

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 29.03.19

Dette dokumentets nettadresse (URL) er:

<https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/cm4all/uproc.php/0/krigsfilm.pdf>

Krigsfilm

(_film, _sjanger) Både fiksjonsfilmer og dokumentarfilmer som primært handler om krig. “War movies lend shape and structure to war, identifying enemies, establishing objectives and allowing audiences to vicariously experience the danger and excitement of the front line.” (Westwell 2006 s. 1) Mange krigsfilmer kan også kalles actionfilmer.

Krig er menneskehetens mest destruktive ytterpunkt, og filmer om krig gir mennesker som ikke har opplevd krig innsikter og erkjennelser om de grusomhetene og lidelsene krig innebærer. Noen krigsfilmer har relativt mye forklarende tekst i begynnelsen og/eller slutten av filmen, f.eks. for å sette en reell krig som filmen handler om, inn i en historisk sammenheng.

Den britiske regissøren Ridley Scotts *Black Hawk Down* (2001) er basert på den amerikanske journalisten Mark Bowdens artikler og hans bok *Black Hawk Down: A Story of Modern War* (1999). Scotts film innledes med forholdsvis mange forklaringer om situasjonen i Somalia i 1992-93, og avsluttes med tekst om hva som skjedde med noen av de amerikanske soldatene etter krigen. På en DVD-utgave av filmen går det dessuten an å spille av et filmlydspor der en amerikansk veteran fra krigshandlingene i 1993 forteller.

Medieforskeren Tania Modleski har skrevet om sjangeren: “If there ever was a purely masculine genre, it is surely the war film. [...] The genre is not only *for* men but plays a crucial role in the masculinizing process so necessary in the creation of warriors” (i “Do We Get To Lose This Time? Revising The Vietnam War Film”, 2004; her sitert fra Mullen 2013 s. 193).

Det kan bli så store mengder grusomme drap, blodsprut, vill skriking osv. at det sløver seeren eller hisser opp og blir en slags “krigspornografi”.

Mange krigsfilmer fungerer som antikrigsfilmer. Noen er éntydig pasifistiske, blant andre den amerikanske regissøren Lewis Milestones *All Quiet on the Western Front* (1930). Andre kan kalles mer tvetydige, f.eks. den israelske regissøren Oren

Movermans *The Messenger* (2009), som handler om utfordringene ved å gi beskjed til familier om at deres nærmeste har blitt drept i krigen.

“War and Anti-War Films often acknowledge the horror and heartbreak of war, letting the actual combat fighting or conflict (against nations or humankind) provide the primary plot or background for the action of the film. Typical elements in the action-oriented war plots include POW camp experiences and escapes, submarine warfare, espionage, personal heroism, “war is hell” brutalities, air dogfights, tough trench/infantry experiences, or male-bonding buddy adventures during wartime. Themes explored in war films include combat, survivor and escape stories, tales of gallant sacrifice and struggle, studies of the futility and inhumanity of battle, the effects of war on society, and intelligent and profound explorations of the moral and human issues. [...] Some war films do balance the soul-searching, tragic consequences and inner turmoil of combatants or characters with action-packed, dramatic spectacles, enthusiastically illustrating the excitement and turmoil of warfare. And some ‘war’ films concentrate on the homefront rather than on the conflict at the military war-front. But many of them provide decisive criticism of senseless warfare. War films have often been used as ‘flag-waving’ propaganda to inspire national pride and morale, and to display the nobility of one’s own forces while harshly displaying and criticizing the villainy of the enemy, especially during war or in post-war periods. Jingoistic-type war films usually do not represent war realistically in their support of nationalistic interests, while avoiding the reality of the horrors of war. The good guys are portrayed as clashing against the bad guys (often with stereotyped labels such as ‘krauts,’ ‘commies,’ ‘Huns,’ or ‘nips’). These revisionistic, politically-correct and historically inaccurate films, in such diverse examples as *Sands of Iwo Jima* (1949) and *The Alamo* (1960), would often redefine the facts. War films can also make political statements – unpopular wars (such as the Vietnam War and the Iraq War), have generated both supportive and critical films about the conflict” (Tim Dirks i <http://www.filmsite.org/warfilms.html.html>; lesedato 09.08.13).

“Det pleier å gå noen år fra USAs kriger er slutt til de store Hollywood-filmene kommer: Irak-filmene laget under Bush-administrasjonens tidsalder var kommersielle fiaskoer. De store Vietnam-eposene *The Deer Hunter* og *Apocalypse Now* kom først på slutten av 1970-tallet. Hjemmepublikummet trenger avstand til nyhetene om de falne, til de draperte kistene, til krigens djevleskap for å løpe til kinosalen.” (Aslak Nore i *Dagbladet* 14. februar 2015 s. 50)

I boka *The Remasculinisation of America: Gender and the Vietnam War* (1989) hevder Susan Jeffords at når målet med en krig begynner å bli uklart for soldatene, blir en seier knyttet opp mot “performance”, det å handle heltemodig. Og en estetisering av krigen dekker over grusomheter: “The inability to define clearly marked goals – to tell Vietnam as a classic narrative – translated the strategies of war into questions, not of whether it was being won but of whether it was being well fought – questions, therefore, of performance. [...] Vietnam technology is

separated from its ostensible function. These machine guns, shells, and mini guns are not described as killing [...]: they are described only as their own display, their own theater.” (sitert fra Mullen 2013 s. 342)

Et “Film Office” i det amerikanske forsvarsdepartementet (Pentagon) tar stilling til alle filmprosjekter som gjelder det amerikanske militæret (Peltzer 2011 s. 32). Denne avdelingen av departementet bestemmer om et filmprosjekt skal få praktisk og/eller økonomisk støtte fra Pentagon. Et filmteam kan f.eks. få tilgang til militært materiell som våpen, helikoptere og jagerfly – som det ville vært svært dyrt å leie eller skaffe på annen måte. At materiellet er ekte gir dessuten filmen et autentisk preg. Men forsvarsdepartementet krever medbestemmelse over dreieboka og filmen. Noen ganger foregår det harde, langvarige forhandlingen mellom filmskaperne og Pentagon, slik det f.eks. var tilfelle med Francis Ford Coppolas *Apocalypse Now* (1979). For å støtte produksjonen av *Black Hawk Down* (2001; regissør Ridley Scott) krevde Pentagon at soldaten John Stebbins’ navn ble endret til Danny Grimes. Stebbins er det ekte navnet på en soldat som deltok i kamphandlingene i Somalia der filmen foregår, og han fikk en Silver Star-medalje for sin innsats, men før produksjonen av filmen var han blitt arrestert for en svært alvorlig kriminell handling. Pentagon fryktet at hans navn i filmen ville gi den amerikanske armeen et dårlig image (Peltzer 2011 s. 33).

