

لجمهورية الجزائرية الديمقراطية الشعبية  
PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA  
وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي  
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY OF ABBES LAGHROUR –KHENCHELA



كلية الآ  
FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES  
نجليزية  
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH



## Elitist, Heroic and Exceptional Hollywood's Depiction of US Army Image in Films

*Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Master in Language and Culture*

**Candidates:**

**TOUAHRIA TAREK**

**BOUDRAA HOUSSEM**

**Supervisor:**

**Mr. KEFALI WALID**

### Board of Examiners

**Mr. GUERZA OMAR**

**President**

**University of Khenchela**

**Mr. KEFALI WALID**

**Supervisor**

**University of Khenchela**

**Mr. OUNIS SALIM**

**Examiner**

**University of Khenchela**

**September, 2019**

## DEDICATION

This work is wholeheartedly dedicated to my beloved parents, who have been my source of inspiration and gave me strength when I thought of giving up, who continually provide their moral, spiritual, emotional, and financial support.

To my beloved wife and sons, relatives, mentor, friends, and classmates who shared their words of advice and encouragement to finish this study.

And lastly, we dedicated this work to the Almighty Allah, thank you for the guidance, strength, power of mind, protection and skills and for giving us a healthy life. All of these, we offer to you.

## Acknowledgements

First, We would like to express our tremendous appreciation and gratitude to our supervisor, **Mr. KefaliWalid**, for his guidance, support throughout the process of completing this study, and the references he provided us with. His mentorship was substantial in completing this study. His explicit investment of his proficiency and time in this thesis contributed to its felicitous completion, not to mention his advice and unsurpassed knowledge of American culture. His good advice, support and friendship, has been invaluable on both an academic and a personal level, for which we are extremely grateful.

We would also like to show our gratitude to the committee members for providing us with valuable advice and orientations.

We would like to express our deepest and sincere gratitude to all our teachers at the department of English at Abbess Laghrour University.

We want to thank all the respondents who participated in this study.

We would like to express our gratitude and appreciations to all who helped us accomplish this research, thanks to all who contributed in a way or another to the achievement of this work.

**Abstract**

The United States (U.S) military is arguably the most formidable fighting force in the world and as such holds a high opinion of itself. With an annual budget that runs into the billions, the Pentagon wields significant influence over not just the national psyche of the U.S but also over the hearts and minds of other nations through movies produced by the movie industry in Hollywood throughout the globe, although many think differently to how the Pentagon would like. While winning the hearts and minds of those in a tactical scenario has never been a skill that the U.S military has quite mastered, it does have a significant ally that can effect significant aspects of human behavior.

Keywords: US Military, Pentagon, Movie Industry, Hollywood, Psyche

يمكن القول إن جيش الولايات المتحدة (الولايات المتحدة) هو القوة القتالية الأ  
يعتد بنفسه.  
ميزانية سنوية تصل إلى المليارات ، يتمتع البنتاغون بنفوذ كبير ليس فقط على النفس الوطنية للولايات المتحدة ولكن أيضاً  
على قلوب وعقول الدول الأخرى من خلال الأفلام التي تنتجها صناعة السينما في هوليوود في جميع أنحاء العالم  
يفكرون بطريقة مختلفة عن الكيفية التي ينتهجها . على الرغم من أن كسب قلوب وعقول أولئك في سيناريو تكتيكي  
لم يكن يوماً مهارة يتقنها الجيش الأمريكي تماماً ه اتخذ حليف مهم يمكنه التأثير على جوانب مهمة من السلوك

مفتاحية: الجيش الأمريكي ، عة السينما ، هوليوود ، علم النفس .

## Table of Contents

Dedication.....	I
Acknowledgments.....	II
Abstract.....	III
Table of Contents. ....	V
<b>General Introduction. ....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>I. Chapter One: The historical relationship between Hollywood and Pentagon....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. 1.The influence of the Pentagon on Hollywood.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. 2. Hollywood movies change after the 9/11 attacks.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>I. 3. Different aspects tackled by War films.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Work Cited.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>II. Chapter Two: People support of the US army.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>II. 1. People support US wars abroad.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>II. 2. The enemy: the concept (Doughboys).....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>II. 3. Hollywood’s War Films.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>II. 4. How Hollywood's depiction of us army influence the other.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>II. 5. Third-Person Perception.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Work Cited.....</b>	<b>33</b>

<b>III. Chapter Three: Movie Analysis.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>III. 1. The Battle of the Bulge.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>III. 2. A Bridge Too Far.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>III. 3. Platoon.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>III. 4. Saving Private Ryan.....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>III. 5. The Hurt Locker.....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Work Cited.....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>General Conclusion.....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>71</b>

## General Introduction

The United States (U.S) military is arguably the most formidable fighting force in the world and as such holds a high opinion of itself. With an annual budget that runs into the billions, the Pentagon wields significant influence over not just the national psyche of the U.S but also over the hearts and minds of other nations throughout the globe, although many think differently to how the Pentagon would like. While winning the hearts and minds of those in a tactical scenario has never been a skill that the U.S military has quite mastered, it does have a significant ally that can effect significant aspects of human behavior.

Hollywood, armed with a weapon more deadly than any missile – the camera - has been utilized by the military since before the Second World War. However, while some of the most critically praised films ever made have been influenced, guided, or governed by the Pentagon, there has typically been dissenters towards the so-called “Military-Industrial-Media Complex” by the more left wing branch of Hollywood. The visible difference in ideologies are often apparent on film and highlight the reaches and limitations of the Pentagon influence and how it presents the image of the U.S military and the face of war to the public. In this essay I will argue that while the Pentagon does hold significant influence over Hollywood and the film industry, it does not hold complete dominance and never will owing to the international nature of film, nations who are keen to either weaken the U.S image or promote their own, and the ideological differences that can be found in a nation that actively promotes the Freedom of Speech.

The U.S military and the U.S film industry began their relationship in 1927 with the production of the film “Wings” (Hall, 1927). Although silent, the film received assistance from an extremely co-operative military who provided vast resources for



the task. The film's director recalled "We had been rehearsing with 3,500 army personnel and 65-odd pilots for ten days. ... It was a gigantic undertaking, and the only element we couldn't control was the weather".

## **I. Chapter One: The historical relationship between Hollywood and Pentagon.**

### **I. 1. The influence of the Pentagon on Hollywood.**

The United States (U.S) military is arguably the most formidable fighting force in the world and as such holds a high opinion of itself. With an annual budget that runs into the billions, the Pentagon wields significant influence over not just the national psyche of the U.S but also over the hearts and minds of other nations throughout the globe, although many think differently to how the Pentagon would like. While winning the hearts and minds of those in a tactical scenario has never been a skill that the U.S military has quite mastered, it does have a significant ally that can effect significant aspects of human behavior. (Anderson & Bushman, 2002: 27-51).

Hollywood, armed with a weapon more deadly than any missile – the camera - has been utilized by the military since before the Second World War. However, while some of the most critically praised films ever made have been influenced, guided, or governed by the Pentagon, there has typically been dissenters towards the so-called “Military-Industrial-Media Complex” by the more left wing branch of Hollywood (Rose, 2009). The visible difference in ideologies are often apparent on film and highlights the reaches and limitations of the Pentagon influence and how it presents the image of the U.S military and the face of war to the public. In this essay I will argue that while the Pentagon does hold significant influence over Hollywood and the film industry, it does not hold complete dominance and never will owing to the international nature of film, nations who are keen to either weaken the U.S image or promote their own, and the ideological differences that can be found in a nation that actively promotes the Freedom of Speech.

The U.S military and the U.S film industry began their relationship in 1927 with the

production of the film “Wings” (Hall, 1927). Although silent, the film received assistance from an extremely co-operative military who provided vast resources for the task. The film’s director recalled “We had been rehearsing with 3,500 army personnel and 65-odd pilots for ten days. ... It was a gigantic undertaking, and the only element we couldn’t control was the weather” (Gladysz, 2016). The film was both a critical and commercial success, resulting in the first ever Oscar win for Best Film Production (Gladysz, 2016). The U.S military, noticing the popular appeal of both films and the popular effect that the action genre had on the audience prompted the U.S military to become more involved in the film industry. However, it was the U.S entry into the Second World War that saw an almost unbreakable bond appear between the two organizations.

Fighting a two front war, in an effort to galvanize its citizens movies extolling the glory and excitement of combat, war films such as *Flying Tigers* (1942) with John Wayne, *30 Seconds Over Tokyo* (1944), and *They Were Expendable* (1945) are notably patriotic – unsurprising as the films were set in the Pacific Theatre of Operations – while movies set against fighting in the European Theatre such as *A Walk in the Sun* (1945) and *The Story of G.I Joe* (1945) were less sanitised and attempted to show the horrors of war with a more realistic slant (Dirks, 2016). While Hollywood in the early part of the 20th Century was overtly racist, it is interesting to note that even during a war involving both Asians and Caucasians as the enemy, the U.S media still chose to portray Asians in a cartoonish and subhuman manner (Miles, 2012) (Silver, 2011). Having witnessed the potential emotion that could be created from films, the Department of Defence (DoD) agreed that in order to safeguard the interests of the military - and by extent - the nation from a public

backlash that a legal compromise be made when co-operating with the film industry.

Zhakova explains:

“The military has been helping Hollywood create spectacular war films by providing filmmakers with the expensive military equipment and personnel for little money. In return, filmmakers have been giving the Department of Defense the right to change their scripts. Such cooperation allows the Pentagon to alter unsatisfactory scenes and characters and create a positive and dignified image of the U.S. armed forces on the screen. This cooperation is based on a DoD provision: DODINST 5410.16. According to this provision the Department of Defense can provide support to a feature film if it benefits the military or is in the national interest” (Zhakova, 2011: 2)

This trend has continued with films since 1948 with films such as Pearl Harbor (2001) and Black Hawk Down (2001) having characters altered so as to present a better image to the wider public (Guardian, 2001) (USA Today, 2001).

Since 1948 the office in charge of maintaining the image of the military has been the US Department of Defense Film Liaison Unit (FLU) (Tarabay, 2012). As films have become more ambitious, so too has the role of the U.S military in assisting film makers, necessitating the U.S Congress to “legislate that the armed services should have a public relations operation [sic]” (Suid, 2002: xi). With the implementation of provision DODINST 5410.16 the FLU were able to wield considerable influence over the direction of how war movies were presented to the public. Owing to the swiftly declining relations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union – as well as the rise of McCarthyism – the U.S military became especially reluctant to participate in films that could show them in an unflattering way, thus supply metaphorical ammo to the

soviet propaganda machine. Despite the end of the Cold War and the more relaxed ideologies of most nations, the DoD is still sensitive about a negative portrayal and film makers must seek prior approval:

“Generally, producers seeking the Pentagon’s support address the main Pentagon’s film liaison office in Washington, known as the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs (OSD/PA), providing five copies of the script and writing an official letter asking for the Department of Defense assistance in their film production. According to DoD instructions, the letter should also contain information on any potential benefit to the DoD for providing assistance to the project” (Zhakova, 8)

Owing to the high costs of renting military equipment and locations through private means, the FLU are able to demand changes to the script or in some cases refuse assistance entirely. Critics have argued that this creates a scenario where the FLU is able to effectively extort changes in films where they see fit (Weisman, 2014). Critics have pointed out that at times the FLU has attempted to make historical events seem more compatible to the official stance of the DoD.

“Ultimately, negotiations fell through between the DOD and the producers of *Thirteen Days*. There was not full cooperation. On seeing the script, the DOD insisted on several changes that would have rendered the film factually in opposition to the historical record. White House tapes show that, while the President was leaning towards a Naval blockade of Cuba, Joint Chief of Staff General Curtis LeMay was arguing forcefully for an invasion. Strub [current official in charge of FLU] wrote, “Both General LeMay and General Maxwell Taylor are depicted in a negative and inauthentic way as unintelligent and

bellicose” (Robb, 18)

Despite being a matter of historical fact in this instance, the Pentagon’s instance on historical revisionism has been seen as a dangerous mixture of self-promotion and the attempt to bulldoze a highly politicised ideology through Hollywood has raised just concerns (Alford, 2016, 332-347).

The national image of the U.S has been a defining factor throughout the nation’s history, having set a historical precedent by winning the American Revolutionary War against the British Empire. Despite the U.S remaining a mostly isolationist nation until the Second World War, this conflict and the Cold War that followed has fostered the image of the U.S acting as “leaders of the free world”, first in helping to defeat totalitarianism in the Pacific and Europe before holding the line against the communist. Even before entering the war, so confident in the nations’ capabilities were some American writers that in 1941, Henry Luce claimed that:

“[the U.S must] accept wholeheartedly our duty and our opportunity as the most powerful and vital nation in the world and in consequence to exert upon the world the full impact of our influence ... [with] ... a passionate devotion to great American ideals” (Luce, 1941)

While the U.S has often been accused of cultural insensitivity, when examining the script for the adaptation of the Tom Clancy novel *The Sum of All Fears* (2002) that was subject to Pentagon approval, several individuals became concerned at the identity of the antagonists and requested that the adversaries of the novel, a Palestinian terrorist organisation, be changed. The script was subsequently changed and an official response was sent Jean-Michel Valentin writes:

“Notified about this project, the Washington based lobby group the Council on

Arab-American Relations (CAIR), was concerned; they effectively feared that, as in the book, the film gave a bad image of Islam and Muslims...Omar Ahmad, board chairman of the CAIR, replied ‘Giving the existing prejudice against and the stereotyping of Islam and Muslims, we believe this film could have had a negative impact on ordinary American Muslims, particularly children.’ (Valantin, 2005: 92)

## **I. 2. Hollywood movies change after the 9/11 attacks.**

As this film was in production immediately after the terror attacks of 9/11 and that emotions were still running high in the U.S, this was a magnanimous decision, in that the Pentagon originally did not plan to change the script but did so to reflect the current climate.

Owing to this belief of inherent supremacy, the appearance of the both the U.S armed forces and the President has been greatly thought out and promoted, while at the same time subjected to ridicule. The film *Independence Day* (1996) centres around an alien attack on earth during the first week of July with the climax of the film occurring on the U.S holiday. Driven to the brink of defeat, the President of the United States (POTUS) delivers an inspiring speech and then personally leads the U.S forces to victory. Following by example, the rest of the world unites behind the U.S and saves the planet. Klindo and Phillips write:

“Producers of the mindless blockbuster *Independence Day* (1996) bent over backwards to gain access to Department of Defense heavy equipment. The Pentagon rejected these overtures, claiming that the movie did not contain any “true military heroes” and that Captain Steve Hiller (Will Smith) was too irresponsible to be cast as a Marine leader (he dates a stripper). Moreover,

the invading aliens were thwarted not by the Marines, but by civilians. While Dean Devlin, the scriptwriter, agreed to rectify these “flaws”, *Independence Day* was given no assistance” (Klindo& Phillips, 2005)

The instance of the Pentagon on having a heroic and morally appropriate protagonist as well as the refusal to allow civilians to take any credit for the victory effectively insulates the U.S military from any criticism of incompetence or low moral standing. In a film that is the complete ideological opposite to *Independence Day*, *Apocalypse Now* (1979) is just as famous for the hardships faced by the cast and crew as the actions portrayed in the film itself. Based on Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*, the film was set in Vietnam and sees the protagonist, a jaded Special Forces operative with PTSD, being sent on an illegal mission to assassinate a fellow soldier that has gone insane. The film includes U.S soldiers abusing drugs and women, as well as cowardice, incompetence, and staggering brutality.

