CINEMA AND REPRESENTATION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS:
HOLLYWOOD CINEMA AND THE COLD WAR

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ALİ FUAT ŞENGÜL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

JULY 2005

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences.

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Atila Eralp
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necati Polat
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nejat Ulusay   (AU,COMM)   _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necati Polat   (METU,IR)   _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Oktay Tanrısever   (METU,IR)   _____

ii

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Surname: Ali Fuat, Şengül

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

CINEMA AND REPRESENTATION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS:
HOLLYWOOD CINEMA AND THE COLD WAR

Şengül, Ali Fuat

M.Sc., Department of International Relations

Supervisor   : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necati Polat

July 2005, 65 pages

The thesis seeks to trace the development of the process of 'reflection as reality' through a politico-historical analysis of the intimacies between the United States governments and Hollywood cinema during the Cold War. The working assumption while projecting this study is as follows; the Hollywood cinema and the United States governments enjoyed a close relationship during the period in question. The latter actively involved in the inscription of the wills and desires of US Foreign policymakers into the American popular culture. The thesis will also extend the discussion to a politic cultural assessment of how the United States, through the films, represents and re-presents its superiority, and more importantly, how these films affect and shape the spectators perceptions about its foreign policy.

Keywords: Hollywood cinema, Cold War, Ideology, Representation,

ÖZ

ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLERDE SİNEMA VE TEMSİL:
HOLLYWOOD SİNEMASI VE SOĞUK SAVAŞ

Şengül, Ali Fuat

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Necati Polat

Temmuz 2005, 65 Sayfa

Bu tez Soğuk Savaş döneminde Amerika Birleşik Devletleri hükümetleri ile Hollywood sineması arasındaki ilişkileri inceleyerek 'gerçeklik olarak görüngü' sürecinin oluşumunu incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışmaya yön verecek olan temel varsayım ise şudur: ele alınacak dönemde Hollywood sineması ile Birleşik Devletler hükümetleri arasında yakın ilişki vardır. Hükümetler bu ilişkiyi dış politika yapıcılarının istek ve arzularını Amerikan popüler kültürüne sindirme aracı olarak kullanmıştır. Bu tez aynı zamanda Birleşik Devletlerin söz konusu dönemdeki filmleri ile nasıl kendi üstünlüğünü temsil ettiğini ve yeniden sunduğunu; daha da önemlisi izleyicilerin kendisinin dış politikası hakkındaki algılarını nasıl etkilediğini ve biçimlendirdiğini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hollywood sineması, Soğuk Savaş, Ideoloji, Temsil,

To My Family

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Approximately one hundred years after Lumiére's mistaken assertion that there is no future for the new medium, cinema has become one of the most important instruments of political power. In the course of its history, cinema would be a space of escape for the people, for instance during the harsh times of the Great Depression in the United States. As early as 1910, twenty-six million persons were going to movies each week in America, and this number would rise to ninety million when the calendar showed the early 1940s[1]. Nazi Germany used the medium for the best propaganda purposes, because the new medium was very suitable for providing national self-reliance: After the 1917 Revolution, Lenin called cinema "the most important art" (Williams, 2002: 6). And whenever the American government had a difficulty in solving the problems the same machine would be at the service of it.

This thesis is an account of the relationship between the Hollywood cinema and the United States government during the Cold War era. The main assumption is that throughout the Cold War the United States governments and Hollywood were strategic partners; the former used this partnership to create a discursive space within which it would emerge as a distinct actor in its difference from others. Although World War II came to an end with the two atomic bombs thrown at Hiroshima and Nagasaki by itself, for about forty years the United States used the fear of a repeated nuclear explosion as if it is a foreign threat. The industry was very successful to introduce to the spectator who the friends and the foes were? Who should be trusted and who should be avoided?

