a valuable natural resource is discovered in the world—whether it be diamonds, rubber, gold, oil, whatever—often what results is a tragedy for the country in which they are found. Making matters worse, the resulting riches from these resources rarely benefit the people of the country from which they come.” Producer Gillian Gorfil stresses that, while shedding light on the issue of blood diamonds, this movie is not intended to cast a

shadow over the entire diamond industry. “It is important to me that this film is not anti-diamond. The issue is blood diamonds, which have very specific origins.”^{xii}

Zwick and screenwriter Charles Leavitt then mount fiction upon fact via three central characters on their own personal quests who become enmeshed with smuggling and civil war in Sierra Leone. It all comes together in what Steve Crum describes as “a complex, riveting, and disturbing way. The film suffers only in pacing; it seems longer than it is.”^{xiii} Danny Archer, played by Leonardo DiCaprio, is an ex-mercenary from Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) turned diamond smuggler. “There was something really authentic about the story,” says DiCaprio. Before shooting began, DiCaprio spent a month in South Africa meeting former mercenaries, undergoing military training and learning the local accent. Although he talked with several ex-mercs and diamond experts, it was a military advisor on the film, a “Rhodesian” named Duff Gifford, who captivated him. “He’s really the man who brought me to the understanding of what this culture was like, what it was like to fight in these wars, the painful things that he’d seen, the love he has for Africa and the bitterness he has as well,” says DiCaprio. And he learned something else. “They drink a hell of a lot of beer and Jagermeister,” says the star, no wimp in the party department himself. “That was their hard-core drink of choice: flaming Jagermeister shots, which I can’t hang with.”^{xiv} This part along with his role in *The Departed* (2006) established his tough guy credentials moving him beyond the pretty boy image from *Titanic* (1997). Archer, adopting an attitude that he is in this for himself, uses charm and muscle to get his way. His dream is to find a golf ball sized diamond which will allow him to get off the African continent. Djimon Hounsou plays Solomon Vandy, a Mende fisherman whose village is attacked by the forces of the RUF—Revolutionary United Front who resort to hacking off the limbs of innocent victims—“long sleeve or short sleeve.” He is taken to work in the diamond fields as a virtual slave. His wife and daughters end up in a refugee camp, while his young son Dia becomes a murderous child soldier of the RUF. Each child, after appropriate indoctrination, chooses a new name such as the “Master of Disaster.”

Commanders in the RUF have names such as “Captain Poison”, “Rambo” or “Major Zero”.

Tupac rap music from boom boxes provide the musical accompaniment. Vandy finds a very large

diamond, known as a pink, which he buries just as government forces attack the diamond camp. Archer, in prison for smuggling, hears of the diamond and wants to get it himself, so he arranges for Vandy to be released. Archer wants the diamond, Solomon wants to find his family, regain his son, and then locate the buried diamond. Into this mix appears American journalist Maddy Bowen (Jennifer Connelly), a Christine Amanpour clone who wants the story of who is behind the diamond smuggling from Archer. The three team up in quest for the diamond, Solomon's family, and his kidnaped son.

Zwick told the story of soldiers led by a white officer during the Civil War in *Glory* (1989), and later focused on a white American leading Japanese Warriors in *The Last Samurai* (2003). Now he looks at the recent history of Sierra Leone in which he offers up the black and white acting team of DiCaprio and Hounsou in an homage to *The Defiant Ones* (1958) with Sidney Poitier and Tony Curtis or *The Wilby Conspiracy* (1975) with the team of Poitier again and Michael Caine. But in *Blood Diamond* handcuffs are not involved, rather international political issues are revealed by two men being bound together by the pursuit of a diamond that offers one of them a ticket to freedom. (Ironically diamonds are also the object of desire in the chase-buddy film *The Wilby Conspiracy*.) On the journey to recover the diamond, Zwick sees Solomon and Archer as inexorably divide by lines of race and class that have existed for generations, "They are both African men, but their histories are very dissimilar," he says. "Yet they have a mutual connection to this continent as their home. In many ways, it is a shared identity that supersedes their backgrounds. It is the common ground on which they ultimately recognize each other's humanity in an inhumane situation." Nevertheless, Marshall Herskovitz counters, "There is an understandable motivation for these two men to work together, but they have conflicting objectives that keep them in opposition. This is not in any way a buddy movie: Archer and Solomon have very different ways of looking at the world, and we did not want to compromise on that."^{xv} Zwick in his DVD edition voice over reinforces this notion, by commenting on a scene where Archer calls Solomon a "Kaffir", which we knew was coming, leading to a fight, that he "did not want to make this a buddy movie."^{xvi}