Hollywood er altså på visse måter avhengig av det amerikanske forsvarsdepartementet for å lage “realistiske” krigsfilmer med et autentisk preg. Dette blant annet på grunn av “Pentagon’s willingness to provide military hardware and personnel (thereby slashing production budgets) in exchange for favourable representation. As a result, when we watch a war movie we should always try to remember that, even within the demarcated realm of fantasy and escape that is the cinema, what we are seeing on screen is the actual apparatus of war: real airplanes, real warships, real uniforms, even real soldiers who frequently act as extras and advisers.” (Westwell 2006 s. 3) Men hvis Pentagon bestemmer seg for å samarbeide med filmprodusentene, ønsker de direkte innflytelse over dreieboka (Heinze m.fl. 2012 s. 203). Departementet forhandler med og presser (i større eller mindre grad) filmprodusentene.

“[T]he US military were unwilling to provide their cooperation and support for films that might criticise the war [Vietnamkrigen], making war films an expensive and risky commercial proposition.” (Westwell 2006 s. 60) I den engelske regissøren Paul Greengrass’ *Green Zone* (2010), som foregår i Bagdad i 2003, er noen av “skuespillerne” reelle soldater som tidligere hadde deltatt i krigen i Irak. Filmene stiller seg kritisk til amerikanske myndigheters påstand om at det var masseødeleggelsesvåpen i Irak, men den store helten i filmen er en amerikansk soldat.

“[F]or all their protestations to the contrary, Hollywood movies tend to show war as necessary, if not essential, and present the armed forces as efficient, egalitarian

and heroic institutions. Shaped ideologically, through the legacy of the propagandist role of the war movie, and industrially, through the synergy between the military and the film industry, war is almost always shown in a positive light. The symbiotic relationship between the military and the movies goes even further. The release of a successful Hollywood war movie will often boost recruitment to the US armed forces, with the film functioning as a kind of trailer to encourage civilians into war (*Top Gun* (1986) famously eased a recruitment crisis in the US Navy in the mid-1980s). Furthermore, the American military consider the movies to be essential to the maintenance of good morale within the armed forces, with cinema spaces quickly set up in war zones. In fact, one of the markers of a successfully controlled area is that the area is safe enough to sustain a cinema and a regular programme of screenings” (Westwell 2006 s. 3).

Tradisjonelle krigsfilmer viser en bevegelse fra familien/hjemmet til krigen, fra uskyld til erfaring og en utvikling der soldatene går fra å være “gutter” til å bli “menn”, det sistnevnte med tydelig markering av “manhood and masculinity” (Westwell 2006 s. 23). Krigsfilmer har blitt kalt “the most jingoistic genre” (Westwell 2006 s. 108) av alle filmsjangrer. “[T]hrough its episodic narrative which moves from home front till front line, from innocence to experience, from civilian to soldier, the war movie shares much with more general ways of thinking about male experience, and in this respect the war movie is also always a movie about masculinity.” (Westwell 2006 s. 25)

“Krigsfilmer har en lei tendens til å framstå i svart-hvitt, med tydelige helte- og fiendebilder, mens virkeligheten som regel mer korrekt kan beskrives som fasetter av grått.” (Eirik Alver i *Dagbladet* 2. oktober 2008 s. 47) Hollywoods krigsfilmproduksjon tenderer til å underbygge “a kind of American collective dreaming of war displaying continuities, connections and coherence” (Westwell 2006 s. 9).

“From *Bataan* [regissert av Tay Garnett, 1943] to *We Were Soldiers* [regissert av Randall Wallace, 2002], propagandist and patriotic versions of the warrior myth rely on a construction of a form of masculinity in which men behave with discipline, capability and bravery according to strict codes of duty, honour and heroism. [...] patriarchy underwrites war and war underwrites patriarchy and the contemporary war cinema ensures that both are ultimately endorsed as essential, binding and positive elements of our social reality” (Westwell 2006 s. 112-113).

Krigsfilmer med pasifistiske trekk “unsettles the building blocks of war mythology – honour, bravery, comradeship” (Westwell 2006 s. 87), mens andre filmer tvert imot viser krig som “progressive, just and, if waged for the right reasons, ennobling” (s. 87). Noen revisjonistiske krigsfilmer viser nasjoners og soldaters “culpability in racism, rape, murder and military incompetence” (Westwell 2006 s. 100).

Amerikanske idealer om frihet og demokrati “sit uncomfortably with America’s wars including genocidal military campaigns against its indigenous people [dvs. indianerne], imperialism in Latin America, and the covert support of barbaric regimes in many parts of the world, all conducted in order to protect economic and strategic interests and all requiring considerable flexibility in America’s stated principles of freedom and democracy.” (Westwell 2006 s. 112)

Gjennom krigsfilmers “resolution full of pathos and yet cloaked with the redemptive moves of mourning, memory and commemoration, the war film is made central to processes of cultural memory. This is significant because the decision to wage war in the present is often dependent on the experience and memory of war in the recent past.” (Westwell 2006 s. 25) Men i noen filmer “there is an implicit, ongoing debate over the tactics, the rationale, the morality” og omkostningne ved krigen (Steve Fore i Westwell 2006 s. 51-52).

Et sentralt tema i mange krigsfilmer er selvopofrelse, i siste instans viljen til å ofre livet for sitt land, for en sak og/eller ideologi og for sine kamerater (Westwell 2006 s. 28). Gjennom militær trening lærer soldater å underordne sine egne behov til fordel for gruppa og målet det kriges for å oppnå. Krigsfilmer viser ofte “the sum of heroic actions carried out by a handful of individuals” (Pierre Sorlin sitert fra Westwell 2006 s. 109).

Mange krigsfilmer er lagd slik at “intensive action emphasises and intensifies the group dynamics [blant soldatene i en gruppe som kjemper sammen], steeling the men to further acts of comradeship and bravery, welding the patrol together and undoing their differences.” (Westwell 2006 s. 36) Filmer framstiller “combat as a catalyst of cohesion” (s. 36). Den militære seieren blir blant annet en måte å hevne sine døde kamerater på. Hvis en seier ikke blir vist i filmen eller hvis nederlaget er et faktum, kan filmpublikum “imagine vengeance effected on some future battlefield. In order for that future engagement to be successful Americans have to fully commit to the necessities of a war economy.” (Westwell 2006 s. 43)

“The film industry has a long history of producing movies that seek to justify and endorse war (often with guidance from governmental propaganda agencies and support from the military) and in describing war in this way these movies shape and consolidate the general sense that war is a valid and productive political and economic tool. The number of films functioning as genuine critique – *All Quiet on the Western Front*, *Paths of Glory*, possibly *Apocalypse Now* – are few and far between and in general the war cinema forms the ground upon which the benefits and justifications for war are argued out and shown to be convincing. As a result the cultural imagination of war is predisposed to conceive war as a positive and necessary part of human experience. This belief that war is just and necessary is itself a prerequisite to the waging of war. Hence, the cultural imagination of war by Hollywood, whilst in many respects a wholly cultural activity, is also constitutive of war in in very real terms.” (Westwell 2006 s. 114-115)