“According to Army Major Ray Smith from the film liaison office, *Apocalypse Now*’s central story line—a CIA mission to assassinate Colonel Kurtz (Marlon Brando), a rebel US military officer in Vietnam—was “not realistic”. Smith falsely claimed: “The army does not lend officers to the CIA to execute or murder other army officers. And even if we did, we wouldn’t help you make it.” He refused all assistance, forcing director Francis Ford Coppola to shoot his film in the Philippines” (Wright, 2011: 57)

Without Pentagon assistance, Coppola instead faced an uphill battle to finish the project. In order to accurately depict realistic combat scenes that involved napalm and multiple helicopters, he was forced to rely on the graces of the Filipino government. Robert Sellers reports:



“When [Martin] Sheen [the actor playing the film’s lead] arrived, he found chaos. Coppola was writing the movie as he went along and firing personnel, people were coming down with various tropical diseases and the helicopters used in the combat sequences were constantly recalled by President Marcos to fight his own war against anti-government rebels” (Sellers, 2009)

Owing to the sheer logistical considerations that were caused by the Pentagon refusing to supply assistance, the entire production was nearly derailed, thus highlighting how difficult it is to make a war film without the support of the U.S military.

Another motive the Pentagon has for maintaining a media friendly image is that a negative portrayal of life in the military may adversely reflect recruitment rates. To this end, movies that focus on the more glamorous aspect of the military are typically more exciting. In *Top Gun* (1986), the film’s protagonist – carrying the *nom de guerre* of Mavrick - is an individualistic and arrogant fighter pilot in the U.S navy. Sent to an elite school, there are multiple scenes of fast-paced “dogfights” set to riffs on an electric guitar. Finally climaxing in an aerial battle with the unidentified but obviously communist enemy in which the U.S navy are victorious, the final shot of the film is of the cheering victors. The film was a massive success and prompted naval recruitment rates to rise exponentially as well as polls showing that people had more confidence in the Reagan administration (Sirota, 2011). Jamie Tarabay reports that the film was so inspiring other branches of services were applied to other than the navy:

“Ironically, the Air Force received a massive boost in recruitment, even though it had nothing to do with the film. ‘The public doesn’t always discern the

difference on the outside between the Navy and the Air Force,' Coons explained. 'But it was also the single biggest boost to the Navy fighters ever' (Tarabay, 2014)

Despite the recruitment selection for navy pilots being extremely selective, the amount of new recruits that were found applying and in some cases succeeding demonstrated the power of the media in recruitment (Department of Defense, 2014, iii). Another film that was designed specifically with recruitment in mind is the film *Act of Valor* (2012) which follows a team of the elite Special Forces group, the navy SEALs. Jordan Zakarian writes:

“There are no corrupt officers, no damaged heroes, no queasy doubts about the value of the mission or the virtue of the cause. That’s because ‘Act of Valor’ was born not in Hollywood, but in the Pentagon. It was commissioned by the Navy’s Special Warfare Command and its success will be measured not in box-office receipts, but in the number of new recruits it attracts to the Navy SEALs” (Zakarian, 2012)

The film was directly inspired *Top Gun*’s success but was filmed with a newer generation of audience in mind – those more familiar with a games console – so that the film felt as authentic as possible. It is also noticeable that unlike *Top Gun* the protagonists are not seen attending a school to become elite in their profession; in this instance they already are elite and seemingly require no introduction.

“The battle scenes were shot during live SEAL training missions, plotted out and blocked by the troops themselves, with cameras placed atop their helmets for a video game-like first-person view of the action. To a generation

well-accustomed to guiding digital soldiers through combat zones, all that's missing is a PlayStation controller in a theater seat" (Zakarian, 2012)

### **I. 3. Different aspects tackled by War films.**

By capturing the film in the style of a First Person shooter the film allows the audience to feel as if they are a part of the unit while at the same time dehumanising the violence occurring on screen with its comparisons to video games.

Gender is also an area that is becoming more of an issue for the Pentagon. While the majority of war films contains characters that are typically white men – a statistical reality – there are few films that depict women (Department of Defense, iii). Furthermore, men in war films typically behave in a gendered manner. Enloe writes that "For violent sacrifice and state disciplined service have been imagined in American culture to be masculine domains" (Enloe, 1994: 82). While already statistically rare, the Pentagon has denied support to several war films with a female lead. In the film *GI Jane*:

"The film in no way questions the policy presumptions of the American military/political establishment, dedicated to raining technological destruction on 'bad guys overseas' who are brown or Arab, rogue and 'other'. Otherwise it would not have been a blockbuster action-adventure movie. Even so the US Navy was unenthusiastic, and [Ridley] Scott's efforts to secure co-operation foundered over the gender issues that were the whole (other) point of the film" (Robb, 2004: 70–71, 121).

Despite fully supporting the actions of the U.S military, the mere suggestion of gender issues within the film was enough for the Pentagon to deny assistance, Terrell Carver further suggests why the film does not have many feminist supporters

either:

“The storyline appears to be superficially to be a liberal feminist fairy tale – one woman gets to the top of the alpha-male tree through determined effort as a matter of her *individual choice*... Radical feminists have read the film as yet more sexploitation, and of a particularly nasty type... The characters in the film are all unsympathetic to lesbian perspectives, so heteronormativity is apparently endorsed, notwithstanding the misogyny (and nonsensical fear of ‘the feminine’) among the tough guys that makes the plot go. ‘Difference’ feminists will not find much difference, given that the few female characters in the film other than O’Neil are either the same as her (e.g. Anne Bancroft’s gutsy Texas senator) or barely noticed walk-ons” (Carver, 2007: 313)

Despite attempting to provide a militarily accessible character that also appealed to a female audience, the film was not favourably received by either groups, arguably because of the unsubtle attempts at redefining gender roles.

However, a supposedly feminist film that the Pentagon did support is *Zero Dark Thirty* (ZD30) (2012) and centres on a female protagonist leading the hunt for Osama bin Laden. The setting of the film is nearly always based in a masculine environment and switches from male dominated military bases to male dominated offices. Despite the reluctance of her male counterparts to trust her hunches, the protagonist Maya, is eventually vindicated. Initially the film was praised for being progressive by former members of the military and intelligence communities. In one report:

“The veteran CIA operative Glenn Carle, who is retired, recalls, ‘When I started, there were to my knowledge four senior operation officers who were

females, and they had to be the toughest SOBs in the universe to survive.

And the rest of the women were treated as sexual toys' (Bergen, 2012)

However, while praised by some as a feminist work, certain scholars disagree:

“Part of the difficulty of detecting some of this obfuscation comes from the selective nature of today's postfeminist rhetoric that strategically appropriate some recognizable features of the gendered politics that at one time contributed to substantive, social progress for women... Pundits have argued over whether the movie is gender neutral, advances the cause of those who still believe in the tenets of second-wave feminism, or presents a postfeminist production that need not prioritize the dismantling of male patriarchy” (Hasian, 2013: 324)

While the protagonist is certainly not subjected to the same amount of masculinisation as is seen in *GI Jane*, it is somewhat revealing that commentators have such a differing opinion about the gender politics seen in the film, indicating that not only does the Pentagon not truly recognise what it wants from a feminist driven film but that the audience does not recognise it either (Gill, 2007: 147-166)

As it has been demonstrated, the U.S military and Hollywood have an understandably strong relationship. While it has been argued that the U.S as a whole is seen as presenting a particular image to the rest of the world, the U.S military is undeniably image conscious (Sardar & Davies, 2002, 47-52). From humble beginnings, the U.S military gradually grew in influence, made possible by the Second World War. Since the 1940's Hollywood has allowed the U.S armed forces not only to show the rest of the world its impressive military might but has also allowed for large areas of both cinema and American culture to become militarised.

Not only has this helped recruitment for the U.S military – both conscious and unconsciously – it has also allowed the Pentagon to whitewash certain historical events while gaining support from the general public at the same time. Conversely, anti-war films such as *Dr. Strangelove* (1964), *Apocalypse Now* (1979), and *Platoon* (1986) have become so famous as to almost become memetic, demonstrating that the Pentagon does not have dominion over every aspect of Hollywood.

## Works Cited

### Books

Department of Defense,. (2014) “Demographics: Profile of the Military Community”,

Washington D.C: United States Government

Enloe, C., (1994) “Women Soldiers”: Images and Reality, London: Palmgrave

MacMillan UK

Robb, D., (2004) “Operation Hollywood: How the Pentagon Shapes and Censors the

Movies”, New York: Prometheus Books

Sardar. Z., & Davies, M., (2002) “Why Do People Hate America?”, Cambridge: Icon

Books

Suid, L., (2002) “Guts and Glory: the Making of the American Military Image”,

Lexington: The

University Press of Kentucky, P. xi.

Valantin, J-M., (2005) “Hollywood, the Pentagon”, and Washington, London: Anthem

Press

### Journals

Anderson, C., & Bushman, B., (2002) “Human Aggression”, *Annual Review of*

*Psychology*, 53, p. 27–51

Alford, M., (2016) “The Political Impact of the Department of Defense on Hollywood

Cinema” *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, 33:4, p. 332-347

Carver, T., (2007) *GI Jane*: What are the ‘Manners’ that ‘Maketh a Man’?, *Political*

*Studies Association*, 9(2) p. 314-315

Gill, R., (2007) Postfeminist media culture: Elements of a sensibility. *European*

*Journal of*

*Cultural Studies*, 101, p. 147–166

Hasianjr, M., (2013) Zero Dark Thirty and the Critical Challenges Posed by Populist Postfeminism During the Global War on Terrorism, *Journal of Communication*

*Inquiry*, 37(4) p. 322–343

### **Monograph**

Zhakova, O., (2011) “Strange Bedfellows: Cooperation between Hollywood and the Pentagon”, Lehigh University: *Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1328

### **Online Journals**

Miles, H., (2012) WWII Propaganda: The Influence of Racism, *Artefacts*, Issue 6, March, Available at: <https://artifactsjournal.missouri.edu/2012/03/wwii-propagandathe-influence-of-racism/>, accessed 10 May 2016

Wright, J., (2011) The Gears of War, *Little White Lies: Truth In Movies*, Issue 35: May-June, Available at: <https://issuu.com/lwlies/docs/lwlies35>, accessed 10 May 2016

### **Online News Articles**

Bergen, P., (2012) A feminist film epic and the real women of the CIA, *CNN*, 13 December, Available at: <http://edition.cnn.com/2012/12/13/opinion/bergen-feministepic/index.html>, accessed 10 May 2016

Guardian, The., (2001) Black Hawk Down Accused of airbrushing history, *The Guardian*, 21 December, Available at:

<http://www.theguardian.com/film/2001/dec/21/news>, accessed 8 May 2016

Hall, M., (1927) The Screen; The Flying Fighters, *The New York Times*, August 13, Available at:

<http://www.nytimes.com/movie/review?res=9805E6D9163CEE3ABC4B52DFBE6683>



8C639EDE, accessed on 7 May 2016

Klindo, M., Phillips, R., (2005) Military interference in American film production.

Operation Hollywood: How the Pentagon shapes and censors the movies by David

L. Robb, *World Socialist Website*, 14 March, Available at:

<https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2005/03/holl-m14.html>, accessed 10 May 2016

Luce, H., (1941) The American Century, *LIFE Magazine*, 17 February, Available at:

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article6139.htm>, accessed 10 May 2016

Rose, S., (2009) The US Military Storm Hollywood, *The Guardian*, 6 July, Available

at: <http://www.theguardian.com/film/2009/jul/06/us-military-hollywood>, accessed 7

May 2016

Sellers, R., (2009) The strained making of 'Apocalypse Now', *The Independent*, 23

July, Available at: [http://www.independent.co.uk/artsentertainment/films/features/the-](http://www.independent.co.uk/artsentertainment/films/features/the-strained-making-of-apocalypse-now-1758689.html)

[strained-making-of-apocalypse-now-1758689.html](http://www.independent.co.uk/artsentertainment/films/features/the-strained-making-of-apocalypse-now-1758689.html),

accessed 7 May 2016

Sirota, D., (2011) 25 years later, how 'Top Gun' made America love war, *The*

*Washington Post*, August 26, Available at:

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/25-years-later-remembering-how-top-gunchanged-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/25-years-later-remembering-how-top-gunchanged-americas-feelings-about-war/2011/08/15/gIQU6qJgJ_story.html)  
[americas-feelings-about-war/2011/08/15/gIQU6qJgJ\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/25-years-later-remembering-how-top-gunchanged-americas-feelings-about-war/2011/08/15/gIQU6qJgJ_story.html),

accessed 10 May 2016

Tarabay, J., (2014) Hollywood and the Pentagon: A relationship of mutual

exploitation, *Al Jazeera*, 29 June, Available at:

[http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/7/29/hollywood-](http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/7/29/hollywood-andthepentagonrelationshipofmutualexploitation.html)

[andthepentagonrelationshipofmutualexploitation.html](http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/7/29/hollywood-andthepentagonrelationshipofmutualexploitation.html), accessed 10 May 2016

USA Today, (2001) Pentagon Provides For Hollywood, *USA Today*, 29 May,

Available at: <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/life/movies/2001-05-17-pentagonhelps-hollywood.htm>, accessed 10 May 2016

Weisman, A., (2014) One Man In The Department Of Defense Controls All Of Hollywood's Access To The Military, *Business Insider*, 5 March, Available at: <http://www.businessinsider.com/phil-strub-controls-hollywoods-military-access-2014-3?IR=T>, accessed 10 2016

### **Online Resources**

Dirks, T., (2016) Greatest War Movies, *AMC Filmsite*, no date, Available at: <http://www.filmsite.org/greatwarfilms4.html>, accessed 7 May 2016

Gladys, T, (2016) Wings, *San Francisco Silent Film Festival*, no date, Available at: <http://www.silentfilm.org/wings-2012>, accessed 7 May 2016

Silver, C., (2011) Why We Fight: Frank Capra's WWII Propaganda Films, *Inside/Out*, June 7, Available at: [http://www.moma.org/explore/inside\\_out/2011/06/07/why-wefight-frank-capras-wwii-propaganda-films/](http://www.moma.org/explore/inside_out/2011/06/07/why-wefight-frank-capras-wwii-propaganda-films/), accessed 10 May 2016

### **Films**

*30 Seconds Over Tokyo* (1944). Dir. Mervyn LeRoy. Perf. Spencer Tracy, Van Johnson, Robert Walker. MGM Studios

*Act of Valor* (2012). Dir. Mike McCoy, Scott Waugh. Perf. Alex Veadov, Roselyn Sanchez, and Nestor Serrano. Relativity Media

*Apocalypse Now* (1979). Dir. Francis Ford Coppola. Perf Martin Sheen, Marlon Brando, Robert Duvall. Zoetrope Studios

*A Walk in the Sun* (1945). Dir. Lewis Milestone. Perf. Dana Andrews, Richard Conte, George Tyne. Lewis Milestone Productions

*Black Hawk Down* (2001). Dir. Ridley Scott. Josh Hartnett, Ewan McGregor, Tom

Sizemore. Revolutionary Studios

*Dr Strangelove: Or, How I Stopped Worrying and Learned to Love the Bomb* (1964).