"What really impressed me about Ed," Leonardo DiCaprio remarks, "was that he wanted

to make an entertaining adventure film, but mixed in were some complex, highly charged political statements. That's what really got me excited about this film.^{»xvii} Unfortunately you can't have it both ways. Carol Cling writes, "But Edward Zwick keeps trying to make socially conscious movies where stuff blows up real good."^{»xviii} Jeremy Fox is even more scathing:

I'm sick of white folks....It's not just that we command an unseemly portion of the world's resources, exploiting hundreds of millions of non-white folks and causing horrendous environmental damage in the process and then patting ourselves on the back for paying the merest lip service to righting our wrongs. It's that when we make movies about the atrocities committed for our benefit and with our tacit consent, we insist upon setting up one of our own as the hero. It's really pretty sick....The latest outbreak of this particular affliction is *Blood Diamond*, a film that's ostensibly about the murder, mutilation, forced labor, kidnapping, and brainwashing of black Africans but whose creators insist that what's really important is whether the roguish white guy gets it on with the hot white chick. This, of course, is a gross oversimplification, but then so is the movie. For every minute spent genuinely considering the devastating legacy of Western imperialism, five are spent watching the twinkles in their pretty eyes.^{xix}

Blood Diamond has the genre baggage and plays homage to a host of Hollywood films, from *The Defiant Ones* (1958), to *Casablanca*(1942), and *the Treasure of the Sierra Madre* (1948), yet it spouts history lessons and political correctness. When Archer meets Bowen (Jennifer Connelly) their conversation is a rapid history of recent African and American history—"TIA This is Africa," says Archer meaning nothing comes out as planned in Africa, snide comments about CNN, American guilt, and "Blow job Gate", and the fact that Americans now refer to Rhodesia as Zimbabwe. Solomon is meant to be symbolic of African people, yet he speaks as if he stepped out of the pages of National Geographic. And through the redemption of Archer at the end of the film there seems to be a conscious attempt to rehabilitate those who fought for the Apartheid regime as Danny did in Angola. Many reviewers noted the unequal weight given to the two male characters. Just as in *Gold!* thirty two years earlier, the old assertion appears that whites have more emotional investment and ownership of Africa than blacks. When Archer goes to Cape Town to meet his former mercenary commander, whom he later kills over the diamond, he is told that the soil of Africa is red because of the fighting over it, and that he will never leave Africa. At the end of the film Archer dying , on the satellite phone to Maddy, bleeds into the soil, saying that he is exactly

where is supposed to be, his true home Africa.

The same symbolic resonance is not given to African blood in the soil. Indeed Solomon dons suit and tie, and with Maddy's help becomes a poster boy for conflict diamonds with the international diamond cartel, and presumably buys a flat in London. Also Archer tells Maddy that his parents were brutally murdered during the war for African liberation in Rhodesia, perhaps explaining his nasty disposition exhibited in the early parts of the film. At one point, Vandy wonders about whether his country would have been better off if whites still ruled. Not a very sophisticated way of looking at the decades of colonial rule in Africa. While being shrill and emotional about his family he is never allowed to express the pain and suffering of his country with the *gravitas* that seems important here. In *The Four Feathers* (2002) Hounsou plays the faithful servant to the late Heath Ledger character. Here he is again subordinate to DiCaprio. Beth Accomando has written perceptively, if not the first to say so, that:

Films from Africa, made by African filmmakers are few and of those few only a rare one ever makes it to American theatre screens. All of the films we've recently seen of Africa—*Blood Diamond*, *Catch a Fire*, *The Constant Gardener*, *Biko*, *The Last King of Scotland*, *Tears of the Sun*—are all very western in terms of their narrative structure. Films from Africa by such directors as Sembene Ousmane or Djibril Diop Mambety have a very different storytelling quality to them that stems from an oral story telling tradition. It would be nice to see more films from a genuinely African perspective make it to American theaters.^{xx}

Nice, but not very likely as African films have a short distribution period and end up in limited distribution by California Newsreel to academic and specialized ethnic audiences. Also remember the apartheid , primitive “Bushman” fantasy *The Gods Must be Crazy* (1989) was the largest grossing South African film of all time and had an almost cult following in the United States, Europe, and Asia.