Filmer kan kritiseres for sin “partial sightedness and lack of historical framing” (Westwell 2006 s. 109). Hollywoods filmer har en tendens til å psykologisere og fjerne den historiske konteksten for krigen, dvs. unngå det problematiske “relating to the ‘system’, understood as the military, the government, or any of the political ideologies fuelling the differences upon which the war was predicated.” (Westwell 2006 s. 82) “[H]istory is understood through the limited personal narratives of spiritual growth and therapeutic transcendence that are so ubiquitous in American culture” (Westwell 2006 s. 110)

“[H]istorical events are thoroughly psychologised thereby eliding the contradictions, ambiguities and difficulties of history. As a result history is understood in very limited terms in relation to an individual traumatic experience that, with the imposition of the right therapeutic narrative, can be overcome and resolved.” (Westwell 2006 s. 95)

Problemet med mange amerikanske krigsfilmer er at de “blocks properly historical understanding of American strategy or political purpose, an understanding that can only come from an appreciation of the complex, self-interested, often economic, motivations influencing America’s entry into wars past and present.” (Westwell 2006 s. 113)

“Krigsfilmen er en problematisk sjanger. Hvordan formidle krigens brutalitet uten å estetisere og uten at meningsløsheten blir gitt en velordnet dramatisk logikk? Det er ofte kort vei fra velmenende antikrigsbudskap, til engasjerende bejubling av det spektakulære og hensiktsmessige ved krig: se bare den slagferdige Valkyrie-scenen i “Apokalypse nå”, eller den pyntelige skattejaktstrukturen i “Saving Private Ryan”.” (Ulrik Eriksen i <http://www.dagbladet.no/kultur/2007/07/06/505590.html>; lesedato 03.12.13)

Krigsfilmer kan tematisere identitet (nasjonalt, personlig osv.). I krigsfilmer “such as *Pearl Harbor*, *Saving Private Ryan*, *Behind Enemy Lines* and *Black Hawk Down* [vises krigen som] an existential battle between humane, moral individuals and a faceless, fanatical, inhumane enemy.” (Westwell 2006 s. 111) Underteksten forteller om en kamp mellom fundamentale krefter i tilværelsen. På sitt mest formelpregete viser krigsfilmer “a struggle between elemental forces of good and evil” (Westwell 2006 s. 113).

“War films come in many forms – but many similar forms. The patterns are familiar. [...] For example, there's the disillusioned soldier storyline – young man goes to war, finds out that war is Hell, changes his mind. (As seen in *Platoon*, *Born on the 4th of July*, and *All Quiet on the Western Front*.) There's the last stand where a small force faces a much larger enemy. There's the war biopic about a famous historical figure. There's the submarine movie. The jet pilot movie. The

Basic Training movie (a rebel squares off against a sadistic drill sergeant only for them both to, over time, develop a grudging respect for one another). [...]

1. Last stand

These are war films that portray a battle of over-whelming odds, often with the protagonists holed up somewhere like the Alamo. Whether it's the Spartans in *300*, the Australians in *Gallipoli*, or Navy SEALs in *Lone Survivor*, these are films premised on the thrilling visuals of soldiers surviving (or not) against overwhelming odds.

2. Disillusioned young soldier

[...] Young man full of patriotic fervor goes off to war, joins the infantry, and learns [...] that war can be, shall we say... “difficult?” It's the story of *Platoon*, *Born on the 4th of July*, and dozens of others. It's also a timeless story, as this is also essentially the story of the World War I classic, *All Quiet on the Western Front* and the Civil War classic, *The Red Badge of Courage*. Some things change a lot, but the desire of young men to participate in combat never does. [...]

3. Dumb action film

Being that war has lots of guns and things blowing up, it's sort of a safe environment to set an action film within. What distinguishes the “Dumb Action Movie” from your more traditional war film, is its complete disregard for any sense of respect for history, fallen soldiers, or the concept of violence. It's within these films that war teaches so many impressionable young minds that war is cool and exciting. [...] Enemies are cartoons and the violence is almost comedic. As an example, consider almost any action film of the 1980s: *Iron Eagle*, *Rambo*, *Delta Force*. Pretty much anything starring Stallone or Chuck Norris will probably qualify.

4. The Comedy

The military and war are hilarious! [...] All joking aside, the military really is pretty ripe for comedy exploits, what with all the seriousness, and the macho toughness and all. [...]

5. The war romance

[...] Who among us hasn't been in a romance that's been interrupted by war? [...] Formulas as follows: Two good looking people working in a war zone (perhaps one of them delivers international aid or works for “Doctors Without Borders” or something similar) find that their romance is interrupted by Civil War or World War or revolution. See *Casablanca*, and *The English Patient*.

6. Sweeping historical epic

In the “sweeping historical epic,” dozens of years of convoluted politics, culture, and history are neatly condensed into an hour and a half long narrative. Sometimes, this historical epic will have some element of truth to it (Denzel Washington in *Glory*), and sometimes the sweeping historical epic will be almost entirely made up (see Mel Gibson in *Braveheart*).

7. The mission gone wong

In the “mission gone wrong,” the focus isn't on characters, or some long arc of history, but rather the film narrowly focuses on some combat situation that has gone horribly wrong. (I don't think they've ever made a war film about a combat mission that went perfectly right.) Examples of this template are *Lone Survivor* (the story of Navy SEALs battling the Taliban in a failed mission), *Blackhawk Down* (the story of Army Rangers battling all the city of Mogadishu), and *We Were Soldiers* (the story of calvary soldiers fighting an entire division of North Vietnamese).

8. The documentary

The documentary is [...] almost always pointing out how bad military decision making is regarding some battle, war, or military conflict. There were quite a few of them about Iraq. [...]

9. The biopic

The Biopic is historical and is a lot like the sweeping historical epic, except that its focus is a single person. *Patton* is a good example. *Lincoln* is another.

10. The returning veteran

The “returning veteran” template avoids the war and focuses on the returning soldier who typically has some problem integrating back into regular life. The little seen *Stop Loss* is one example. *Dear John* is another.” (Johnny Rico i <http://warmovies.about.com/od/FilmReviewsbyGenre/tp/Types-of-War-Films.htm>; lesedato 24.06.14)

“Early on, war movies had welded together what Christine Gledhill calls ‘photographic realism’ and ‘pictorial sensationalism’ in a powerful symbiotic relationship that would give shape to the emerging genre [...] The most renowned film of this period, *Hearts of the World*, directed by D. W. Griffith, was released in March 1918 [...] Many of the war pictures shown in *Hearts of the World* were taken at the actual front and under fire of the enemy’s guns. With remarkable skills they

have been woven into the warp of the play, so that it is difficult to distinguish real scenes from the manufactured ones.” (Westwell 2006 s. 12 og 15-16).