Dir. Stanley Kubrick. Perf. Peter Sellers, George C. Scott, Sterling Hayden.

Columbia Pictures

*Flying Tigers* (1942). Dir. David Miller. Perf. John Wayne, John Carroll, Anna Lee.

Republic Pictures

*GI Jane* (1997). Dir. Ridley Scott. Perf. Demi Moore, Viggo Mortensen, Anne

Bancroft and Jason Beghe. Buena Vista Pictures

*Independence Day* (1996). Dir. Roland Emmerich. Perf. Will Smith, Bill Pullman, Jeff

Goldblum. Twentieth Century Fox

*Pearl Harbor* (2001). Dir. Michael Bay. Perf. Ben Affleck, Josh Hartnett, Kate

Beckinsale. Touchstone Pictures

*Platoon* (1986). Dir. Oliver Stone. Perf. Charlie Sheen, Tom Berenger, Willem Dafoe.

MGM

*Story of G.I Joe* (1945). Dir. William Wellman. Perf. Burgess Meredith, Robert

Mitchum, Freddie Steele. Lester Cowan Productions

*Thirteen Days* (2000). Dir. Roger Donaldson. Perf. Kevin Costner, Bruce

Greenwood, Shawn Driscoll. New Line Cinema

*Top Gun* (1986). Dir. Tony Scott. Perf. Tom Cruise, Kelly McGillis, Tim Robbins.

Paramount Pictures

*Zero Dark Thirty* (2012) Dir. Kathryn Bigalow, Perf. Jessica Chastain, Joel Edgerton,

Chris Pratt. Columbia Pictures.

## **II. Chapter Two: People support of the US army.**

When we first look at the relationship between politics, film and television at the turn of the 21st century, we accepted the consensus opinion that a small office at the Pentagon had, on request, assisted the production of around 200 movies throughout the history of modern media, with minimal input on the scripts. This chapter discusses the role of movie images in influencing the public's perceptions of service members. The implications of these findings are relevant to policymakers responsible for balancing service members' needs with public perceptions.

### **II.1. People support US wars abroad.**

Since the beginning of the history of mankind, war has always existed. Likewise, since the beginning of the film industry war movies have always existed. As with most other types of movies, war movies are made as a form of entertainment to benefit individuals or organizations. More and more people are willing to spend money and time on actions, excitement, heroism, patriotism feelings, not the terrible and horrible images of real and generic human destruction. The government has been using propaganda for a long time, and when the movie was screened, the government saw new media as an opportunity to influence the public almost immediately. Governments like the United States, in cooperation with the film industry, use this influence to encourage a positive view towards war and gain support for war. The film industry depicts war in an exciting, beautiful, romantic and heroic way, often demonizing enemies; this often leads to a connection to the war of unrealistic public opinion, making public opinion more positive, Actual battle support. (**Baruch 13**)

Hollywood war movies are usually based on heroic and brave behavior. These are the main features of the movie "Save the Great Ryan" and "Black Hawk". The movie Black Hawk

Down is based on real events, but it is about overcoming the fear and difficulties of ordinary soldiers to save injured fellows. The story was personalized, focusing on some soldiers depicting heroism. In the movie, the soldier returned to the base to injure and later chose to return to the forefront to rescue the ally injured more seriously than him. There are multiple instances. (**Baruch 20**)

War is a positive and inevitable part of life and they take corresponding actions. If the general public prove that the real massacre is a fear of real war, they are shocked by what they saw, and their real war, the tool the government uses for their own benefits, how bad it is As well. General people take various actions. People will understand that this is not the most effective or effective way to achieve their goals, so there will be more protests against war.

Congressmen are reluctant to vote for war as they are afraid that voters will become unhappy, war will decline, loss of lives will be reduced, and more exploration of diplomatic negotiations will be prospected. You should keep on war to protect the country. In the case of war movies, the movie industry has a great influence on the opinions of the public, but so far this effect has not been properly used for human interests. (**Baruch 20**)

Like all other American industries, the film industry has responded to World War II, raised productivity, and created a new wave of wartime photos. During the war, Hollywood was the main cause of American patriotism through publicity, documentary, and production of educational photographs and the general perception of wartime needs. In 1946, the number of attendees at the theater and gross profit recorded a record high. The 1950s was an era of great changes in American culture and around the world. In the postwar United States, ordinary families became wealthy, new social trends, progress of music, prosperity of popular culture,

especially the introduction of television was born. Estimated 10 million households owned television by 1950. (**Baruch 25**)

The attendance rate of the theater was the highest ever in 1946 and proved to be the most profitable year in Hollywood for ten years. For the United States, the propaganda organization coordinating action with the movie industry is the War Information Bureau. Agencies work with movie makers to record and film the wartime activities while standardizing their content. Government agencies are striving to show war in positive ways like soldier's madness and photos of casualties and seek to review negative content; pictures of American casualties banned publication before 1943.

When discussing the role of mass media in the American advertising war, Hollywood's role as well as of course. During the war, Hollywood has produced many war related movies like the target, Myanmar! , The bridge of the Kwai River, the story of G.I. Joe, where do we serve? Several documentaries were also produced at this time. Among them, Frank Coupla's "Why We Fight" series is the most famous. Capra is known for his movie like "Good Life", Mr. Smith travels to Washington, and as the military personnel create a series of movies to monitor and learn various learning as troops in order I was asked. The tool, not America, "knows its enemies." Coupler's main goal is to unite the American people by "winning the war and winning peace" (Dower 16)

## **II.2. The enemy: the concept (Doughboys).**

How does a democratic government conscript citizens? Turn them into soldiers who can fight effectively against a highly-trained enemy, and then somehow reward these troops for

their service? In this account, Jennifer D. Keene argues that the doughboy experience in 1917-18 forged the US Army of the 20th century and ultimately led to the most sweeping piece of social-welfare legislation in the nation's history - the G.I. Bill. Keene shows how citizen-soldiers established standards of discipline that the army in a sense had to adopt. Even after these troops had returned to civilian life, lessons learned by the army during its first experience with a mass conscripted force continued to influence the military as an institution. Moreover, the experience of going into uniform and fighting abroad politicized citizen-soldiers in ways that Keene asks us to ponder. She argues that the country and the conscripts - in their view - entered into a certain social compact, one that assured veterans that the federal government owed conscripted soldiers of the 20th century debts far in excess of the pensions the Grand Army of the Republic had claimed in the late-19th century. (**Broeckert 55**)

In 1917 George M. Cohan wrote his greatest hit, "Over There." The song captured the American notion that the country's involvement in the Great was a grand and noble effort, a crusade that would end, hopefully, in a just peace, and a world safe for democracy. Most histories of the American role in the war emphasize these altruistic ideas, along with American sacrifice, and, ultimately, victory. They also show how unprepared and unexpected our armed forces were. After the war, after the disappointing and ill-fated peace of Versailles, the American people became disillusioned with the war, and to a lesser extent, Europeans. Jennifer D. Keene's new book, *Doughboys, The Great War, and the Remaking of America*, speeds up the process of disillusionment for the Doughboys: she argues that America's citizen soldiers, in the midst of the conflict, are better understood as largely rejecting Cohan's war, army culture, and ultimately the federal government's claim that its obligation to them was finished when they were belatedly, at least in their minds, mustered out of the army. In demonstrating this rejection, Keene hopes to offer "a dramatically different paradigm for

understanding the American experience in the Great War." One might expect Dr. Keene to attack the old interpretation directly, pointing out its flaws and inadequacies. He does not; she ignores it rattler like a literary version of the American island hopping campaign of the Pacific war with Japan. Keene attacks targets of her own choosing, apparently on the assumption that if she does not discuss the decisions and motivations of political and military leaders, their grand strategy, and the larger military options, these cannot be of much importance. This approach is considerably less successful than American strategy in the Pacific war noted above. More specifically, Keene would have us believe that the American expeditionary Forces were composed primarily of disgruntled radicals who cared little for the French and still less for the war. Keene's Doughboys, much to their officers' dismay, prefer the Germans, fraternizing openly with them. Yet the author herself admits that the American soldiers fought well, impressing their officers to the point that postwar army plans relied heavily on the citizen soldier. Still more telling, the fraternization claim is based on research concerning only three regiments of one division, and the incidents all occur near the end of the war. Officers who discovered the congenial relationship between the opposing lines were shocked, and the division commander was sent home. Yet Keene extrapolates that this antipathy for the French and friendship for the Germans "created serious problems in the postwar Franco-American relationship." While scholars of the era have long known that many American soldiers preferred German culture to French, Keene offers no evidence that Woodrow Wilson, who often ignored his own advisers at Versailles, was moved to oppose French treaty demands because of Doughboy sentiments. Indeed, Wilson's views on the nature of the peace for which the U.S. fought were well established before a single American soldier set foot on French soil. Consequently, the more traditional method of examining and emphasizing the policies and motives of the various leaders and nations involved in postwar negotiations offers a far better



explanation as to why American and French political leaders were so at odds over the nature of the peace. While Professor Keene's larger purpose is far too grandiose, the book still has much to commend it. It is clearly written and magnificently researched. When Keene carefully interprets that research, her work makes a significant contribution to developing the complexity and utility of the old paradigm. While one cannot read this book in the hope that it provides a thorough view of the war as a whole, it provides important new insights into the nature of many of the citizen soldiers, and their impact on the American army and the federal government. In the book's best passages, Keene's *Doughboys* force the federal government to re-examine the relationship between itself and its citizen soldiers. The result was a more egalitarian army- at least for whites- and the Bonus Bill of 1924. That legislation established the federal government's ongoing responsibility to the men whose military service interrupted their civilian lives. Still more significantly, Doughboy leadership, in the midst of a far more catastrophic conflict, would help expand that responsibility through the GI Bill. The author is quite correct in ending her work with the assertion that the GI Bill "played a key role in generating the unprecedented prosperity Americans enjoyed in the second half of the twentieth century." Jennifer Keene's book provides a unique and helpful view of part of the American experience in the Great War and its aftermath. Those who desire a comprehensive understanding of that war should read it as a supplement to the more traditional interpretations. (**Broeckert 60**)

### **II.3. Hollywood's War Films**

Due to its role during America's long wars and its effect on perceptions of US military prestige, the entertainment media can be considered one of the third forces—"organizations that can influence the outcome of armed combat." This part explains the ability of combat films to influence civilian and military perceptions of service members and veterans. By

understanding Hollywood's depictions of service members in combat and veterans at home, military leaders can respond better to media-influenced perceptions of military institutions and the people who provide our nation's defense. The film *American Sniper*, based on the autobiography of Chris Kyle, a veteran US Navy Seal sniper with 160 officially confirmed kills during four tours in the Iraq War, serves as a fulcrum for this article. Although the book and film were criticized for inaccuracies, the film was nominated for several Academy Awards, and Kyle's murder by Eddie Ray Routh accelerated the notoriety of both productions. The mutually generated interest in the film and the trial presented a unique opportunity to study not only civilian perceptions of service members portrayed in Hollywood movies but also the potential impact on jurors' perceptions of "Routh," a former Marine with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) who was depicted in the film prior to the trial. (**Hatch 100**)

#### **II.4. How Hollywood's depiction of us army influence the other.**

The Oxford Dictionary of Film Studies defines a combat film as one that features "scenes of combat that are dramatically central and that determine the fate of the film's principal characters." Such films may include home-front dramas, veterans' stories, service comedies, basic training films, spy films, prisoner-of-war movies, and partisan films. While the American Civil War and international conflicts may be included, the genre is usually associated with representations of twentieth-century wars. Edison Company films of the Spanish-American War are said to be the first war films. *Wings* (1927), a World War I film named Best Picture at the first Academy Awards ceremony in 1928, is an early example of an antiwar movie. America's Office of War Information exercised a great deal of control over scripts during World War II, resulting in prowar propaganda films that came to characterize the combat genre. (**Georgi 17**)

Despite some cynical Vietnam-era films in the 1960s and 1970s, such as *The Deer Hunter* and *Apocalypse Now*, the pro-American, prewar conventions established during World War II largely remain. Films such as *First Blood* and subsequent titles in the Rambo series provided audiences with a revisionist version of Vietnam. Contemporary films— such as *The Hurt Locker*, *American Sniper*, and *Brothers*—shift the focus from the squad or platoon perspective of World War II combat films to the impact of the Iraq War on the individual soldier, both during the war and upon returning home. **(Georgi 20)**

*Saving Private Ryan* and *The Thin Red Line* ushered in the current era of the genre, in which advancements in digital cinematography and computer graphics technology offer audience increasingly dramatic and violent images of combat. The films use visual realism to disguise heightened moral assertions: should soldiers be proud or devastated about killing the enemy? Some critics assert films like *Saving Private Ryan* and *Black Hawk Down* are based on contrived plots, relying on combat sequences more like those from action movies, rather than realistic depictions of twenty-first century combat. Unlike combat films of the 1980s—such as *Platoon* and *Hamburger Hill*, which were lauded for their realism—contemporary films set in Afghanistan and Iraq are more entertainment than history. The visual style of the new Hollywood combat film presents a realistic and graphic image of combat, but does not present a true story. Such films appear to be founded in realism, while actually reinforcing common myths of heroism and war. **(Georgi 18)**

A 2011 book about contemporary war films argues these realistic looking fictions offer audiences a cast of ordinary folks they can relate to in extraordinary circumstances. Frequently, soldiers are depicted as uneducated grunts, not always clear on why they are fighting, but fighting for survival and from a sense of patriotism. This article explores the relationship between servicemembers' perceptions of the realism of combat films, civilians'

perceptions of the same, and the impact of those perceptions on real servicemembers. This is known as the phenomenon of third-person perception. (Georgi 20)

### **II.5. Third-Person Perception.**

In lay terms, third-person perception (TPP) is the belief that media messages influence others more than oneself. The concept was introduced more than 30 years ago regarding a service unit consisting of mostly African American troops and white officers on Iwo Jima island. The Japanese dropped propaganda leaflets over the island encouraging the “colored soldiers” to stop risking their lives for the white men. Despite no evidence that the leaflets had an impact on their intended audience, the troops were withdrawn. The example was interpreted to illustrate how people act on their perceptions of media influence rather than on reality. Dozens of studies have documented the phenomenon across a variety of contexts. Some contexts, such as press coverage, advertising, and pornography have received a great deal of attention. Given the origins of the theory, it is surprising to note there have been no published studies on TPP regarding contemporary warfare until this exploration. While no previous studies of TPP regard depictions of service members, a few studies have focused on film. In 2006, a small study of college students found reverse TPP, or first-person perception, regarding the documentary *An Inconvenient Truth*. Participants believed they were more likely than their peers to be influenced by the film. First-person perception was related to the willingness to promote the film and to make personal changes toward a more sustainable lifestyle. These behavioral effects and attitudinal changes are referred to in the literature as third-person effects, which are important when documenting TPP because people act on their perceptions. First-person perception tends to emerge when participants believe it is good to be influenced; TPP emerges when media influence is perceived to be bad. A study of adults in Singapore, for instance, found participants believed they were less influenced than others by

films with homosexual content. An earlier study of college students documented TPP regarding alcohol content in films. While the TPP literature on film remains small, a larger body of literature on television consistently documents similar findings. Participants believe others are more influenced by television content unless that content is perceived to be positive.