The thesis consists of four chapters. Chapter 1 discusses the grounds for integrating 'cinema' into the analysis of International Relations. Robert Gregg proposes that films help us to understand "valuable windows to the reality of international relations". According to him films are ideological in that they reflect their producers' perspectives. But he claims that this representation is not because of a "conscious

---

[1] People's Century: 1927 Great Escape, BBC Documentary Series

strategy of exclusion", rather it is "because of the nature of the film" (Gregg, 1998: 10). Cynthia Weber maintains that films are instruments through which certain worldviews are naturalized in the popular culture and that they offer valuable insights about the "the connection between the popular and the political" (Weber, 2001: 9). For Jutta Weldes, films "contribute to the reproduction of foreign policy discourses" and they "produce consent for foreign policy" (Weldes, 1999: 119).

In Chapter 2, I discuss how the developments taking place throughout 1970s in social science scholarship influenced cinema studies. During the 1970s, the discussions on cinema and ideology continued in two different directions. On the one hand there were scholars who took Jacques Lacan's seminal article "Mirror-phase" as starting point in their discussion of cinema and ideology. The article wherein Lacan delineates the formation of subject in terms of the encounter of the infant with its reflection in the mirror, is appraised differently among the scholars. Christian Metz claims that the position of the infant in front of the mirror and the position of the spectator in front of the scene is the same. The infant recognizes itself by its mastery over its own image; Metz transfers this relationship to the relationship between the spectator and the scene. Contesting Metz's interpretation, Tod McGowann argues that the relationship between the spectator and what it spectates is not one of mastery over the image. The infant's identification with the image at the mirror does not happen as a result of its mastering the reflection, but to the contrary it is the gaze of the image on the mirror that the infant identifies with. The stance of the infant – and the spectator – is "more masochistic than sadistic" (McGowann, 2003: 36). Joan Copjec claims that the appropriation of "screen as the mirror", as Metz did, leads to distraction from the essence of Lacan's article. Instead one should take "the mirror as screen" in order to adhere to the gist of Lacanian analysis (Copjec, 2000: 449). The spectator does not look for mastery over the image; instead it doubts the part "missing from the representation". This discussion on Lacan's article is important for the thesis in its delineating the formation of the self as identification with something/someone other than its self.

On the other hand some scholars claim that the ideological character of the medium

2

is due to its technical hardware and the representation strategies it inherited from Renaissance pictorial system which finds its expression in the works of such artists as Diego Velasquez and Leonardo da Vinci. Jean Pierre Oudart (Oudart, 1990a) relates the ideological character of the cinematic medium to its reality effects and its inscription of the spectator into the representation. According to Oudart, by blurring the line between the representation and the reality it depicts, cinema leads the spectators take representation for reality. This process is achieved through "suturing" the spectator into cinematic space by successive camera movements. Jean Louis Baudry (1990) claims that the scientific origin of the camera keeps it immune to accusations of being ideological, but quite to the contrary to its technical basis, the camera inflicts the dominant ideology onto the spectator. Kaja Silverman maintains that the spectator is inculcated into the dominant discourse through the technical capacity of the camera. For Silverman (1999) the narrative continuity created by camera movements makes the spectator wait for successive shots at the expense of delay in the meaning. The relation of the ideological character of the cinema to its technical basis, alerts me in this thesis to investigate the technical functioning of the medium in order to be able to better explore the ideological process in film.

Chapter 3 deals with the institutional relationship between Hollywood cinema and the U.S. governments throughout the Cold War era. The relationship between the two was one of wartime solidarity. The Hollywood industry was very successful at creating the national mood in which American foreign policy initiatives became meaningful, or even necessary. Within this frame, I look at what the governments of the period expected from the industry and how the industry responded to these expectations. The historical material relations between the U.S. governments and the Hollywood industry attest to the importance of film for power and international relations. One of the executives of MGM studio Samuel Goldwyn claims that the industry aims at entertaining the audience (quoted in Giglio, 2000: 10). But throughout the Cold War, the films of Hollywood functioned as political documents issuing the official policy of the governments. This information contests the argument of Lipschutz (2001) that films are mirrors to the real world. The almost official relationship between the governments and the industry necessitates the

analysis to take film as not reflections of government policies but as their constitutive elements.