“Steve Neale notes that the nature and duration of production schedules meant that over fifty war-related feature films were released in 1919, a year after the war’s close (2000: 129). These movies (the tail-end of wartime film production) overlapped with a brief cycle of revenge films, including *Why Germany Must Pay* (1918), *The Heart of Humanity* (1919) and *Behind the Door* (1919), the latter a particularly shocking Thomas Ince movie in which a German-American taxidermist, whose wife has been raped and murdered by a German submarine crew, captures the captain of the U-boat and endeavours to skin him alive.” (Westwell 2006 s. 18)

Lewis Milestones *All Quiet on the Western Front* (1930), basert på tyskeren Erich Maria Remarques pasifistiske roman fra 1929, ble rost for dens “exactitude and authentic detail” når det gjaldt krigen, og regissør Milestone “had worked in the photography section of the US Army Signal Corp during the war and as a result had great familiarity with newsreel and photographic images from the front. Actors were clad in original French and German uniforms and the film also utilised army surplus tools, packs, helmets, rifles, machine-guns and even six complete artillery pieces.” (Westwell 2006 s. 20) Dessuten var filmen relativt balansert: “it is difficult to imagine Hollywood producing a similarly balanced perspective in any scenario involving American troops.” (Westwell 2006 s. 21) Men *All Quiet on the Western Front* ble sterkt kritisert av tyske myndigheter, og det amerikanske produksjons-selskapet Universal Pictures gikk med på å slette scener fra filmen som nazistiske sensurinstanser mente ikke burde vises. Disse utelatte scenene ble ikke vist i Tyskland, men heller ikke i andre land (Westwell 2006 s. 27). Én grunn til overenskomsten med tyskerne var antakelig at produsentene var redd for tapte inntekter hvis filmen ble for kontroversiell eller ble boikottet.

“Russell Merritt compares *All Quiet on the Western Front* to Griffith’s *Hearts of the World* and sees almost everything turned on its head: “Rather than Griffith’s heroic struggle, the war became known as a hideous embarrassment, a conflict senseless in its origin, pointless in its outcome, which produced a catastrophe out of all proportion to the issues at stake. Even today, our iconography is built around trench wastelands, incompetent generals, and mass slaughter – not love-struck soldiers and stoical refugees.” ” (Westwell 2006 s. 22) *All Quiet on the Western Front* har de lidende soldatenes perspektiv som ofre for krigen, men har blitt kritisert for ikke å vise de bakenforliggende kreftene som driver krigen og som gjør soldatene til voldsutøvere (Bernd Hüppauf gjengitt fra Westwell 2006 s. 23). Hollywoods krigsfilmer har ofte et underliggende budskap om “fornyelse (regenerasjon) gjennom vold” (Liptay og Bauer 2013 s. 392).

Tyske krigsfilmer vist i etterkrigstidens Tyskland fungerte ofte som en psykisk avlastning for dem som hadde deltatt i krigen, fordi filmene formidlet at deres

krigsinnsats ikke var fullstendig meningsløs (Schenk, Tröhler og Zimmermann 2010 s. 257).

Den nederlandske dokumentarfilmskaperen Joris Ivens' *Spanish Earth* (1937), om den spanske borgerkrigen, "is a unique propaganda documentary film made in favor of the Republicans (Communists, Socialists and Anarchists). Its aim was to dramatize the effect of the Fascist uprising and invasion on the ordinary citizen. It shows the struggle to keep the road to Madrid open and to protect the bridge outside Madrid from destruction. Included are scenes of German and Italian planes bombing Madrid, and Spanish farmers constructing an irrigation system under seemingly impossible circumstances of war. Three of the leading intellectuals of the 30s – Lillian Hellman, John Dos Passos and Archibald MacLeish – collaborated on what was obviously a labor of love. Ernest Hemingway was a consultant on the shooting script, and was present on location. Hemingway's remarkable commentary is the author's only screen writing, and his reading of it is his only film performance." (<http://ihffilm.com/spanishearth.html>; lesedato 10.04.14)

Under 2. verdenskrig hevdet Elmer Davis, direktør i det amerikanske Office of War Information (OWI), at Hollywoods krigsfilmer egnet seg spesielt godt som propaganda fordi folk ikke er klar over at en underholdende film fungerer som propaganda (Westwell 2006 s. 31). Krig hadde også sine fordeler: "In the OWI/Hollywood vision, war produced unity. Labor and capital buried their differences for a greater cause; class, ethnic and racial divisions evaporated in the foxholes and on the assembly line" (Westwell 2006 s. 46).

Under 2. verdenskrig, "and with Stalin a key ally in the fight against Nazi Germany, Hollywood had produced a number of pro-Soviet war movies, including *Mission to Moscow* (1943), *Song of Russia* (1943) and *The North Star* (1943). It was also common for the World War II combat patrol to include someone of Russian or Eastern European descent" (Westwell 2006 s. 49). Slike filmer ble problematiske ettersom Sovjet-skepsisen økte i USA. Under McCarthys og myndighetenes kommunistjakt på 1950-tallet ble en rekke filmer anklaget for å være kommunistiske. "Among the first nineteen Hollywood figures subpoenaed [= innstevnet] to appear before HUAC [= House Committee on Un-American Activities] accused of communist subversion were Howard Koch, who had written *Mission to Moscow*, and Lewis Milestone, the director of *All Quiet on the Western Front* and *The North Star*. Pressure of this sort ensured a glut of movies, such as *Iron Curtain* (1947), *Guilty of Treason* (1949) and *The Big Lift* (1950) that described the Cold War in simplistic binary terms as a struggle between totalitarianism and democracy. Cold War anti-communism went as far as to put a positive spin on the use atomic weapons with *Above and Beyond* (1952) valorising the life of Colonel Paul Tibbets, the pilot who flew the airplane that dropped the bomb on Hiroshima." (Westwell 2006 s. 50)

Italieneren Gillo Pontecorvos krigsfilm *Kampen om Algerie* (1966) har vært en “inspirasjon” for noen: ”[B]åde Pentagon, Black Panthers og Hamas [har] på hvert sitt tidspunkt [...] forholdt seg til den som om den skulle være en lærebok. [...] Her var anti-imperialistisk tankegods forløst gjennom et forrykende dokudrama som var så overbevisende at mange trodde det var en uforfalsket dokumentar. Regissøren Pontecorvo oppnådde en sjelden effektiv realisme ved bruk av amatørskuespillere som fortsatt hadde frigjøringen i friskt minne (flere av aktørene som [advokaten Jacques] Verges forsvarte spiller seg selv i filmen).” (*Morgenbladet* 22. – 28. februar 2008 s. 27)