### **Conclusion**

Hollywood's depictions of the U.S. army in its movies can be a powerful third force that not only motivates young men and women to serve their country but also sways public support for lengthy military engagements. Public relations battles at home affect more than just public opinion; it impacts recruiting, retention, and morale, as well as policy. Similar to the previous example of the perceived impact of leaflets on minority service members on Iwo Jima, this study—the first of its kind—measures TPP regarding the perceived impact of Hollywood combat films on civilians' perceptions of service members and veterans. The study documented TPP and third person effect—the presumption of guilt or innocence of a defendant in a high-profile, real-life murder case depicted in a popular film. From the many differences in perceptions of service members and civilians, the most likely explanation for the verdict differing among the research groups is related to PTSD. Films like *Brothers* and *American Sniper* portray veterans struggling to reunite with loved ones. *Brothers* paints a hopeless picture of a doomed marriage that escalates to violence. *American Sniper* shows a rocky start, followed by process of healing cut short by another veteran suffering from PTSD killing his would-be mentor. Service members find both films unrealistic and say the myth of the broken soldier with PTSD is Hollywood's latest legacy. Civilians are torn: some agree PTSD is overemphasized in combat films and others argue happy reunions with well-adjusted veterans are the myth. Civilians' willingness to accept and service members' definitive rejection of Routh's PTSD defense underscores the different perceptions. Alternatively,

military consultants suggest service members are quick to support one another and would not accept the defense because they would not want the killer of one of their contemporary heroes to go free. Many veterans and service members of the Iraq and Afghanistan Wars say 1980s films like *Top Gun* and *A Few Good Men* influenced their decision to serve, but quickly assessed the productions to be inaccurate at best. While military participants recognized contemporary combat films capture the brotherhood of soldiers, most of them are discontent with being depicted as uneducated, ignorant, bloodthirsty racists in need of counseling for PTSD. Civilians, on the other hand, see the films as accurately portraying the sights and sounds of war while simplifying why America sends men and women to fight in the first place. Implications for Strategic Communications to understand how third forces such as the media can influence servicemembers' morale as well as garner public support for extended wars, commanders must be aware of portrayals of servicemembers and combat in Hollywood films. Common myths and misperceptions must be addressed not only within the Department of Defense but also in the Department of Veterans Affairs. Public affairs offices can be create and distribute national messaging strategies to dispel myths. Encouraging film screenings and discussions within the military and initiating external media campaigns focusing on the accuracy of film depictions, misconceptions about PTSD, and perceptions of "broken" veterans can shape public opinion. One technique called "Message of the Day" could be used to initiate social change. The Defense Department and the Department of Veterans Affairs could adopt a communications strategy that presents a unified message about the inaccuracies of Hollywood films. The messages might starting with "it's not like the movies" and provide a detail such as "we care about our community." The message needs to be repeated, particularly when addressing policy and budget issues. The message can be reinforced through public speaking events and targeted social media campaigns such as #NotLikeTheMovies. As the

message gains traction, it is important to address the common myths about PTSD specifically. Critical incidents, especially those occurring stateside, get a lot of traction. Credible spokespeople must be prepared to respond to media requests with accurate information about PTSD, explain what it looks like, and provide realistic estimates of its prevalence. Such events also need to be followed by positive stories about successful veterans from all walks of life. The public as well as the military community deserve to know men and women who served their country are not broken. The best tool to shape opinion through Hollywood films is film. Pentagon support for combat films dates back to the 1920s. The most successful of these were *The Green Berets*, *Top Gun*, and *Black Hawk Down*.<sup>25</sup> *The Green Berets* was a prewar film starring John Wayne made to counterbalance Vietnam War protests. The film did not hold up over time because of the simplistic viewpoint, but it drew an audience and generated discussion during its run in theaters. *Top Gun* was produced with the full support of the Navy, including fighter jets and aircraft carriers. The popularity of the film increased recruitment by 400 percent. Service members in the study mentioned *Top Gun* as a film that encouraged them to enlist or that contributed to their positive perceptions about the military. *Black Hawk Down*, also frequently named in the current study, provided a quick, symbolic response to September 11, 2001, and continues to inspire.

## Works Cited

- “The Iran-Contra Affair 20 Years On.” **The National Security Archive**. The George Washington University. 24 November 2006. Web. 20 June 2011.
- A Few Good Men**. Dir. Rob Reinor. Columbia Pictures, 1992. DVD.
- Apollo 13**. Dir. Ron Howard. Universal Pictures, 1995. DVD.
- Baruch, Donald E. Letter to Michele Kuhar. 27 May 1977. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. **Print**.
- Baruch, Donald E. Letter to Robert Greenhut. 10 May 1977. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. **Print**.
- Baruch, Donald E. Memo for Audio Visual Branch. 26 Oct. 1977. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. **Print**.
- Baruch, Donald E. Memo for Director, Audiovisual Entertainment, Chief of Information, Department of the Navy. 27 Dec. 1988. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. **Print**.
- Boomer, William E. Memo to the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense. 12 Jan. 1994. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. **Print**.
- Broeckert, Jerry E. Memo for the Commanding General. 5 Aug. 1993. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. **Print**.



Broeckert, Jerry N. Memo to Shotwell, John M. 18 Oct. 1993. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Broeckert, Jerry. Memo for John Shotwell. 9 June 1993. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Broeckert, Jerry. Memo to T. V. Draude. 18 Sep. 1991. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

**Clear and Present Danger** Script. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

**Clear and Present Danger**. Dir. Phillip Noyce. Paramount Pictures, 1994. DVD.

**Deep Impact**. Dir. Mimi Leder. Paramount Pictures, 1998. DVD.

Department of Defense Instruction Number 5410.15. 28 Mar. 1989. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Department of Defense Instruction Number 5410.16. Jan. 26, 1988. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Draude, T. V. Memo for the record. 18 Sep. 1991. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Dunleavy, Richard M. Memo for CHINFO. 26 May 1989. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center,

Washington, D.C. Print.

Ellis, Edward R. Memo for the Special Assistant for Public Affairs. 9 June 1993.

**Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Field, Thomas J. Letter to Joan Bradshaw. 15 Apr. 1998. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Finkelstein, J. B. Memo for Philip M. Strub. 3 Nov. 1989. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Finkelstein, J. B. Memo for the Assistant Secretary of Defense. Washington, D.C. 22 June 1989. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

**Flight of the Intruder**. Dir. John Milius. Paramount Pictures, 1991. DVD.

**Forrest Gump**. Dir. Robert Zemeckis. Paramount Pictures, 1994. DVD.

Frazier, Benjamin C. Memo to the DoD Public Affairs Office. Washington, D.C. 17 Sep. 1996. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Fulbright, James W. **The Pentagon Propaganda Machine**. New York, New York: Liveright, 1970. Print.

Georgi, David A. Memo to SAPA-ZA. 16 July 1993. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Georgi, David A. Notes on **Clear and Present Danger**. Dec. 8, 1993. **Department of**

**Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Greer, James L. Memo to Gen Hogle. 23 July 1993. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

**Hair**. Dir. Milos Forman. United Artists, 1979. DVD.

Hatch, Norman T. Memo to Thomas Ross. 19 Oct. 1977. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print

Hatch, Norman T. Memo to Thomas Ross. 2 Nov. 1977. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Hogler, Walter S. Memo from Special Assistant (Audiovisual.) 17 June 1993.

**Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Horton, John E. Letter to Donald Baruch. 10 Apr. 1989. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Horton, John E. Letter to Donald E. Baruch. 19 Feb. 1987. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Horton, John E. Letter to Philip M. Strub. Washington, D.C. 5 July 1989. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Horton, John E. Memo to Lis Kern. 25 Oct. 1993. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Marovitz, Mitchell E. Memo for Chief of Public Affairs. 26 July 1994. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Marovitz, Mitchell E. Memo for Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. 29 June 1993. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

Marovitz, Mitchell E. Memo for Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Public Affairs (Audio Visual.) 15 July 1993. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. Print.

### III. Chapter Three: Movie Analysis.

As we look into to the analysis of the films at hand, aimed at understanding the hero and exploring the existence or absence of the changing hero, we must remember that these films rarely if ever walk the audience through the entire nuclear unit of the hero's story, that is the journey of separation to initiation to return (Campbell 2008). We usually glimpse the hero at the point of initiation, especially as this is the climax of the separation and films about soldiers fighting or "going away" to war fits beautifully into this criterion. Campbell (2008) calls this "the trials and victories of initiation" where we almost exclusively experience the soldier in war films, at least those depicting combat.

#### III.1. The Battle of the Bulge.

*The Battle of the Bulge* (Harmon et. al, 1965) is a film that follows various characters as they weave their way across each other's path before and during the monumental battle of the bulge during World War II. The film follows Lt. Col. Kiley, Lt. Weaver, and Col. Hessler, they represent the hero, the non-hero, and the villain respectively. The archetype of the villain will not be discussed at length in this study as this study aims to focus specifically on the hero and non-hero. Much like *Platoon* (Kopelson& Stone, 1986) the film begins with an already established hero, personified in Lt. Col. Kiley, who makes all the right decisions, risks himself for the good of his men and his country, and exhibits strong leadership.

*The Battle of the Bulge* (Harmon et. al), released in 1965, was made in a time marked by domestic civil unrest as well as global turmoil. In the previous year, the conflict in Vietnam was beginning to heat up with U.S. military bases being attacked and general tension in Southeast Asia. In the western hemisphere, the current President of Brazil was removed from power by a military coup backed by the United States, a

debatable action. Domestically in 1964 the Civil Rights Act had passed, outlawing racial and gender discrimination. This led to much racial tension all over the U.S., more so in the southern states than the northern states but the tension and reaction to the Act was palpable. The military draft increased in 1965 leading to many anti-war protests beginning in Washington and spreading to other cities (Dittmar & Michaud, 1990). In 1965 the first U.S. combat troops made landfall in Vietnam officially demarcating a milestone in U.S. involvement. Also, to note was the counter-cultural movement of the sixties, this resulted in widespread anti-war sentiments as well as the advent of the “hippy” (Gitlin, 1987).

Lt. Col. Kiley who is main focus of the film embodies the established hero. His actions personify the criteria of the hero, specifically: leadership, risk-taking, and loyalty (Wansink, Payne, & von Ittersum, 2008), all evidenced in his actions throughout the film. His leadership is made evident through various actions during the course of the battle. Most notably in pre-battle where he fights for his ideas and eventually is proven right, both in his inclination to believe that the Germans are mounting a full-scale assault and also during the following battle.

Notable as well are his risk-taking actions – the hallmark of the hero soldier. For example, before the onset of the battle he fights with his commanding officer to be allowed to go on a mission to collect German P.O.W.s and question them. He leads a small group of men out into the freezing night in an effort to capture some of the opposing forces and succeeds. Immediately after the battle begins his drive for victory coupled with his willingness to take risks and garner information about the enemy demonstrates his propensity for risk-taking.

An intercut montage of the various soldiers waking up to the sound of tanks

signals the onset of the battle. Wide panning shots of hundreds of soldiers moving to setup a front conveys the scale and danger of the battle about to take place. Kiley and Wolenski move quickly through the lines to the front. Wolenski stops to tell his Sergeant that he is the anchor position and must hold. Afterwards, he turns to Kiley and says, "You might as well stay here, one more man won't make any difference." Kiley responds, "I need to look inside one of those Tigers [tanks]." As the shot shifts to the German tanks pushing through trees, we see a quick shot of Lt. Weaver; the shot is framed wide, and Weaver is positioned behind a log barricade. His position in the shot, his slouching body language, and the look in his eye convey the fear he is feeling. As the German tanks roll toward his position, we once again return to a shot of Weaver; he is motionless and paralyzed by fear. Those around him are firing grenades and rockets at the tank; their constant motion adds the effect of Weaver's paralysis.

In stark contrast to Weaver's fear, we cut to Kiley and Wolenski rushing forward to find a Tiger to "get a look at." They stop at a forward rocket position, where a tank has just machine-gunned the rocketeer. Wolenski grabs the rocket launcher, Kiley loads it, and they disable the tread of an oncoming tank. Then Wolenski says "There's your Tiger," hands Kiley a grenade and a "greaser" (machine gun) and Kiley sets off on foot into the thick of oncoming tanks to singlehandedly disable the Tiger. He succeeds after gunning the driver and dropping a grenade inside.

This display of risk-taking behavior outside the normal duties of a soldier shows the extent of Kiley's heroism. Throughout the battle and the film he continues to display his selfless heroism. He takes a shot at Hessler from a distance away in an effort to avoid the impending tank battle. He borrows a rifle and jumps into the firefight at Ambleve without orders to do so and has to be pulled out of the battle by his superiors. He

repeatedly takes risks to further benefit his men and his country.

He even goes as far as taking up a plane in a thick fog so he can pinpoint the tank battalion trying to ambush the Allied troops. In the process of this daring and heroic action his plane is shot down and he suffers serious injury. This quick thinking and myriad heroic actions on the part of Kiley epitomize his ability to adapt to change, a key facet of risk-taking and the hero (Wansink, Payne, & von Ittersum, 2008).

Conversely, Lt. Weaver in this case is the non-hero; his actions endanger other soldiers and eventually lead to some of them being killed. Lt. Weaver starts out his journey under Maj. Wolenski, in the bunker visited by Kiley in his search for Germans to interrogate. He expresses his disinterest in the war and displays a generally apathetic attitude toward the war in his conversation with a fellow squad mate. He reaches the apex of his non-heroic cowardice in his trek through the woods with the same squad mate after their Jeep breaks down. Weaver, when confronted with the possibility of conflict with the Germans, instantly surrenders while the Germans examine his broken down vehicle.

Subsequently, he and his sergeant are taken to the prisoner gathering in a clearing and then massacred by the German troops. Lt. Weaver narrowly escapes death and flees into the forest. Through his cowardice and surrender he indirectly caused the death of his squad mate. This realization pushes him over the line from non-hero to hero.