While intense, *Blood Diamond* also contains elements that are unrealistic if not downright silly. First of all, the lead characters seem bullet proof. And then there is the scene where Maddy disarms the Kamajor, a warrior sect of the Mende tribe, characterized by animist beliefs and superstition, by posing for photographs with them...”She reminds me of my wife,” remarks one of the fighters. Yet the film should not be dismissed completely, for it does expose American

audiences to issues that get lost among the breaking stories treatment by Fox and CNN News and it definitely got the attention of De Beers, the largest diamond mining and selling company in the world.^{xxi} (Interestingly the film was filmed in South Africa and Mozambique, as the conditions in Sierra Leone were simply too primitive for a modern film company) Beth Acamando may just have pegged it right when she wrote, Zwick “...just nicked the surface of a much bigger and more complex issue. In the end, Zwick’s film feels like another attempt at alleviating white guilt.”^{xxii}

The film suffers from a similar fate that befall Shashar Kapur’s remake of *The Four Feathers*(2002). Kapur attempted to accomplish two fundamentally different things: a rousing war epic and adventure story that stirs our spirits with an old fashioned sense of romantic self-sacrifice and the rites of manhood, while at the same time critiquing the evils of colonialism of the very British imperialists who are the films heroes. The result is not a revisionist treatment but rather a skilled update of the same imperialist swashbuckler that clings to the standard British agenda. Adventure will always trump message, and if not, the danger is being accused of delivering a boring history lecture. Hollywood may have more of a social conscience that it did in the nineteen seventies but *Blood Diamond* remains true to the old fashioned formula of white-black friendship (with the white guy dying this time, but with redemption for his past sins and greed, for the sake of the solid family values represented by Solomon). Then there is the rough, tough, handsome, charismatic white Rhodesian “soldier of fortune” in love (sort of) with beautiful white American news correspondent, all set against an exotic and foreign backdrop of a menacing Africa filled with scary black dudes in sunglasses and Tupac t-shirts. In shamelessly attempting to establish a rather stodgy Roger Moore’s action-adventure credentials for his future James Bond films, *Gold!* at best glosses over, when not ignoring altogether, the racism and exploitation of South Africa in the nineteen seventies, but Zwick wants to deliver a message about the dirty business of “conflict diamond” and “child soldiers”, but his film is too simplistic and naive to function as an effective political commentary. For all its earnestness it remains trapped in the “things are not important until white people take notice of it” perspective it shares with *Gold!* As an action/adventure film it works. Viewers might get a topping of conscience with their popcorn but as is so often the case with Hollywood the African side of the story gets slighted. And in

general the topical-message-movie genre may be in big trouble. Audiences can spot the clichés: “...the selfish heroes who wake up and learn how to care, the cover-ups that tilt into violence, the last-act triumph over the system”,^{xxiii} all so obvious in *Blood Diamond*. Owen Gleiberman predicts the final nail driven into the topical-message-movie genre: “It boils down to this: We now live in a reality-based media culture that bombards us with advocacy . Book-length exposes. Cable news, Talk radio. The 24/7 information stream that is the Internet.”^{xxiv} Any scandal or crises gets dissected by pundits from every angle *ad nauseum*. But when Hollywood decides to make a movie about something “urgent” it falls back upon “tidy liberal homilies served up in melodramatic form...giving us a hero with a newly awakened conscience, a romance to make us “care’.”^{xxv} When it does that a movie becomes a lie itself. It is telling the audience that these things are as important as the “urgent message” itself. While paying some homage to *Casablanca* (1942), *Blood Diamond* neglects to learn the lesson that the problems of two people “don’t amount to a hill of beans.”^{xxvi} But Edward Zwick remains convinced that entertainment and ideas are not mutually exclusive: “I’m more interested in those who know nothing about the subject than in preaching to the choir. How much more interesting to present a set of images to 19 year olds who have never given a thought to any of this?”^{xxvii} Rebecca Winters Keegen writing in *Time* argues that it is indeed hard to quantify the real impact of a film. But there are in fact small changes wrought by recent movies, including *Blood Diamond* where the diamond industry launched a p.r blitz to educate consumers about conflict-free diamonds, but actually stone sales were unaffected. “Movies make advocates out of supporters,” she writes, “They change the world not in wide swaths of multiplexes but one popcorn bucket at a time.”^{xxviii} Zwick’s avowed demythologizing of Hollywood’s complicity with diamonds , or arguing that “Not all American girls want a storybook wedding!” (a line from Maddy Bowen) , seems a rather filmsy and trivial basis for a meaningful political diatribe. *Gold!* serves up straight popcorn, but the popcorn with conscience films such as *Blood Diamond* may very well be in jeopardy in a society saturated with endless “hot-button” topics that all demand “urgent’ action, until something more urgent comes along.