“Jean Pierre Melvilles mesterverk “L’Armée des ombres” (1969) handler om den franske motstandsbevegelsen [under 2. verdenskrig]. I stedet for å dvele ved deres heldådader, er filmen mer opptatt av det fåfengte og planløse ved det hele, om alle de gangene dømmekraften svikter. Her er ingen heroiske attentat eller geniale infiltrasjoner. Kampen presenteres som et Sisyfos-opppdrag der menneskelig feilbarlighet og paranoia dominerer over handlekraften. Det er en film om å være menneske i krig.” (*Dagbladet* 20. juli 2008 s. 2)

Den amerikanske regissøren Francis Ford Coppolas film *Apocalypse Now* (1979) har blitt kritisert for ikke å forankre Vietnam-krigen i en historisk-politisk kontekst, “arguing that by falling back on archetype and allegory in this way the film turns away from the specific political and historical discourses within which the war was debated as it unfolded in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Jeffrey Louvre and Alf Walsh comment that films like *Apocalypse Now* ‘offer a collective retreat into metaphysics, the view that war is to be seen as a darkness of the soul, and ordeal of the fallen, a version of hell, an apocalypse’ (1988: 12). Jim Neilson, identifying a similar tendency in written narratives of the Vietnam War, warns that ‘this view of the war as unknowable reinforces an ideologically useful historical ignorance and confusion’ (1998: 143). It is telling that the *Apocalypse Now Redux* version, released in 2001, includes a sequence cut from the film on its initial release in which Willard stumbles across a French plantation and engages in a long protracted discussion with its French owners about Vietnam’s colonial history. Clearly, this level of historical specificity was felt to sit uncomfortably with the vague allegorical tenor of the rest of the movie.” (Westwell 2006 s. 66)

I en scene i *Apocalypse Now* “[t]he kinetic action of helicopters, napalm strikes and fierce ground fire is overlaid with a complex soundtrack that uses Wagner’s ‘Ride of the Valkyries’ and Carmine Coppola’s unsettling electronic score to shape the sense of combat. The viewer is caught up in the visceral thrill of the battle, and yet is also aware of participating in it from the point of view of a quasi-fascistic American military. This balance of elements creates a structure of ambiguity – the viewer is not sure where to place themselves – and the result is a sequence functioning as critique that locates the irreverence, egoism and machismo that motivates the attack in the historical precedents of previous racist and genocidal military campaigns.” (Westwell 2006 s. 68)

Coppola sammenlignet innspillingen av *Apocalypse Now*, med handling fra Vietnam, med krigen der: “The way we made it was very much like the Americans were in Vietnam: we were in the jungle; there were too many of us; we had access to too much money, too much equipment, and little by little we went insane.” (sitert fra Mullen 2013 s. 192)

Amerikaneren John Milius, manusforfatter for Coppolas *Apocalypse Now*, har beskrevet problemene med å få finansiert filmen. På slutten av 1960-tallet var ingen filmstudioer interessert i å finansiere en film om en pågående krig som ble stadig mer upopulær i amerikansk opinion. I en dokumentarfilm om innspillingen, *Hearts of Darkness: A Filmmaker’s Apocalypse* (1991; regissert av Fax Bahr og George Hickenlooper) sier Milius: “People were so bitter about the war that there were riots [...] people were spitting on soldiers. Studio executives are the last people who are going to get into the middle of that thing. Studio executives are not noted for their social courage.” (sitert fra Mullen 2013 s. 195) Først etter sine kommersielle suksesser med to *The Godfather*-filmer fikk Coppola de pengene han trengte. *Apocalypse Now* ble spilt inn i en jungel på Filippinene. Dette krevde lange forhandlinger med myndighetene i landet, fordi myndighetene trengte helikoptrene som ble brukt under innspillingen til deres egne angrep på opprørere (Mullen 2013 s. 197).

Milius ble beskrevet slik at Peter Lev: “Milius, a very macho writer, understands the cruelty of war but seems to find it exciting. It was he who suggested the “Ride of the Valkyries” as accompaniment for the helicopter assault, and also the bizarre “Charlie don’t surf” scene. The title *Apocalypse Now* was also his; it suggests the reckless abandon of modern combat as well as a willingness to escalate the Vietnam war. [...] It was Coppola, however, who added the scene where the jumpy crew of the patrol boat opens fire on the Vietnamese family, killing them all.” (sitert fra Mullen 2013 s. 194) Den sistnevnte scenen kan minne publikum om My Lai og lignende massakre på sivile, og egner seg derfor til å uttrykke Coppolas ambivalens overfor det “heroiske” ved de amerikanske soldatenes innsats i Vietnam (Mullen 2013 s. 194).

“Fred Rexer, a friend of Milius’s, joined the Zoetrope scene to help with the narration [i *Apocalypse Now*]. A towering hulk of a man, with pale skin and blue eyes, he would regale the sound crew with stories of how, as a CIA operative, he had executed Viet Cong chieftains by squeezing his fingers through their eye-sockets and literally tearing their skulls apart. [...] In another incident, during a break for food in the basement of the Sentinel Building, Rexer produced a loaded .45 and handed it to Martin Sheen and said, ‘You could shoot anyone in this room. You have the power of life and death in your hands.’ Coppola, understandably not wanting anyone killed on his watch, pulled Milius aside and told him that loaded firearms were simply not part of the editing process.” (Peter Cowie sitert fra Mullen 2013 s. 200)

En bølge av Vietnam-krigsfilmer som begynte på slutten av 1970-tallet “all tended to stress loss and impairment [= forringelse] – the loss or impairment of American moral, political and military superiority as well as the lives, bodies, innocence or sanity of its troops – as fundamental hallmarks of the war and its aftermath” (Steve Neale sitert fra Westwell 2006 s. 69). Tendensen var ikke å ville skjule nederlaget på verken militært eller moralsk nivå. Men andre filmer, som kanadiere Ted Kotcheffs film *Rambo* (1982; den opprinnelige tittelen er *First Blood*), viser derimot “an insistent moral conscience that enabled them to fight compassionately and ethically, and ultimately to win if not a military victory then at least a moral victory” (Westwell 2006 s. 83). I *Rambo* kan macho-hovedpersonen “appear from nowhere, disappear into nothing, and kill with impunity ... he cannot be controlled by the Russians, the Vietnamese, the audience or the camera. He is pervasive, powerful and inexhaustible.” (Susan Jeffords i boka *The Remasculinization of America: Gender and the Vietnam War*, 1989; sitert fra Westwell 2006 s. 75)

“David James suggests that the general tendency of the 1980s Vietnam War movie is to “dehistoricise the war, to represent it as a transhistorical, existential catastrophe that is in essence inexplicable, unrepresentable, and itself a contradiction, and then to rewrite it as local actions, often limited military undertakings, in which the American soldiers win qualified or depleted local victories that cover for the actual defeat of the invasion as a whole.” (1990: 88) In sum, the squaring away of contradiction, the effacing of cultural and political differences, the eliding of the experience of the Vietnamese, and the remasculinisation of American male identity all make Hollywood’s Vietnam war movies among the most ideologically interventionist films ever made and allow a successful process of revision to recuperate the experience of Vietnam.” (Westwell 2006 s. 83)