Later in the film the Weaver is trying to stay warm and away from Germans in a half destroyed barn. The buildup to the scene is unlike any other in the film. The camera circles the building then zooms to Weaver trying to cover up behind a broken pallet. The music lends itself to a very dark mood, and the composition of the shot suggests that something of importance is going to occur. Symbolically and literally, Weaver is hiding in the dark. A group of young, lost, American privates stumble into the barn searching



with their light. The light falls on Weaver, and he stands up, also symbolic in that he is rising to his responsibility as a hero. The privates pepper him with questions before he utters a word; the last question asked before the group quiets down is "...do you think we should surrender Lieutenant?" Before he answers we witness the change from the scared Lt. at the opening battle to a battle-hardened hero. His eyes take on a determined look and as he squares his jaw he replies, "Surrender? No!" He then goes on to issue a few orders, and take command. As noted before, this scene marks a turning point in Weaver's heroic journey. The privates look to him as a leader since he is an officer. In that moment of his first interaction with the scared group of soldiers he realizes that he must step up and lead these men.

From that point on he is a changed man. This is shown through his actions at the fuel depot at the end of the film – both his courage in calling out the fake MPs as well as his actions in taking down the tank advance. He exhibits his newly found leadership in the moment when he orders that the fuel dump be destroyed, and upon issuing the order he is questioned by a soldier who asks where the orders are, "We got no orders, Lieutenant!" He replies, "Yeah, well, I'm giving the orders," and shows himself a hero who has crossed the line from non-hero and embraced his heroic identity.

Kiley on the other hand is an established and unflawed hero. His determination to do the right thing, even though his superiors doubt him and his intuition, override and prevail over the other shortsighted officers. His brand of heroism is seen in Sgt. Elias of *Platoon* (Kopelson & Stone, 1986) and, to a lesser degree, Capt. Miller of *Saving Private Ryan* (Bryce & Spielberg, 1998). It is characterized by an unflawed, shining hero who lacks the cowardice and other negative traits of the non-hero; however, he is not invincible. His plane is shot down after he reports on the movement of the German tanks

in the fog, although he survives albeit with some serious injuries. He is mortal, and a hero in action not in physical stature or immunity to mortality.

The techniques used in the shooting of the film also point to Kiley's heroism. When alone or among equals, he is shot as the power of the screen (left side). His placement in key shots subtly illustrates his heroic placement. Many times he is shot from a low angle; this creates the effect of power and heroism, as one might look up to the statue of a hero. This heroic placement and intentional way of framing the shots of Kiley conveys the heroic ideal upon him.

Lt. Weaver, on the other hand, is in many ways a precursor to Pvt. Taylor of *Platoon* and Cpl. Upham of *Saving Private Ryan*, inasmuch as all of them undergo the hero's journey, albeit in slightly different ways. They all make mistakes that are markedly non-heroic and lead to the deaths of others. But in the end they all find their courage and become heroes. While some remain a bit more flawed than others (e.g., Pvt. Taylor), all undergo the journey (Campbell, 2008) that leads them to the path of the hero.

A key difference in this film from the subsequent films is that the villain is a character present in the film. While this is not uncommon in war films, it is worth noting nonetheless (Fisz, Saltzman, & Hamilton, 1969, *The Battle of Britain*; Foster, Glattes, Hoblit, Ladd, Rifkin, & Hoblit, 2002, *Hart's War*; Davey, Lemley, McEveety, Schmidt, Wallace, Zapotoczny, & Wallace, 2002, *We Were Soldiers*; and more). The mere presence of Col. Hessler via juxtaposition makes the actions of Lt. Weaver seem less non-heroic and more heroic in comparison. His inclusion in the film falls in direct opposition to Kiley and creates perspective on Weaver that would not have existed. In this way, the villainy of Hessler makes Weaver's actions less reprehensible as the juxtaposition places Weaver in the middle of the hero and the villain, and not at the far

end of the spectrum since he is not the most un-heroic character in the film. In essence, it softens the wrong actions taken by Weaver, in the same way the inclusion of Hitler in the film would have softened the wrong actions of Hessler.

Overall, Kiley represents the true hero – the hero soldier who always does what is right for both his country and his men. He lacks the flaws and poor decision making of Weaver and succeeds through his willpower, leadership, and risk-taking behaviors. For example, near the end of the film a heavy fog descends on the Arden (the valley where the battle is being fought) and the Allies lose track of the German tank movement. Kiley hatches a plan to find out where the tanks are. In his dialogue with the pilot he asks to take him up in the fog, the pilot, Joe asks to see the flying orders, Kiley responds, “There are no orders, Joe... if we don’t find that Panzer column there’s gonna be no tank battle, we’ll have to stop them with infantry. A lot of guys are going to die to keep you safe and cozy.” He convinces Joe to take him up on a reconnaissance mission.

Due to the heavy fog they have to cut the plane’s engine and glide to listen for the tanks, then quickly restart the engine. The mood in cabin is tense while they discuss this plan, more than once Joe tries to call off the mission. Kiley remains firm and is rewarded for his persistence. They locate the tank column and report back to headquarters. Moments after reporting they take a hit from the tanks, forcing them to crash land near the fuel depot. The pilot is killed while Kiley survives but is badly wounded. He risks himself in order to save the lives of his infantry men, his heroic determination and confidence carry him through the film as a hero.

Weaver, on the other hand, represents the hero undergoing his journey. He starts a non-hero, and through challenges and opposition becomes a hero by the end of the film.

He realizes what strength is and displays the traits of hero. He thus becomes a hero much as Taylor does in *Platoon* (Kopelson& Stone, 1986).

### **III.2. A Bridge Too Far**

*A Bridge Too Far* (Levine et. al, 1977) is a film which revolves around Operation Market Garden, an allied offensive in World War II in which 35,000 paratroopers are dropped behind German lines with the objective of holding and preserving three bridges while they wait for the Allied ground advance to reach them. The story follows U.S. soldiers, British soldiers and Polish soldiers as well as German soldiers, albeit briefly. The allied forces are tasked with taking three bridges, and manage to take the first two but suffer heavy casualties and are unable to take the third bridge, hence the name of the film; they had tried to go a bridge too far.

The film was made in 1977 and saw the preceding years leading up the film mark the end of the Vietnam War. In 1975, President Ford officially declared that the United States' involvement in the war was over. That same year South Vietnam officially surrendered to North Vietnam marking the global end of the war. The following year (1976) Vietnam was officially reunified, although the U.S. vetoed their request for acceptance into the U.N. on the basis of many suspected P.O.W.s still being held. The following year they were eventually allowed to enter the U.N. Also in 1977, President Carter covered all Vietnam draft evaders with unconditional amnesty. The conflict surrounding apartheid in South Africa is also heating up in the mid-seventies. At this time riots, inhuman treatment of prisoners, and a breathless global audience characterize South Africa (Dittmar& Michaud, 1990).

The heroes in the film are not hard to find. They display their heroism blatantly and, much akin to their predecessors in *The Battle of the Bulge* (Harmon et. al, 1965),

lack any sort of visible character defect. There exist multiple heroes within the film; at least one can be found in each partition of the allied force. For the Americans there is Maj. Cook, Col. Stout, and Staff Sgt. Dohun; the English force holds Lt. Col. Frost; for the Polish there is Maj. Gen Sosabowski. All exemplify heroism in their own way and tout its telltale characteristics via their actions throughout the film.

This film draws a clear line between hero and non-hero. Nowhere is there a gray area residing between the two. Most notable in its contrast to *The Battle of the Bulge* (Harmon et. al, 1965) is that there is no non-hero who undergoes the journey from said state to that of the hero. The film clearly and unchangingly defines the roles of those it focuses on.

A prime example of heroism in the film occurs early on when Col. Stout and his 101st airborne troops are dropped behind enemy lines; the manner in which the scene is shot accentuates his heroic figure. First, he emerges alone from the woods, pauses to let us take in the idea that he is the leader. Then he is joined by a few men, then a few more, and so forth. They begin at the pace of a slow jog, and begin to build speed. This serves to create a tempo for the scene. The next shot from the front of the now running company. It is a low angle half shot and at first we see just regular soldiers. Then Col. Stout comes running through the pack, moving quickly, with a sense of purpose and a determined look on his face. The big band, patriotic music builds and builds until the Son Bridge is in sight. Just as they arrive, German artillery destroys the bridge. As the bombardment of the bridge commences all of the troops following Stout drop and take cover while Stout continues his advance on the bridge to assess the situation. He displays the classic risk-taking behavior associated with heroes as noted previously. The way this scene was constructed also highlights his leadership, from his first emergence from the

woods, to his moving to the front of the pack of running soldiers, to his courageous run to the edge of the former bridge while his men take cover. The score and shot composition together painted him a hero.

Also notable are the actions of Staff Sgt. Dohun. Early on in the film his captain, many years his junior, in a moment of fear, makes Dohun promise him that he will not be allowed to die. Dohun makes the promise, not quite realizing what it will mean for him later on. When we return to this particular thread of story after focusing on others for a time, we find Dohun searching for the captain. He finds him barely alive in a field of the dead with a bullet lodged in his skull. He quickly loads his friend's limp body in his jeep and tears off down the road for the medical tent.

Just minutes down the road he sees a German tank column crossing the road ahead of him. He immediately leaves the road and takes his Jeep into the woods. After some weaving through trees and the like, the Jeep comes to rest behind a growth of underbrush. He pauses and watches the Germans moving in and out of the forest all around him. When he can wait no longer, he guns the Jeep's engine and goes careening through the different groups of Germans. When he finally runs out of room he accelerates hard and breaks through the line to get his friend to the medical tent.

Once at the medical camp, a doctor tells him his friend is as good as dead without barely a cursory medical examination. The doctor tells Dohun to leave him alone so he can attend to those he can actually help. Dohun refuses to take no for an answer, puts the captain's body on the doctor's table, and pleads, "Would you look at him please, sir?" The doctor's silence answers him, immediately Dohun pulls his gun, points it at the doctor, and states, "Right now. Or I'll blow your fucking head off." The doctor, without much of a choice, obliges. Dohun waits outside the medical tent and as it turns out his

friend will live after surgery. The doctor recognizes Dohun's heroism and does not penalize him for his actions.

The cinematography in the scene is a study in control. Before Dohun gets the captain to the medical tent, the shots convey him as fighting the odds and without power or control. They are straight-on and high-angle shots, with Dohun positioned often at the right side of the screen (the weak side). Once he confronts the doctor, the shot composition shifts to paint him in a more powerful and heroic light. The lower angle shots with Dohun on the left side of the screen suggest that he has made a shift from powerless to powerful, and gained his hero soldier status via his actions in saving the life of his captain at great personal risk. Without a care for the consequences to himself he risks both his own career and possibly his life via court martial as well as demonstrating his unflinching loyalty to his captain and the promise he made. These actions are prime examples of heroism as noted by Wansink, Payne, & von Ittersum (2008) and others, noted previously.

Another example of fearlessness and risk-taking is seen in Maj. Cook near the end of the film. He is tasked by his commanding officer to lead an amphibious assault across a river and take a German-defended side of a bridge in broad daylight. His subtle reactions and vocalizations make it very apparent that he is aware of the situation and its inherent peril. In talking with his superior, the dialogue is playful but with a heavy air to it. However, even in the face of an overly dangerous mission, he displays his leadership and penchant for risk-taking in his fearless and courageous leading of the assault. His men grab the collapsible boats, charge the river and row across amid German artillery and gunfire. They paddle with their oars, rifles and hands to cross the river as fast as possible. When he reaches the far shore amid heavy fire from dug in German

troops, he stands and leads the charge down the beach, up the hill, and to the bridge to reach his tasked objective.

In this way both American officers display not only risk-taking and loyalty but also leadership. They possess no flaws in terms of character or lack of heroism. They do not question their orders or hint that they disagree with the need for the action vocally; however, they understand how dangerous some of their missions are and we can see the weight of the task in their nonverbal reactions and facial expressions.

The non-hero is also present in the film. The overarching theme of how the nonhero differs from the hero is slightly divergent from the previous and subsequent films analyzed. In the case of *A Bridge Too Far* (Levine et. al, 1977) non-heroism manifests itself as vanity and cowardice to speak up, not specifically cowardice in combat.

For example, near the onset of the film the British communications officers are discussing the state of the radios that the troops will be taking into the field and after coming to the conclusion that they may not be adequate they decide not to bring up the issue with their commander as they do not want to “rock the boat.” This cowardly choice not to make sure that everything would work properly negatively impacts Maj. Gen. Urquhart and his troops as, for the majority of the film, his radios do not work and he remains out of contact with Lt. Col. Frost. This lack of communication nearly results in the complete extermination of Frost’s men.

Two examples of the vanity of the non-hero are found in Maj. Gen. Taylor and Lt. Col. Vandeleur. In the case of Taylor his vanity and choice to ignore the reports from the Dutch underground led to the commencement of Operation Market Garden, an offensive which ended with a higher number of casualties than D-Day and failed to accomplish its objective (Levine et. al, 1977). Even when confronted with photos of camouflaged tanks



that were thought not to be present, he refused to cancel the operation citing reasons that were purely political.

His non-heroic actions led to the death of thousands of allied troops who could have been spared had he not disregarded the information presented to him. Another instance of a non-heroic action that cost allied soldiers their lives was on the part of Vandeleur, the British tank commander. After his victory in a skirmish, when asked why he was not hurrying to take the next objective, he noted that he should be on time and it would be poor form to arrive early. He explained that he wanted to arrive in the nick of time to save the battle and not so early as to make it easy.

These displays of vanity and cowardice are clearly non-heroic and run counter to the risk-taking and loyalty displayed by the heroes in the film. In this film the heroes, non-heroes and villains (the German forces) are all confined to their own silos. There is no blurring in the lines between the two as there is in other films such as *Platoon* (Kopelson& Stone, 1986) and *The Hurt Locker* (Bigelow et. al, 2008).

### **III.3. Platoon**

*Platoon* (Kopelson& Stone, 1986) follows Pvt. Taylor through his tour of duty in Vietnam in which he encounters the horrors of war and struggles with the dual nature of man. The central conflict in the film focuses on an internal dispute between the U.S. troops revolving around the killing of innocent villagers and how the platoon deals with the event. The 1980s were a turbulent time in the United States. The country was fresh out of the Vietnam War and Oliver Stone set out to make a movie that depicted his actual experiences in Vietnam.

The film was also made at a time of intense escalation of the cold war tensions between world powers. This tension between communist and free nations is directly

reflected in the subject matter of the film. A renewed national opposition to communist nations also defined this time, as most of America's opponents in the cold war were communist nations; also of note was that this time in history saw the beginning of the Reagan era (Baker, 2007) whose singular goal for his presidency was the prevention of nuclear war. In many ways *Platoon* (Kopelson& Stone, 1986) reflected the focus on truth and opposition to communism of the time, while all at the same time positing a social commentary suggesting that perhaps the freemen fighting communism were fighting parts of themselves as well.