ⁱ Films such as *Tsotsi* (2005) and *Catch a Fire* (2006) also represent this fascination with Africa but because of the uniqueness of the struggle against apartheid in South Africa these and other films made in the post-apartheid era constitute their own sub-genre and warrant a separate study. Clint Eastwood's recent *Invictus* (2009) straddles two genres: the apartheid film and the sports film.

ⁱⁱ William Arnold, "'Blood Diamond' is a multicaret message movie", December 2, 2006 at <http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/movies/295110.diamon08q.html>, 12/23/2007.

ⁱⁱⁱ James Robert Parrish and Don E. Stanke, *The Debonairs*, New Rochelle, New York: Arlington House Publishers, 1975, 280.

^{iv} "Gold", <http://.imdb.com/title/ttoo71566/>, 3, 12/12/2007.

v. Roy Moseley, *Roger Moore, A Biography*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1985, 212.

vi. *Ibid.*, 212-213.

vii. Peter Davis, *In Darkest Hollywood*, Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1996, 71.

viii. Arnold

ix. "Interview: Blood Diamond Ed Zwick,

<http://www.emanuellevy.com/printpage.php?articleID=3801> , 11?30?2007

x. Greg Campbell, *Blood Diamonds*, New York: Basic Books, 2004.

xi. *Zwick Interview*

xii. *Ibid.*

xiii. Steve Crum, "Blood Diamond Movie Review",

<http://www.rottentomatoes.com/m/blooddiamond/articles/1561376?1php>., 12/13/2007.

^{xiv} Simon Robinson, "Hollywood Plays Rough With Diamonds", *Time*, November 27, 2006, p. 66.

xv. *Blood Diamond*, <http://www.cinemareview.com/production.asp?prodid=3774>

xvi. *Blood Diamond, DVD, Commentary by Director Edward Zwick, Warner Bros. 2007.*

xvii. *Blood Diamond*, <http://www.cinemareview.com/production.asp?prodid/=3777>, p. 2 of 8

xviii. Carol Cling, "Blood Diamond", *Las Vegas Review Journal*, 12/08/06

<http://reviewjournalprintthisclickability.compt?action=cpt&title=reviewjournal.com>, 12/13/2007

xix. Jeremy Fox, *Blood Diamond*, <http://.paiiba.com/blood-diamond.htm>, 12/13/2007

xx. Beth Accomando, *Blood Diamond*, December 9, 2006,

<http://www.kpbs.org/blogs/movies/2006/12/09blood-diamond/>, 12/13/07

xxi. See Janine Roberts, *Glitter and Greed, The Secret World of the Diamond Cartel*, New York: The Disinformation Company, Ltd., 2003, 2007

xxii. *Ibid.*

^{xxiii} Owen Gleiberman, "Fighting the Power", *Entertainment Weekly*, November 17, 2006, p.77.

xxiv. *Ibid.*

xxv. *Ibid.*

xxvi. *Ibid.*

xxvii. *Ibid.*

^{xxviii} Rebecca Winters Keegan, "Can A Film Change The World?", *Time*, March 27, 2008, pp. 60, 61.