Noen filmer handler om eller berører de overlevende amerikanske soldatenes liv etter Vietnamkrigen. “Portrayed as the key victims of the war, the suffering of the Vietnam veteran diverts attention from the war’s other victims (the Vietnamese) and from the reasons for fighting the war.” (Westwell 2006 s. 82)

Den sovjetrussiske filmregissøren Elem Klimovs *Gå og se* (1985) handler primært om nazistenes ugjerninger i Sovjet-Russland, ikke minst med massakrer på sivile. “Krig er absurd og kan derfor bare formidles gjennom absurditet. Noe sånt må være rasjonale bak russiske Elem Klimovs arresterende krigsdrama “Gå og se”. Filmen er en abstrakt, høysurrealistisk klagesang over krigens grusomhet, men også en realistisk fortelling om en ung gutts dannelsesreise i sadistisk og menneskefiendtlig brutalitet. Og søker man en rask og direkte opplæring i umenneskelighet, er det trolig få steder som er mer formålstjenlig enn de vanvittige blodbadene på Østfronten under Den andre verdenskrig. Det er her “Gå og se” finner sted. Florya er eneste sønn og mann i en familie i en hviterussisk landsby i nærheten av fronten. Tittelen høres ut som en barnlig oppfordring og speiler hovedpersonens

ungdommelige entusiasme for å komme seg i krigen. Fjortenåringen finner et gevær i en grunn soldatgrav og oppfyller dermed den eneste betingelsen for å kunne verve seg til den lutfattige russiske hæren. Moren kan gråte så fortvilt hun bare vil. Florya har ingen andre tanker enn å gå, se og delta i krigen. Og vi følger med. [...] “Gå og se” benytter et velbrukt grep innen krigsfilmene: Den viser et uskyldig ungt barns desillusjonerende møte med krigen og gryende bevissthet om verdens ondskap. Men regissør Elem Klimovs hypnotiserende film unngår krigsfilmens mange klisjeer. Her er bilder som vil følge deg i lang tid. Tyske soldater trer ut av en tykk tåke som en gjeng hvileløse gjenferd. Florya som i vill desperasjon svømmer gjennom en dyp, gjørmete myr, akkompagnert av en kakofoni av mer eller mindre imaginær støy. En ku som forviller seg inn i kryssild og blir ett av krigens mange ofre. Vi følger dødskampen på ultranært hold. Kuas øyne som febrilsk svirrer rundt er ett av filmens mest urovekkende syn.” (Ulrik Eriksen i <http://www.dagbladet.no/kultur/2007/07/06/505590.html>; lesedato 03.12.13)

“Til tross for sitt velkjente tematiske territorium likner “Gå og se” på svært lite annet. Med et rastløst, nesten svevende kamera introduseres vi til et krigsunivers som veksler mellom marerittaktig ekspresjonisme og nådeløs realisme. Lydarbeidet er et kapittel for seg, og er med på å overdrive og underdrive dramatikken i filmen, med fascinerende resultat. Når bombene hamrer over Florya, er lyden dempet til et knapt hørbart minimum. Men når han i en stille scene besøker landsbyen sin på leting etter familien, låter fluene som svirrer rundt i stua som hissige bombefly på tokt. “Gå og se” ble produsert i forbindelse med Sovjetunionens 40-årsjubileum for seieren over nazi-Tyskland, men er milevis unna en patriotisk og forherligende beretning om den dyrekjøpte seieren. Filmen ender i et barbarisk sirkus av fulle tyske soldater og bjeffende hunder som massakrerer en hel landsby av sivile foran de sjokkerte og resignerte øynene til Florya, som så opplever de russiske styrkenes ikke akkurat skånsomme hevn. En avskrekkende påminnelse om krigens katastrofale kostnader, selv for den seirende part.” (Ulrik Eriksen i <http://www.dagbladet.no/kultur/2007/07/06/505590.html>; lesedato 03.12.13)

En annen krigsfilm som skildrer empatisk hva en krig gjør med krigernes og ofrenes sjel, er den amerikanske regissøren Brian De Palmas *Casualties of War* (1989). Filmen skal være basert på sanne hendelser fra Vietnamkrigen. “A five-man patrol of American soldiers in Vietnam kidnapped a young woman from her village, forced her to march with them, and then raped her and killed her. One of the five refused to participate in the rape and murder, and it was his testimony that eventually brought the others to a military court martial and prison sentences. The movie is not so much about the event as about the atmosphere leading up to it – the dehumanizing reality of combat, the way it justifies brute force and penalizes those who would try to live by a higher standard.” (<http://www.rogerebert.com/reviews/casualties-of-war-1989>; lesedato 22.09.14)

“In contrast to the 1980s, the 1990s saw very few war movies in production. The changed nature of war – small scale, localised and mired in the complex politics of ethnic conflict – failed to register cleanly enough to be figured in the limited generic language available to Hollywood film producers.” (Westwell 2006 s. 86)
Det amerikanske “war cinema of the late 1990s – for all its liberal hesitancy – subsumes these more complex and difficult visions of war, laying a foundation of sorts for real war in the contemporary period.” (Westwell 2006 s. 100)

Den serbiske regissøren Emil Kusturicas *Underground* (1995) handler om 2. verdenskrig og Balkan-krigene på 1990-tallet. “*Underground* represents the history of modern Yugoslavia from 1941, the outbreak of WWII, to 1992 and the Bosnian conflict. The narrative is divided into three parts: The War (1941-); The Cold War (1961-); The War (1992-). Each of these dates represents key moments in Yugoslav history: 1941, the dismemberment of the old Yugoslav state and the beginning of the Partisan resistance; 1961, the first formal meeting of the Non-Aligned movement in Belgrade and the opening up of Yugoslavia to the West; 1992, the Bosnian conflict and effectively the end of the Yugoslav state. [...] Kusturica’s status as an emancipator (to use Gocic’s term) of Bosnian culture, language and identity was transformed into that of a betrayer of the national ideal. The film was widely acclaimed by many Western European critics and won the Palm d’Or at Cannes. At the same time, it was greeted by howls of outrage by critics from the non-Serb republics, who attacked the film for being nothing short of Serbian nationalist propaganda. [...] A key point of contention in the film was the use of documentary footage portraying Slovenes in Maribor and Croats in Zagreb cheering and welcoming Nazi troops in contrast to the footage of devastation wrought on Belgrade by Nazi bombers, the fairly obvious implication being that the Croats and Slovenes were collaborators while the brave Serbs resisted the occupation. Kusturica defended his use of this documentary footage, arguing that he was trying to counter the selective humanism of the West in showing only the Serbs as the aggressor. He was, he insisted, against ethnic cleansing of all kinds, whether it came from Bosnians, Croats or Serbs.” (http://www.pwsz.krosno.pl/gfx/pwszkrosno/pl/defaultaktualnosci/675/5/1/s04_mlb_boym2.pdf; lesedato 17.03.15)