The eighties marked a shift away from the ebbing counter-cultural movement of the sixties and seventies (Gitlin, 1987) and a focus on realism (Baker, 2007). In many ways this spirit is embodied in Oliver Stone's *Platoon* (Kopelson& Stone, 1986). The years leading up to the film mark a relatively quiet time in U.S. foreign involvement save for the Reagan Administration's involvement with the Contras. While Congress turns down military aid, it does green light humanitarian aid for the "freedom fighters" (Dittmar& Michaud, 1990). While international turmoil continues as it always had, the U.S., with a lack of foreign focus, seemed to enter a more introspective state culturally. *Platoon* (Kopelson& Stone, 1986) is a film in which, more than any other examined in this analysis, the line between hero and non-hero blurs while keeping them existent in separate characters. In many ways the main character, Pvt. Taylor is an unwitting hero. At the beginning of the film he struggles to understand the situation in which he is thrust. This film, more than most others, allows the audience to witness the hero's journey. Alongside Taylor in the heroic role is Sgt. Elias. Elias is much akin to Capt. Miller in *Saving Private Ryan* (Bryce & Spielberg, 1998) and Lt. Col. Kiley in *The Battle of the Bulge* (Harmon et. al, 1965). He begins the film as the hero and ends it as the

hero. His actions throughout closely align with the characteristics associated with heroes i.e., risk-taking, loyalty, and leadership (Wansink, Payne, & von Ittersum, 2008).

As evinced via the voiceover in Taylor's letters to his grandmother, he is conflicted about his reasons for being in Vietnam and the reasons behind the war. As with any other hero, he needs motivation (Campbell, 2008). For the first act of the film, he struggles with this, and only after the conflict in the village between the village leader, Elias, and Barnes does Taylor realize what he must do to be the hero. Barnes unwittingly forces this realization on him when he kills the wife of the village leader. This is the point where Barnes "snaps." He crosses the line from a soldier doing his duty to a villain.

Contrary to previous films, the non-hero/villain in *Platoon* (Kopelson & Stone, 1986) is embodied in the inhuman Sgt. Barnes. He is an extreme case of non-heroism, inasmuch as he lacks basic human decency. In other cases such as *Saving Private Ryan* (Bryce & Spielberg, 1998) and *The Hurt Locker* (Bigelow et al., 2008) non-heroism is minor character flaw or one side of the duality of the hero; here Barnes embodies not just non-heroism, but in many ways, evil.

In his slaying of the innocent villagers he crosses the line from gruff senior officer to non-hero and the subsequent murder of Elias further cements his transformation; one could even argue this makes him a villain. At the onset of the film both Taylor and Barnes are on even ground from a heroic standpoint. They are both non-heroes, doing their duty, albeit with varying levels of experience. But through the course of the film they diverge in their hero path, with one ascending to hero and the other descending to villainy.

The scene in the village is central to Taylor's transformation. After the encounter and booby trap at the bunker, Manny disappears. They find him a thousand yards

downriver with his throat cut. This fuels the platoon's rage as they enter the village and deal with the villagers. Taylor comes close to crossing the line himself in dealing with the one-legged villager. After flirting the line with killing him, and Bunny yelling "Do him, man, do him!" Taylor realizes what he's doing. The scene shot in the dark of the hut symbolizes the dark place into which Taylor almost enters. After he stops and Bunny kills the villager, the guilt and pain are evident in his eyes. His turning point can be seen in the struggle in his eyes while the conflict at the village heightens.

After they find the cache of weapons in the village, Barnes and Lerner interrogate the village leader. The leader's wife comes in screaming and yelling at Barnes and the platoon. We can see the building tension in Barnes's face as well as feel it rising in the score. In a moment's decision Barnes raises his rifle and fires a single shot into the woman's head. She falls and takes with her Barnes's humanity. Taylor all the while looks on; we can see the struggle in his expressions and subtle non-verbal cues. After the ensuing fight between Elias and Barnes, where Elias is horrified by the sequence of events that led to murder of the village leader's wife as well as Barnes holding a gun to the head of his daughter, Elias displays his commitment to heroism both in his respect and defense of life as well as his desire to see justice served and stop the evil of Barnes. At the end of the fight, Taylor is standing still and the camera focuses on him while the cast of characters walks by him out of the village. This shot symbolically underpins his path to heroism. As all the soldiers walk by, Taylor seemingly stares into nothing until Elias passes him. It is after Elias passes that he turns and joins the group, signifying his decision to follow the heroic path.

Taylor reaches the apex of his internal decision moments later when he saves the two girls from being raped by Junior, Bunny, and the others of the platoon after the

incident with the village leader. He screams: “She’s a fucking human being, man!” and thusly foreshadows which side of the conflict he has decided to defend. He begins his heroic journey here, in the same spirit as Elias, defending the weak and in opposition to the evil of Barnes. Elias sees what Taylor does in defense of the girls; they catch a knowing look between them as Taylor escorts the girls away from the four would-be rapists.

From that moment on Taylor displays myriad acts of heroism. He carries wounded comrades to safety through enemy fire; he charges bunkers and generally endangers himself for the greater good and his fellow soldiers. He begins to demonstrate his growing sense of justice not only in the saving of the village girl, but also in his uncontrollable feeling and need for justice in the situation with Barnes.

If Barnes’s actions had not cemented Taylor’s transition into the hero, his murder of Elias does. While Taylor was not completely sure that Barnes had murdered Elias, he suspected it and was given more proof when Barnes said Elias was dead and then Elias bursts from the underbrush in a hopeless run for the helicopter.

After his confrontation with Barnes in “the underworld” Taylor grapples with his conscience as to how to handle the situation. The climax of the conflict comes at the end of the final battle. In the heat of combat, Taylor is saved from a maniacal Barnes by a bombing run that strikes nearby and throws Barnes and Taylor apart. When he awakes in the morning, he find Barnes hurt and in need of help. It is debatable as to whether Taylor should or should not have ended Barnes’s life here, as noted by Sheen in *Tour of the Inferno*, a featurette on the *Platoon* (Kopelson& Stone, 1986) DVD, “I didn’t look at it as killing Barnes, as much as I looked at it as releasing Barnes from Barnes. This may sound crazy but a gesture of peace than an act of violence... to release his soul.” Taylor is

in essence releasing Barnes from the evil he has become. In this way Taylor demonstrates his heroism via his pursuit of justice and vision of the metaphysical outcomes. Sheen goes on to note that it “was more about freeing him [Barnes] from his own Hell.” But his decision is not without its consequences.

When found by the reinforcing forces later in the scene, he is moments away from pulling the pin on a grenade in his hand and killing himself. He drops the grenade when the soldiers find him and accepts his destiny to live. As he notes in the helicopter ride out of Vietnam: “I think now, looking back, we did not fight the enemy. We fought ourselves and the enemy was in us. The war is over for me now but it will always be there, the rest of my days. As I’m sure Elias will be, fighting with Barnes for what Rhah called possession of my soul.”

Taylor is by no means a perfect hero, but he embodies the era in which he was created as well as the spirit of the Vietnam War. He is a tainted hero, struggling not only with himself also but with external forces, both with soldiers on his side of the conflict as well as the enemy. In many ways this film shows the breadth of how a hero can be explicated. Elias resides at the very heroic end of the spectrum; he is the classic hero. As noted previously, he has no flaws, seeks justice, and fights hard. In the middle is Taylor, the central character within the film.

The action focuses on his journey from blank slate to hero. Specifically, the focal point rests on his struggles with the duality of man and the evil of which all are capable. In the end he pursues justice for Elias and the end of the non-hero, Barnes as well as the non-hero within himself. Barnes is an extreme form of non-hero; he starts out as an unlikable grunt but in the end allows himself to be lost in the rage and anger of his situation. He stands in opposition to those things which make a hero: loyalty, he defies in

his slaying of Elias; leadership, he subverts the chain of command with his disregard for the Lieutenant; risk-taking, his only motivation within his risk taking behaviors is selfgratification and enjoyment of battle. His actions all run counter to those of heroes and place him at the opposite end of the spectrum as the non-hero and worse, the villain.

#### **III.4. Saving Private Ryan.**

“This was going to be some brand of current, definitive document about a day of decision unlike any other in the history of the world” – Tom Hanks, *Into the Breach*, (Bryce & Spielberg, 1998)

*Saving Private Ryan* (Bryce & Spielberg, 1998) is a film about a group of soldiers led by a select captain who lands in Normandy on D-Day. They are ordered to traverse the French countryside in search of Private James Ryan so he can be sent home. While the focus of the film is on the “saving of Private Ryan,” the captain is the main character the action follows throughout the movie. He epitomizes the ideal of a hero soldier. He always makes the right decision, empathizes with his unit, and has its best interests at heart, all the while standing up for the orders issued to him whether he agrees with them or not.

The film *Saving Private Ryan* (Bryce & Spielberg) was released in 1998. The nineties were a conflicted time in the United States. In the nineties the United States was involved in various overseas conflicts including the Gulf War, the Yugoslav wars, NATO intervention in the Balkans and the Chechan Wars (Baker, 2007). But in many ways the conflicts signified a return to the traditional modes of warfare and views of heroes in the military as evinced in *Saving Private Ryan* (Bryce & Spielberg, 1998). Long past the anti-military sentiment of the Vietnam era and the tension of the cold war the nineties signified a renewed faith in the military and by extension in the hero soldier. In the film

this is shown through the portrayal of the captain and his men. They are heroes, fighting hard and dying for their country. They lack the tainted worldview common among Vietnam era films such as *Platoon* (Kopelson& Stone, 1986).

Capt. Miller displays his heroism time and again throughout the film and the techniques used in shooting the film also lend to this. The first scene in the film is the DDay invasion of the Normandy beaches. While the scene contains a plethora of violence, survival, and disregard for one's well-being, one cannot recognize any specific acts of heroism from the sequence. Specifically, this opening scene was viewed as soldiers simply doing their job, i.e., there was no choice in how the soldiers behaved in the Normandy invasion. They did not have the capacity to make a choice and thus choose a heroic over a non-heroic action. They were merely fighting for survival without a capacity for decision.

The captain begins to display his heroism at the encounter at the radar site. First, by the decision to attack and destroy the machine gun so that it is no longer a danger to any other Allied unit which passed through the area, and second is the part the captain takes in the assault. While his men suggest that they simply detour and avoid the danger, the captain understands the bigger picture and makes a heroic decision to endanger himself and his unit.

His understanding that they aren't only there to find Pvt. Ryan but to win the war shows his deeper understanding of his duty that escapes his men. Mellish notes, "Uh, Captain, we can still skip it and still accomplish our mission, I mean, this isn't our mission, right sir?" Miller responds "Oh, that's what you want to do, Mellish? You just want to leave it here so they can ambush the next company that comes along?" Mellish backs down, "No sir, that's not what I'm saying. I'm simply saying it seems like an



unnecessary risk given our objective.” Miller retorts, ”Our objective is to win the war.” He was well within his rights and could not have been chastised had he chosen to detour around the machine gun nest, but instead he chose to behave heroically and risk the assault on the nest.

The action in the shot illustrates Miller’s leadership and power. While the company sits in a circle, moping about the decision, Miller rises and runs off through the woods. His action juxtaposed against their inaction shows him to be the leader and a capable one at that. The motion conveys his perseverance in contrast to their cowardice or lack of understanding of the gravity of their position.

The captain’s own courage and heroism is displayed not only in his decision to attack the nest but also in his assertion that he will be the one going up the middle, the most dangerous part of the attack. In the pre-attack huddle the men are reluctant to even be part of the main assault; as no one will volunteer to go up the left until the captain asks numerous times. He could have easily ordered three of his men to make the attack and supported them from the rear, but instead he heroically puts himself in danger unnecessarily. Also of note is that the audience views this entire scene and the heroism of those involved from Upham’s perspective. In many ways the film is shot from the nonhero’s perspective. Upham is the scared pencil pusher shoved into action on merit of his ability to understand German and French. His ascent to a hero is a slow one but his journey is witnessed first-hand by the audience.

In the aftermath both Upham and Miller display varying degrees of heroism, Upham in his efforts to prevent the killing of a P.O.W. and Miller in his decision to acquiesce to Upham’s efforts. His leadership and ability to diffuse the situation which arose with Reiban demonstrate his heroism and loyalty to duty as well as the good of his

men, even if they don't immediately realize it.

Another notable instance of heroism occurs on the outskirts of Ramelle, France (a fictional village) where the squad first encounters Pvt. Ryan. As they are making their way through a field, the captain hears a German half-track incoming. At his order the men take cover in the field. As it passes an RPG hits the half-track. Miller's unit fires on the Germans who pour out, then in a heroic move the captain charges the half-track. He orders his men to take the left flank while he works his way around the right flank killing multiple Germans in the process in the effort to secure it. He could have easily ordered Horvath, Mellish, or another squad member to lead the charge but instead took the risk himself in a heroic action without thought of risk to himself.

The final display of heroism in *Saving Private Ryan* (Bryce & Spielberg, 1998), finds the captain, concussed by a tank shot, with his men crumbling around him, making a heroic rush for the detonator to blow the bridge and thereby stop the German advance. He is shot multiple times in this rush and as he lies dying, he un-holsters his pistol and fires on an advancing tank. A moment before he blows the bridge an Allied bombing squadron flies overhead and destroys the tank and advancing troops. This scene shows the captain heroically giving his life in order to save Private Ryan and the mission from death and failure respectively.

The presence of the non-hero in Upham serves to create the dichotomy between the coward and the hero and to help the audience understand the gravity of a hero's actions as opposed to the consequences of displaying non-heroic behavior. A display of cowardice is shown by Cpl. Upham in the final battle of *Saving Private Ryan* (Bryce & Spielberg, 1998) in which he succumbs to fear and is paralyzed to the degree that Mellish, whom he is capable of saving, is knifed in a hand-to-hand fight with a German

soldier. But in the end of the final battle Upham finally finds his courage and becomes a hero. His journey is not the central focus of the film as it was for Taylor in *Platoon* (Kopelson & Stone, 1986). It is more akin to Weaver's in *Battle of the Bulge* (Harmon et al., 1965) where it is one component of the story. In his confrontation with the German, whom they had originally let go at the radar site, he moves from the non-hero and the scared, crying soldier on the stairs to a hero who seized control of his own destiny and did what needed to be done. He served justice for Capt. Miller and those who died in his unit.

*Saving Private Ryan* (Bryce & Spielberg, 1998) paints the hero soldier as a loyal, risk-taking leader. All these characteristics were posited by Wansink, Payne and von Ittersum (2008) as the traits which are most commonly associated with war heroes. One thing absent from the film was the presence of major character flaws within the hero. Capt. Miller possessed no flaws that ran counter to his heroic presence. While he may have a very minor physical defect, i.e., his shaky hand, he possessed no character flaws; he commits to his duty and goes above and beyond. According to Spielberg (1998) the hero soldiers in the film were "courageous, ordinary guys" and this film was made to honor them and the sacrifice they made to stop the Nazi expansion.