Den amerikanske regissøren Steven Spielbergs *Saving Private Ryan* (1998) “is widely considered to be the most realistic depiction of the D-Day landings ever brought to the screen. A box office smash in the cinemas, no expense was spared in recreating the horror experienced by the American troops on Omaha Beach, and the film’s opening scene has gone down in cinema history as one of the greatest sequences ever made. The film unfolds to tell the story of the daring rescue of Private Ryan, the last surviving brother in his family. But just how accurate really is the landing scene? And was there a real Private Ryan? In [dokumentarfilmen] *Saving Private Ryan – The True Story*, Historians, eye-witnesses and weapons experts reveal amazing new insights into the detail of Spielberg’s graphic depiction of the landings. Veteran Harley Reynolds was one of the first men to make it off

Omaha Beach on D-Day and gives us his powerful eyewitness testimony. Pete Niland tells why his family story is thought by many to be the inspiration for the film, and why his uncle is the real Private Ryan. We take to the seas in one of the last surviving landing boats, see the real effects of an exploding mortar shell on the human body and test whether a sniper really can shoot an enemy straight their scope as shown in the film. The Allied invasion to liberate Europe is the backdrop to the main plot of [the] film, which revolves around Tom Hanks' character Captain Miller and his small unit of men as they are sent to rescue Private Ryan played by Matt Damon. Ryan is the last of four brothers left alive, the others all killed in action. Although the story of Captain Miller's rescue mission is fictional, the story of the Ryan brothers and the military policy that leads to Private Ryan being brought home are based on incredible, and tragic, true stories." (<http://www.discoveryuk.com/web/the-true-story/about/saving-private-ryan/>; lesedato 13.05.14)

Paul Fussell bruker i boka *The Great War and Modern Memory* (1975) uttrykket "military romanticism" om visse framstillinger av krig (Westwell 2006 s. 99). "As the World War II veterans were reaching their 80s, Fussell wrote, "there has been a return, especially in popular culture, to military romanticism." Of Steven Spielberg's movie "Saving Private Ryan," Fussell suggested that the first 20 minutes be made into a short subject called, "Omaha Beach: Aren't You Glad You Weren't There?" and the rest of it filed with the boys' adventure films." (http://seattletimes.com/html/editorials/2018289807_edit28fussell.html; lesedato 02.09.14)

"Just as the myth of the Fall is fragmented over the course of *The Thin Red Line* [regissert av amerikaneren Terrence Malick, 1998], so is another powerful myth, that of the "Good War." In his study of the reception of *The Thin Red Line*, John Streamas compares Malick's film with Spielberg's *Saving Private Ryan*, released that same year. Spielberg's film relies heavily on genre to present a stable image of a good war. "Idealised, the Good War resists historical analysis" concludes Streamas. Malick's film refuses to use the conventions associated with commemorating a "good war" and as such invites spectatorial analysis and engagement with history. Malick's film does not completely abandon all the icons of the combat film, but experiments with the spectator's expectations. Rather than the sounds of battle, the soundtrack delivers poetry. Malick uses the graphic violence of the combat genre, yet in one case frames two dead and dismembered American soldiers in a grassy clearing and holds the shot uncomfortably long. Malick's war invites historical analysis because it fractures an idealized and glorified celebration of the Second World War." (Lindsay Steenberg i <http://cinophile.ca/wp-content/uploads/2008/10/steenbergs-framingwar.pdf>; lesedato 10.04.14)

"Antallet filmer fra annen verdenskrig var høyt på førti-, femti- og sekstitallet, dalte noe gjennom sytti- og åttitallet, nådde et bunnpunkt på nittitallet før en ny, bratt stigning. De siste femten åra har krigsfilmen på ny manifestert sin stilling som en

dominerende sjanger med bred appell, og med sine egne klisjeer og konvensjoner. Hollywood-godzillaer som Steven Spielberg, Clint Eastwood og Michael Bay har nærmest konkurrert om å lage store, levende krigslerreter av yrende slagmarker for å suge seeren inn, men krigen åpner for historier på alle skalaer: Realisme og pastisj, politikk og action, blockbustere og intime kammerspill. Kanskje er avstanden i tid litt av poenget: Der den mest umiddelbare etterkrigstida i sin nummenhet forsøkte å få orden på hva som egentlig hadde skjedd, kan et publikum som kjenner krigen gjennom populærkulturen, historietimene og en og annen bestefarsanekdote, sentimentalisere en epoke der farene var mange, men heroismen også stor. Her har også annen verdenskrig en ubestridelig fordel som filmbakteppe: I større grad enn så mange andre omfattende konflikter, kan ettertida se tilbake og grøsse, men kjenne på en indre ro over at det var en nødvendig kamp som nedkjempet et system drevet av en menneskefiendtlig ideologi. Det gjør annen verdenskrig til et bedre utgangspunkt for underholdningsfilmer, heltepos og komedier enn andre konflikter. Det blir mye gru underveis, men anstrengelsene vil som regel ha en følelse av hensikt, at ofrene ble gjort for å nå et nødvendig mål. Til tross for tallrike historier som har søkt å komplisere den moralske klarheten, har denne tilnærmingen fremdeles en magnetisk kraft på seerskarene, ikke minst i Norge. Til sammenlikning har Vietnamkrigen vært brukt helt annerledes: Filmer lagt til de blodige krigsåra i jungelen har i større grad enn annen verdenskrig-filmene gått inn for å skildre krigens absurditet, der lidelsene er mange og meningsløse. “Apokalypse nå” og “Platoon” er typiske eksempler, og også “Good Morning, Vietnam” har et bitter bismak. De ble da også alle laget i en annen og mer autoritetskritisk tid, der man søkte narrativer som var splittende mer enn samlende. Fortellinger fra annen verdenskrig kan være begge deler.” (Inger Merete Hobbeldstad i *Dagbladet* 9. april 2015 s. 2)

“Hollywood’s cultural imagination of war” har blitt anklaget for å formidle “a myopic view of the past – predicated on a limited point of view, a prejudicial and nationalistic construction of cultural and ideological otherness, a reconstructed masculine capability, and a profound nostalgia for a mythologised version of World War II [that] has become justification for war in the present.” (Westwell 2006 s. 115)

Den amerikanske regissøren Jonathan Mostows film *U-571* (2000), om et strategisk viktig angrep på en av Nazi-Tysklands ubåter, ble kontroversiell i Storbritannia fordi den var historisk unøyaktig. Den britiske statsministeren Tony Blair uttalte “that the film – a huge success in the US and number four in the UK box office chart on its opening weekend – was an “affront” to British sailors. The film portrays the capture of the Enigma coding machine from a Nazi submarine – an event which changed the course of World War II – as an American rather than British, operation. It was described in the Commons as an “affront” to British sailors killed in the operation. Mr Blair said that he entirely agreed. The Culture Secretary, Chris Smith, has already said he will raise the issue in Hollywood for inaccurately glossing over the real story. [...] According to *U-571*, it was the US