According to *Into the Breach*, a featurette on *Saving Private Ryan* (Bryce & Spielberg, 1998) this film is meant to be a story of sacrifice and heroism. On a base level Spielberg in the aforementioned featurette notes that the idea behind the film moved him on an emotional level and was the reason that he made the film.

Overall, this film is a study in heroism almost unparalleled in war films. It contains a deep explication of the hero's character that is rarely matched. Throughout the film Capt. Miller, the hero, is defined through his actions as well as his interactions with

others and the resulting self-explication. While the film paints Miller as an almost infallible hero, there are subtle changes present in contrast to earlier films. While the character himself may be a shining example of a hero, his mission is not without moral ambiguity.

Over the course of the film Miller and more vocally his squad, state and hint at their disapproval of their assigned mission. Best stated by Pvt. Reiban, "You want to explain the math of this to me? I mean, where's the sense of risking the lives of the eight of us to save one guy?" The hero myth as noted by Campbell (2008) includes distinct acceptance of the task at hand or the "journey" as a piece of the hero; however, in the case of these soldiers there is no belief in their task, simply their duty to follow orders. One might conjecture that as a soldier one loses the ability to accept or decline the hero's task. This is a valid concern but one that is always shaped by the filmmaker. By giving the soldiers in the film a morally ambiguous task, Spielberg comments on how he and our culture view heroes. Specifically in this case, they question their journey and while they may behave heroically, they have doubts about why they are doing what they are doing. This doubt is a characteristic not common with those heroes in earlier films and provides one benchmark by which we can trace the change of the hero over time.

As noted by Matt Damon, these were regular guys who were put into an extraordinary situation and as a result were able to exceed their normal capacities and act heroically. This idea that these are just ordinary men is one that speaks to the cultural view of heroes. All of the "real" heroes today are ordinary people, not the demi-gods of times past (Whitehall, 1966-67). But most revealing is a comment that Spielberg makes when discussing the film in the *Into the Breach* featurette; he notes, "my films are windows into war" (1998). This single quote shows that Spielberg is painting the hero

and the war in terms of how he, as a filmmaker and our cultural shaman or guide (Zehnder & Calvert, 2004), views these situations and the way those involved, i.e., the soldiers, behaved. This secures this film as a cultural marker in the evolution of heroes.

### **III.5. The Hurt Locker**

*The Hurt Locker* (Bigelow et. al, 2008) is a film following an elite bomb squad operating in Iraq during the early years of the Iraq war. The main character and hero of the film is Sergeant First Class James, an Explosive Ordinance Disposal (EOD) Technician. While he is a bit reckless, he embodies the spirit of a hero, unlike some of his predecessors in the aforementioned films. He is deeply flawed and his reckless heroism endangers his team on more than one occasion. K. Bigelow, in an interview in the supplemental materials on the DVD, notes that, in regards to the movie as a whole, “the hope is to be able to replicate the feel of war, the chaos of war, the messiness of war” (Bigelow et al., 2008). The movie was made in 2008, the end of the Bush presidency and a time of dissatisfaction and unrest among Americans with regards to the war in Iraq as well as an escalation of violence in Afghanistan as well as characterized by a general disillusionment with place of government in the U.S..

Early on in the film a notable heroic act occurs and sets the tone for the rest of the film. In the scene, James and his team are called on to investigate a possible car bomb, and discover a massive amount of explosive ordinance in the trunk of the car. James immediately realizes that his bomb gear is useless and removes it to be more effective at his job. He displays a different kind of heroism than one might expect to see from soldiers, i.e., disarming a bomb is a very selfless act insomuch as the diffuser is risking his own life and putting himself directly in harm’s way to prevent anyone else from being harmed by the bomb.

Bigelow (2008) points out the job of the EOD Tech is probably one of the most dangerous jobs in the world, and by extension selfless. This selflessness noted by Wansink et. al (2008) suggests that one major "characteristic of risk-taking for heroes may be selflessness;" they then go on to point out that this "may not involve risk-taking for the sake of excitement as much as it involves the willingness to sacrifice oneself for the benefit of the group" (p. 549). In this way one can deem the vast majority of James' actions as heroic actions. In many ways, an EOD specialist can be viewed as a more heroic soldier than most. While an infantryman may have brief moments of action followed by long periods of inaction, bomb techs risk death on a far more regular basis. Another important aspect of the hero's character is that of leadership. In the sniper standoff James displays his leadership by empowering Specialist Eldridge to make the call and decide how to react to the possible threat on the hill behind them. While James is occupied in the task of spotting the sniper for Sanborn, he entrusts their rear flank to the weakest member of the team. Trust is an integral aspect of loyalty when addressing the hero soldier (Wansink et al., 2008). In this scene he also begins the hero's journey for Eldridge; in helping him find his courage, he starts Eldridge on the path to being a hero.

Most telling of James and his heroic predilections in the film is the part in which the squad arrives at a scene where a bomb has already been detonated. As carnage and death surround the squad, James gives the order to pursue the possible bomber into the dark streets surrounding the scene. In the end, James, in firing on the assailants who have taken Eldridge hostage, hits Eldridge in the leg. This is a pivotal moment – up until this point James has simply been a reckless hero, well-intentioned but keeping his squad safe via his good decisions and EOD skills. In the moment when he decides to unnecessarily pursue a phantom bomber (they didn't know whether the bomb was set off remotely or

was a suicide bomb) into a dark alley, he crosses the line from reckless hero back to nonhero. In a way he almost regresses from being a hero to taking a step back into the area before that, to the area where Upham spends the majority of *Saving Private Ryan* (Bryce & Spielberg, 1998).

In this fall from heroism the film explicates our cultural feeling toward both the Iraqi war and heroes. Our heroes are no longer the smart, strong half-gods they once were. They are mere shadows of their former selves. While still possessing many of the heroic qualities, they have an added dimension, one of human fallibility and doubt (Whitehall, 1966-67).

While a non-hero does exist in the film and undergoes a subtle journey, it by no means is the central focus of the film. The non-hero in this case is Specialist Eldridge; he is scared and dealing with his own internal issues while trying to follow and learn from the example of either Sanborn or James. One telling fact about the non-hero in this film is that he never completes his journey; he is perpetually stuck in transition. Part of this could be attributed to the fact that he is not the focus of the film. More notable, however, is the idea that this was an intentional choice around our conception of heroes. Taking this idea we understand that the film is meant to comment on our current heroes and the idea that they are not as fully formed as they once were. Our main hero is a flawed man who endangers his team and does the wrong thing many times. The non-hero on the heroic journey is one who never completes his journey, and forever falls short of a heroic destiny.

The flaw in Sgt. James is made apparent in both the opening quote of the film - "The rush of battle is often a potent and lethal addiction, for war is a drug" (Bigelow et al., 2008), and when he is talking with his infant son:

"You love playing with that. You love playing with all your stuffed animals. You love your Mommy, your Daddy. You love your pajamas. You love everything, don't ya? Yea. But you know what, buddy? As you get older... some of the things you love might not seem so special anymore. Like you're Jack-in-a-Box. Maybe you'll realize it's just a piece of tin and a stuffed animal. And the older you get, the fewer things you really love. And by the time you get to my age, maybe it's only one or two things. With me, I think it's one" (Bigelow et al., 2008).

He is, of course, referring to his addiction to war. He realizes that he craves the rush of battle. No longer is he a hero, disarming bombs to save lives; he is an addict getting his fix. Without the rush of battle James cannot handle ordinary life, as evinced by the scene with his wife in their house as well as in the grocery store. He is a fallen hero, a commentary on how our society now perceives heroes.

Anthony Mackie (Sanborn), in the supplemental DVD materials, notes, "I think there has to be a kind of superhero aspect to soldiers going into a war. Because if you wake up every day in fear, you'll drive yourself crazy because you realize every minute is possibly your last" (Bigelow et al., 2008). Here Mackie hits on the central idea that just by definition, soldiers on a base level can perhaps be considered heroes. People who live normal lives don't have to deal with death on a daily basis. This fact alone can qualify our soldiers as heroes. The quality of the hero, however, is a different story. This film, different markedly from the other four films analyzed, paints the hero as a darker, tainted version of himself.



## Works Cited

- Armstrong, C. L., & Nelson, M. R. (2005). How newspaper sources trigger gender stereotypes. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(4), 820-837.
- Baker, D. (2007). *The United States since 1980*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Baran, S. J. & Davis, D. K. (1995). *Mass communication theory*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Behm-Morawitz, E. & D. E. Mastro (2008). Mean girls? The influence of gender portrayals in teen movies on emerging adults' gender-based attitudes and beliefs. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 85(1), 131-146.
- Bigelow, K., Boal, M., Chartier, N., & Shapiro, G. (Producers), & Bigelow, K. (Director). (2008). *The hurt locker* [DVD]. USA: Voltage Pictures, Grosvenor Park Media, Film Capital Europe Funds (FCEF), First Light Production, Kingsgate Films, Summit Entertainment.
- Browne, R. B. (1983). Hero with 2000 faces. Browne, R. B., & Fishwick, M. W. (Eds.), *The hero in transition*. Bowling Green University Popular Press: Bowling Green Ohio.
- Bryce, I. (Producer), & Spielberg, S. (Director). (1998). *Saving private ryan* [DVD]. USA: Paramount, Amblin Entertainment, Dreamworks.
- Campbell, J. (2008). *The hero with a thousand faces*. (3rd Edition). Novato, California: New World Library.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. (2nd Edition). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Dittmar, L., & Michaud, G. (1990). *From Hanoi to Hollywood: The Vietnam War in American film*. New Brunswick & London: Rutgers University Press.

- Dixon, T. L. (2006). Schemas as average conceptions: Skin tone, television news exposure, and culpability judgments. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 83(1), 131-149.
- Fujioka, Y. (1999). Television portrayals and African-American stereotypes: Examination of television effects when direct contact is lacking. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 76(1), 52-75.
- Garson, G. D. (2011). *Narrative analysis*. Retrieved from <http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/pa765syl.htm>
- Gitlin, T. (1987). *The sixties: Years of hope, days of rage*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Graber, D. (1984). *Processing the news: How people tame the information tide*. New York: Longman.
- Henderson, J. L. (1964). Ancient myths and modern man. Jung, C. G. (Ed.), *Man and his symbols*. USA: Dell.
- Harvey, J., Erdos, G., & Turnbull, L. (2009). How do we perceive heroes? *Journal of Risk Research*, 12(3-4), 313-327.
- Huber, J., & Whelan, K. (1999). A marginal story as a place of possibility: Negotiating self on the professional knowledge landscape. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 381 – 396.
- IMDb: Best War Feature Films With At Least 1,000 Votes (1990 - 2010). Retrieved from [http://www.imdb.com/search/title?genres=war&num\\_votes=1000,&sort=user\\_rating,desc&title\\_type=feature](http://www.imdb.com/search/title?genres=war&num_votes=1000,&sort=user_rating,desc&title_type=feature)
- James, C. (2010). 'The Pacific': Hollywood goes to war (again). *Newsweek*. Retrieved from <http://www.newsweek.com/2010/03/04/the-pacific-hollywood-goes-to-waragain.html>
- Jung, C. G. (1964). Approaching the unconscious. Jung, C. G. (Ed.), *Man and his*

*symbols*. USA: Dell.

Kopelson, A. (Producer), & Stone, O. (Director). (1986). *Platoon*[DVD]. UK, USA: Hemdale Film, Cinema 86.

Lasorsa, D. & Dai, J. (2007). When news reporters deceive: the production of stereotypes. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 84(2), 281-298.

Lee, K.-Y., & Joo, S.-H. (2005). The portrayal of Asian Americans in mainstream magazine ads: An update. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(3), 654-671.

Levine, J., Levine, R., Palmer, J., & Stanley-Evans, M. (Producers), & Attenborough, R. (Director). (1977). *A bridge too far* [DVD]. USA, UK: Joseph E. Levine Productions.

Mastro, D. E., & Greenberg, B. S. (2000). The portrayal of racial minorities on prime time television. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 44(4), 690-703.

Porpora, D. V. (1996) Personal heroes, religion, and transcendental metanarratives. *Sociological Forum*, 11(2), 209-229.

Ramasubramanian, S. (2007). Media-based strategies to reduce racial stereotypes activated by news stories. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 84(2), 249-264.

Rollin, R. B. (1973). The quest for victory. Rollin, R. B. (Ed.), *Hero/non-hero*. New York: Webster Division McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Rollin, R. R. (1983). The Lone Ranger and Lenny Skutnik: The hero as popular culture.

Browne, R. B., & Fishwick, M. W. (Eds.), *The hero in transition*. Bowling Green University Popular Press: Bowling Green Ohio.

Schlenker, B. R., Weigold, M. F., & Schlenker, K. A. (2008). What makes a hero? The

- impact of integrity on admiration and interpersonal judgment. *Journal of Personality*, 76(2), 323-355.
- Severin, W. J., & Tankard, Jr., J. W. (2001). *Communication theories: Origins, methods, and uses in the mass media*. (5th Ed.). New York: Longman.
- Sullivan, M. P., & Venter, A. (2005). The hero within: Inclusion of heroes into the self. *Self and Identity*, 4, 101-111.
- Wansink, B., Payne, C.R., & von Ittersum, K. (2008). Profiling the heroic leader: Empirical lessons from combat-decorated veterans of World War II. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 547-555.
- Whitehall, R. (1966-1967) The heroes are tired. *Film Quarterly*, 20(2), 12-24.
- Wrench, J. S., Thomas-Maddox, C., Richmond, V. P., & McCrosky, J. C. (2008). *Quantitative research methods for communication*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zehnder, S. M., & Calvert, S. L. (2004). Between the hero and the shadow: Developmental differences in adolescents' perceptions and understanding of mythic themes in films. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 28(2), 122-137.
- Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2009). Qualitative analysis of content. In B. Wildemuth (Ed.), *Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library*, 1-12.

## General Conclusion

The United States (U.S) military is apparently the most imposing battling power in the world and all things considered holds a high assessment of itself. With a yearly spending that keeps running into the billions, the Pentagon employs huge impact over not simply the national mind of the U.S yet in addition over the hearts and brains of different countries all through the globe, albeit many think contrastingly to how the Pentagon might want. While winning the hearts and psyches of those in a strategic situation has never been an aptitude that the U.S military has very aced, it has a noteworthy partner that can impact noteworthy parts of human conduct Hollywood, equipped with a weapon more lethal than any rocket – the camera - has been used by the military since before the Second World War. In any case, while probably the most fundamentally commended movies at any point made have been affected, guided, or represented by the Pentagon, there has normally been protesters towards the supposed "Military-Industrial-Media Complex" by the more left wing part of Hollywood. The obvious distinction in belief systems are frequently evident on film and features the compasses and restrictions of the Pentagon impact and how it shows the picture of the U.S military and the substance of war to general society. In this paper I will contend that while the Pentagon holds critical impact over Hollywood and the film industry, it doesn't hold total predominance and never will attributable to the global nature of film, countries who are quick to either debilitate the U.S picture or advance their own, and the ideological contrasts that can be found in a country that effectively advances the Freedom of Speech.