Navy that recovered the code machine, but the device was really captured by the crew of HMS Bulldog. They disabled and seized German submarine U-110 to retrieve the device. [...] At the end of *U-571*, prior to the credits, it is made clear that the movie is fictional but inspired by real events. [...] members of the boarding party were decorated for their heroism in retrieving the encoding device and that King George VI described their actions as perhaps the most important single event in the war at sea. [...] Hollywood has chosen to distort the truth and detract from the valour of the British sailors concerned by appropriating the story for its own financial gain.” (http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/781858.stm; lesedato 04.08.14)

Etter terrorangrepene i USA 11. september 2001 “Karl Rove, senior advisor to President George Bush Jr, met with several top Hollywood executives to discuss how the film industry might contribute to the ‘war on terror’. As a result of this meeting *Black Hawk Down* (2001) and *We Were Soldiers* (2002), films with clear patriotic and pro-military tendencies, had their release dates brought forward in order to cash in on, and help to consolidate, post-11 September bellicosity [= stridbarhet, krigersk mentalitet]. At the same time, the release date of *Buffalo Soldiers* (2003), a story of heroin dealing on a US military base in West Germany in 1989, and *The Quiet American* (2002), which tells of America’s clandestine support of terrorist networks in Vietnam in the 1950s, had their release dates delayed because they were deemed too critical of the US military. As these examples indicate, the Bush administration considered Hollywood a way of gaining important leverage in the construction of a way of thinking about war that would support and sustain a more aggressive foreign policy stance. Further, Hollywood executives saw a favourable business opportunity exploitable via the fine-tuning of their release schedules in order to tap into the belligerent public mood. These two attuned actions reinforced one another” (Westwell 2006 s. 1-2).

“War is a key building block in the formation of cultural memory and the war movie genre is one of the primary ways in which past wars are recalled, re-enacted and rescripted. [...] The cultural imagination of war in the contemporary period relies on a kind of faulty memory, the unreliability of which the war cinema has undoubtedly contributed.” (Westwell 2006 s. 113-114)

Krigsfilmer kan la publikum ha et “endangered gaze”: “The field of vision offered to the viewer ensures an intensely subjective point of view equivalent to the soldiers on the beach and the space off-screen, outside this field of vision, is full of threat from all directions through machine-gun fire, artillery, mines and enemy snipers” (Westwell 2006 s. 94).

“Saddam Hussein is said to have told his troops to use the film *Black Hawk Down*, the true story of how US soldiers were drawn into a bloody urban battle in Somalia, as a lesson for the Iraq war. American military intelligence sources told Time magazine that Saddam believed that President George W Bush would pull out US

forces if the Iraqis managed to inflict humiliating casualties. In 1993 Bill Clinton ordered a withdrawal from Somalia after 18 soldiers were killed in Mogadishu and some of their bodies were dragged through the streets. Osama bin Laden, the al-Qa'eda leader, was inspired by what happened in Somalia, when two Black Hawk helicopters were shot down. He said in interviews that Mogadishu convinced him the US armed forces were a “paper tiger” that hid behind sophisticated technology and would fold once things began to go wrong. The film, which starred Josh Hartnett and Ewan McGregor, was adapted from the 1999 book by Mark Bowden. It showed in graphic detail how US Army Rangers and members of Delta Force killed hundreds of Somalis who attacked them with an unexpected ferocity. [...] Lt Col Michael Humm, a Pentagon spokesman, said: “Whether or not the Iraqis are using Black Hawk Down as a manual, they would be well advised to consider that we have also learned lessons from our past.” ” (<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/1426315/Iraqis-watch-Black-Hawk-Down-for-tips.html>; lesedato 22.09.14)

American Sniper (2014; regissert av Clint Eastwood) slutter med dokumentariske filmopptak av begravelsen til Chris Kyle, filmens hovedperson. Filmen er basert på Kyles selvbiografi fra 2012. “Navy SEAL Chris Kyle is considered the deadliest sniper in US military history. Kyle had 160 confirmed kills, and his autobiography, “American Sniper,” led to a hit movie of the same title.” (<http://www.businessinsider.com/eddie-ray-routh-is-on-trial-for-allegedly-killing-chris-kyle-2015-2?r=US&IR=T&IR=T>; lesedato 25.04.18)

American Sniper, “basert på snikskytteren Chris Kyles selvbiografi, har sprengt alle rekorder for krigsfilmer på amerikanske kinoer. [...] “American Sniper” er en actionfylt affære, kompromissløst fortalt fra soldatens perspektiv. Det er det håndgripelige og kortsiktige som er viktig, avgjørelsene som styrer hvem som lever og dør i gatene i Fallujah [i Irak] – som valget om å skyte eller ikke skyte et barn som kanskje bærer på en granat. Storpolitikken, de nedslående, lange linjene, er så godt som fraværende. [...] Slik blir det mulig å identifisere seg med Kyle, beundre evnene hans og ønske at han skal overleve, uten å føle seg ansvarlig for feilvurderingene som ble gjort i krigen han utkjemper. Det er også en grunn til at filmen har vært splittende i USA, og at linja i stor grad overlapper det politiske skillet. [...] Men både det hyllende høyre og det rasende venstre har for enkle tolkninger. Eastwood er verken forpliktet til å dele andre filmskaperes perspektiv eller til å inkludere alle syn på krigen i én enkelt film. Det er lov å konsentrere seg om den individuelle opplevelsen i skildringa av en krig. Det kan argumenteres for at det er sunt å få fram opplevelsen sett fra den første frontlinja, selv om soldatene ikke gjør noen sofistisert analyse av krigen de deltar i. Dessuten er det ikke slik at Kyles forståelse av krigen presenteres som den eneste rette. Kyle er sikker på at han forsvarer landet sitt og kjemper mot ondskapen, men fra medsoldatene kommer deprimerte drypp, og spørsmål om krigen nytter. På grunn av denne ambivalensen føles det påklistret når den ellers spennende filmen munner ut i konvensjonell, patriotisk heltedyrking med brusende musikk. [...] [Eastwood] unnsår ikke de

moralske dilemmaene, men ender, som før, med å se på oppgaven som nødvendig og sympatiserer med den som tar den på seg. Kan hende er dette noe av “American Snipers” appell: At den lar publikum sitte igjen med en ren, positiv følelse for noe de egentlig vet er grumsete og vanskelig.” (Inger Merete Hobbelstad i *Dagbladet* 18. januar 2015 s. 2)

Alle artiklene og litteraturlista til hele leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>