The U.S military and the U.S film industry started their relationship in 1927 with the creation of the film "Wings" (Hall, 1927). Albeit quiet, the film got help from an incredibly co-employable military who gave tremendous assets to the undertaking.

## Bibliography

### Books

Department of Defense,. (2014) “Demographics: Profile of the Military Community”,

Washington D.C: United States Government

Enloe, C., (1994) “Women Soldiers”: Images and Reality, London: Palmgrave

MacMillan UK

Robb, D., (2004) “Operation Hollywood: How the Pentagon Shapes and Censors the

Movies”, New York: Prometheus Books

Sardar. Z., & Davies, M., (2002) “Why Do People Hate America?”, Cambridge: Icon

Books

Suid, L., (2002) “Guts and Glory: the Making of the American Military Image”,

Lexington: The

University Press of Kentucky, P. xi.

Valantin, J-M., (2005) “Hollywood, the Pentagon”, and Washington, London: Anthem

Press

### Journals

Anderson, C., & Bushman, B., (2002) “Human Aggression”, *Annual Review of*

*Psychology*, 53, p. 27–51

Alford, M., (2016) “The Political Impact of the Department of Defense on Hollywood

Cinema” *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, 33:4, p. 332-347

Carver, T., (2007) *GI Jane: What are the ‘Manners’ that ‘Maketh a Man’?*, *Political*

*Studies Association*, 9(2) p. 314-315

Gill, R., (2007) Postfeminist media culture: Elements of a sensibility. *European*

*Journal of*

*Cultural Studies*, 101, p. 147–166

Hasianjr, M., (2013) Zero Dark Thirty and the Critical Challenges Posed by Populist Postfeminism During the Global War on Terrorism, *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 37(4) p. 322–343

### **Monograph**

Zhakova, O., (2011) “Strange Bedfellows: Cooperation between Hollywood and the Pentagon”, Lehigh University: *Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1328

### **Online Journals**

Miles, H., (2012) WWII Propaganda: The Influence of Racism, *Artefacts*, Issue 6, March, Available at: <https://artifactsjournal.missouri.edu/2012/03/wwii-propagandathe-influence-of-racism/>, accessed 10 May 2016

Wright, J., (2011) The Gears of War, *Little White Lies: Truth In Movies*, Issue 35: May-June, Available at: <https://issuu.com/lwlies/docs/lwlies35>, accessed 10 May 2016

### **Online News Articles**

Bergen, P., (2012) A feminist film epic and the real women of the CIA, *CNN*, 13 December, Available at: <http://edition.cnn.com/2012/12/13/opinion/bergen-feministepic/index.html>, accessed 10 May 2016

Guardian, The., (2001) Black Hawk Down Accused of airbrushing history, *The Guardian*, 21 December, Available at:

<http://www.theguardian.com/film/2001/dec/21/news>, accessed 8 May 2016

Hall, M., (1927) The Screen; The Flying Fighters, *The New York Times*, August 13, Available at:

<http://www.nytimes.com/movie/review?res=9805E6D9163CEE3ABC4B52DFBE66838C639EDE>, accessed on 7 May 2016

- Klindo, M., Phillips, R., (2005) Military interference in American film production. Operation Hollywood: How the Pentagon shapes and censors the movies by David L. Robb, *World Socialist Website*, 14 March, Available at: <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2005/03/holl-m14.html>, accessed 10 May 2016
- Luce, H., (1941) The American Century, *LIFE Magazine*, 17 February, Available at: <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article6139.htm>, accessed 10 May 2016
- Rose, S., (2009) The US Military Storm Hollywood, *The Guardian*, 6 July, Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/film/2009/jul/06/us-military-hollywood>, accessed 7 May 2016
- Sellers, R., (2009) The strained making of 'Apocalypse Now', *The Independent*, 23 July, Available at: <http://www.independent.co.uk/artsentertainment/films/features/the-strained-making-of-apocalypse-now-1758689.html>, accessed 7 May 2016
- Sirota, D., (2011) 25 years later, how 'Top Gun' made America love war, *The Washington Post*, August 26, Available at: [https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/25-years-later-remembering-how-top-gunchanged-americas-feelings-about-war/2011/08/15/gIQAU6qJgJ\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/25-years-later-remembering-how-top-gunchanged-americas-feelings-about-war/2011/08/15/gIQAU6qJgJ_story.html), accessed 10 May 2016
- Tarabay, J., (2014) Hollywood and the Pentagon: A relationship of mutual exploitation, *Al Jazeera*, 29 June, Available at: <http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/7/29/hollywood-andthepentagonarelationshipofmutualexploitation.html>, accessed 10 May 2016
- USA Today, (2001) Pentagon Provides For Hollywood, *USA Today*, 29 May, Available at: <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/life/movies/2001-05-17-pentagonhelps->



hollywood.htm, accessed 10 May 2016

Weisman, A., (2014) One Man In The Department Of Defense Controls All Of Hollywood's Access To The Military, *Business Insider*, 5 March, Available at: <http://www.businessinsider.com/phil-strub-controls-hollywoods-military-access-2014-3?IR=T>, accessed 10 2016

### **Online Resources**

Dirks, T., (2016) Greatest War Movies, *AMC Filmsite*, no date, Available at:

<http://www.filmsite.org/greatwarfilms4.html>, accessed 7 May 2016

Gladys, T., (2016) Wings, *San Francisco Silent Film Festival*, no date, Available at:

<http://www.silentfilm.org/wings-2012>, accessed 7 May 2016

Silver, C., (2011) Why We Fight: Frank Capra's WWII Propaganda Films, Inside/Out,

June 7, Available at: [http://www.moma.org/explore/inside\\_out/2011/06/07/why-wefight-frank-capras-wwii-propaganda-films/](http://www.moma.org/explore/inside_out/2011/06/07/why-wefight-frank-capras-wwii-propaganda-films/), accessed 10 May 2016

### **Films**

*30 Seconds Over Tokyo* (1944). Dir. Mervyn LeRoy. Perf. Spencer Tracy, Van

Johnson, Robert Walker. MGM Studios

*Act of Valor* (2012). Dir. Mike McCoy, Scott Waugh. Perf. Alex Veadov, Roselyn

Sanchez, and Nestor Serrano. Relativity Media

*Apocalypse Now* (1979). Dir. Francis Ford Coppola. Perf Martin Sheen, Marlon

Brando, Robert Duvall. Zoetrope Studios

*A Walk in the Sun* (1945). Dir. Lewis Milestone. Perf. Dana Andrews, Richard Conte,

George Tyne. Lewis Milestone Productions

*Black Hawk Down* (2001). Dir. Ridley Scott. Josh Hartnett, Ewan McGregor, Tom

Sizemore. Revolutionary Studios

*Dr Strangelove: Or, How I Stopped Worrying and Learned to Love the Bomb* (1964).

Dir. Stanley Kubrick. Perf. Peter Sellers, George C. Scott, Sterling Hayden.

Columbia Pictures

*Flying Tigers* (1942). Dir. David Miller. Perf. John Wayne, John Carroll, Anna Lee.

Republic Pictures

*GI Jane* (1997). Dir. Ridley Scott. Perf. Demi Moore, Viggo Mortensen, Anne

Bancroft and Jason Beghe. Buena Vista Pictures

*Independence Day* (1996). Dir. Roland Emmerich. Perf. Will Smith, Bill Pullman, Jeff

Goldblum. Twentieth Century Fox

*Pearl Harbor* (2001). Dir. Michael Bay. Perf. Ben Affleck, Josh Hartnett, Kate

Beckinsale. Touchstone Pictures

*Platoon* (1986). Dir. Oliver Stone. Perf. Charlie Sheen, Tom Berenger, Willem Dafoe.

MGM

*Story of G.I Joe* (1945). Dir. William Wellman. Perf. Burgess Meredith, Robert

Mitchum, Freddie Steele. Lester Cowan Productions

*Thirteen Days* (2000). Dir. Roger Donaldson. Perf. Kevin Costner, Bruce

Greenwood, Shawn Driscoll. New Line Cinema

*Top Gun* (1986). Dir. Tony Scott. Perf. Tom Cruise, Kelly McGillis, Tim Robbins.

Paramount Pictures

*Zero Dark Thirty* (2012) Dir. Kathryn Bigalow, Perf. Jessica Chastain, Joel Edgerton,

Chris Pratt. Columbia Pictures.

“The Iran-Contra Affair 20 Years On.” **The National Security Archive**. The George Washington University. 24 November 2006. Web. 20 June 2011.

**A Few Good Men**. Dir. Rob Reinor. Columbia Pictures, 1992. DVD.

**Apollo 13.** Dir. Ron Howard. Universal Pictures, 1995. DVD.

Baruch, Donald E. Letter to Michele Kuhar. 27 May 1977. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. **Print.**

Baruch, Donald E. Letter to Robert Greenhut. 10 May 1977. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. **Print.**

Baruch, Donald E. Memo for Audio Visual Branch. 26 Oct. 1977. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. **Print.**

Baruch, Donald E. Memo for Director, Audiovisual Entertainment, Chief of Information, Department of the Navy. 27 Dec. 1988. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. **Print.**

Boomer, William E. Memo to the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense. 12 Jan. 1994. **Department of Defense Film Collection**, Georgetown University Library, Special Collections Research Center, Washington, D.C. **Print.**

Armstrong, C. L., & Nelson, M. R. (2005). How newspaper sources trigger gender stereotypes. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(4), 820-837.

Baker, D. (2007). *The United States since 1980*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Baran, S. J. & Davis, D. K. (1995). *Mass communication theory*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Behm-Morawitz, E. & D. E. Mastro (2008). Mean girls? The influence of gender portrayals in teen movies on emerging adults' gender-based attitudes and

- beliefs. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 85(1), 131-146.
- Bigelow, K., Boal, M., Chartier, N., & Shapiro, G. (Producers), & Bigelow, K. (Director). (2008). *The hurt locker* [DVD]. USA: Voltage Pictures, Grosvenor Park Media, Film Capital Europe Funds (FCEF), First Light Production, Kingsgate Films, Summit Entertainment.
- Browne, R. B. (1983). Hero with 2000 faces. Browne, R. B., & Fishwick, M. W. (Eds.), *The hero in transition*. Bowling Green University Popular Press: Bowling Green Ohio.
- Bryce, I. (Producer), & Spielberg, S. (Director). (1998). *Saving private ryan*[DVD]. USA: Paramount, Amblin Entertainment, Dreamworks.
- Campbell, J. (2008). *The hero with a thousand faces*. (3rd Edition). Novato, California: New World Library.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. (2nd Edition). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Dittmar, L., & Michaud, G. (1990). *From Hanoi to Hollywood: The Vietnam War in American film*. New Brunswick & London: Rutgers University Press.
- Dixon, T. L. (2006). Schemas as average conceptions: Skin tone, television news exposure, and culpability judgments. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 83(1), 131-149.
- Fujioka, Y. (1999). Television portrayals and African-American stereotypes: Examination of television effects when direct contact is lacking. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 76(1), 52-75.
- Garson, G. D. (2011). *Narrative analysis*. Retrieved from <http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/pa765syl.htm>

- Gitlin, T. (1987). *The sixties: Years of hope, days of rage*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Graber, D. (1984). *Processing the news: How people tame the information tide*. New York: Longman.
- Henderson, J. L. (1964). Ancient myths and modern man. Jung, C. G. (Ed.), *Man and his symbols*. USA: Dell.
- Harvey, J., Erdos, G., & Turnbull, L. (2009). How do we perceive heroes? *Journal of Risk Research*, 12(3-4), 313-327.
- Huber, J., & Whelan, K. (1999). A marginal story as a place of possibility: Negotiating self on the professional knowledge landscape. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 381 – 396.
- IMDb: Best War Feature Films With At Least 1,000 Votes (1990 - 2010). Retrieved from [http://www.imdb.com/search/title?genres=war&num\\_votes=1000,&sort=user\\_rating,desc&title\\_type=feature](http://www.imdb.com/search/title?genres=war&num_votes=1000,&sort=user_rating,desc&title_type=feature)
- James, C. (2010). 'The Pacific': Hollywood goes to war (again). *Newsweek*. Retrieved from <http://www.newsweek.com/2010/03/04/the-pacific-hollywood-goes-to-waragain.html>
- Jung, C. G. (1964). Approaching the unconscious. Jung, C. G. (Ed.), *Man and his symbols*. USA: Dell.
- Kopelson, A. (Producer), & Stone, O. (Director). (1986). *Platoon*[DVD]. UK, USA: Hemdale Film, Cinema 86.
- Lasorsa, D. & Dai, J. (2007). When news reporters deceive: the production of stereotypes. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 84(2), 281-298.
- Lee, K.-Y., & Joo, S.-H. (2005). The portrayal of Asian Americans in mainstream magazine ads: An update. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(3), 654-671.

Levine, J., Levine, R., Palmer, J., & Stanley-Evans, M. (Producers), & Attenborough, R. (Director). (1977). *A bridge too far* [DVD]. USA, UK: Joseph E. Levine Productions.

Mastro, D. E., & Greenberg, B. S. (2000). The portrayal of racial minorities on prime time television. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 44(4), 690-703.

Porpora, D. V. (1996) Personal heroes, religion, and transcendental metanarratives. *Sociological Forum*, 11(2), 209-229.

Ramasubramanian, S. (2007). Media-based strategies to reduce racial stereotypes activated by news stories. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 84(2), 249-264.

Rollin, R. B. (1973). The quest for victory. Rollin, R. B. (Ed.), *Hero/non-hero*. New York: Webster Division McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Rollin, R. R. (1983). The Lone Ranger and Lenny Skutnik: The hero as popular culture.

Browne, R. B., & Fishwick, M. W. (Eds.), *The hero in transition*. Bowling Green University Popular Press: Bowling Green Ohio.

Schlenker, B. R., Weigold, M. F., & Schlenker, K. A. (2008). What makes a hero? The impact of integrity on admiration and interpersonal judgment. *Journal of Personality*, 76(2), 323-355.

Severin, W. J., & Tankard, Jr., J. W. (2001). *Communication theories: Origins, methods, and uses in the mass media*. (5th Ed.). New York: Longman.

Sullivan, M. P., & Venter, A. (2005). The hero within: Inclusion of heroes into the self. *Self and Identity*, 4, 101-111.

Wansink, B., Payne, C.R., & von Ittersum, K. (2008). Profiling the heroic leader: Empirical lessons from combat-decorated veterans of World War II. *The*

*Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 547-555.

Whitehall, R. (1966-1967) The heroes are tired. *Film Quarterly*, 20(2), 12-24.

Wrench, J. S., Thomas-Maddox, C., Richmond, V. P., & McCrosky, J. C.

(2008). *Quantitative research methods for communication*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zehnder, S. M., & Calvert, S. L. (2004). Between the hero and the shadow:

Developmental differences in adolescents' perceptions and understanding of mythic themes in films. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 28(2), 122-137.

Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2009). Qualitative analysis of content. In B. Wildemuth (Ed.), *Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library*, 1-12.