Chapter 4 focuses on the relation between the socio-political reality of the United States and its representation through symptomatic reading of highly popular films of the Cold War era: *Born on the Fourth of July* (1989), *Superman* (1978), *Indiana Jones series* (1981-1984-1989), *The Day the Earth Stood Still* (1951), *Deer Hunter* (1978), *Star Wars: A New Hope* (1977), *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (1978 version), *Apocalypse Now* (1979), *Invaders From Mars* (1953), *Close Encounters of the Third Kind* (1977), and *Full Metal Jacket* (1987). Resisting any separation between reality and its representation, I suggest that films constitute the American nation, state and self at the moment of representation. As such, films should not be analyzed in isolation from actual politics, or as posterior to it, but as constitutive sites of politics. That is why my reading of the Cold War films in relation to the Unites States' foreign policy focuses on investigating what kind of reality effects, truth effects and subject effects are produced through these films. That is, rather than investigating what films tell, I am concerned in this chapter with exploring how, through what mechanisms and regimes of representation they tell what they tell, and what they produce in effect. To this end I organize my discussion around four themes, which are respectively the construction of the U.S. national space, the construction of the national self and narrative subject, the representation of other national prototypes, and the construction of the U.S. as the global power.

II. CHAPTER ONE: INTEGRATING FILM STUDIES INTO IR

2.1. WHY STUDY FILM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Film is probably the most technologically sophisticated and narratively complete form of aesthetic fiction and a profound medium of inculcating in us a larger symbolic order. By showing how their protagonists conduct their lives, films tell us – we, the protagonists of our own lives– how to conduct ours by fashioning the

mundane details of daily life into larger systems of ideas and values that are, finally, political. They show us and tell us who we are supposed to be by presenting "an ideology that conveys an attitude toward everything from the trivial to the profound, from what we eat for breakfast to whether we should go to war" (Biskind, 2000: 2).

The thesis argues that films are ideological instruments. However, defining film as an ideological instrument can only be the opening statement of an analysis, as the aim should be to elaborate how film performs the ideological function. Indeed the relation between film and power works in quite a complex way. In the process of power's locating itself in the social/world system by fixing the (constitutive) others as others, the film provides a medium to 'make' the otherwise alternative views destructive to the right-for-all official ends, and through presenting the life within a particular form helps produce the subjectivities necessary for the maintenance of power.

In the field of International Relations the self-construction of the nation-state as the ontological ground of 'the political' goes back to the treaty of Westphalia. The agent of relations was agreed to be nation-states. However, this step not only means ontological privileging of the nation-state, but the nation-state also became the ground of the 'episteme'. Once the frame of 'the political' is drawn by the nation-state itself, the outside became everything that is not directly related to the relationships 'among' nation-states. Cultural, aesthetic, racial, and ethnic issues became the properties of the inner-space of the nation-states. This very process led to the hierarchical ordering of issues: 'high' politics relating to the practical relationships among the nation-states which constitutes power politics; 'low' issues relating to the discursive practices and cultural issues. Deduction of the relationship to the power politics presupposes the field's main argument that only the actual relationships have an explanatory power over what goes on in the 'inter'-national relations.

The definition of the scope of 'the political' by the nation-state itself also finds its expression in the definition of 'political film'. In his attempt to define political film

genre, Michael Genovese counts three criteria for inclusion of films into this genre: if a film serves as a vehicle for international propaganda or if The film's major intention is to bring about political change; or the film is designed to support the existing economic, political, and social system, it becomes a political film (Giglio, 2000: 23). However, the categorization fetishizes the content of films while ignoring the political and ideological effects of the ontological basis of them.

2.2. THE RECEPTION OF FILM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Any effort at integrating film studies into the scope of International Relations should legitimate the grounds to treat an 'instrument of entertainment', like film, as a unit of analysis in a discipline which dedicates itself to the analysis of the macro-politics of factual world. How can one consider films and the high-level issues of IR together, in an analysis which claims to have a serious say on world affairs? Any plausible answer would respond to a series of counter-questions: Are films more serious then we at first thought? Is IR theory more trivial then we dared to imagine (Weber, 2003: 133)?

What can films say on international relations? The analysts whose work I discuss in this section respond to this question at different levels. Defining films as a "learning tool" (1999: ix), Gregg proposes that films help us to understand "the complex and dangerous issues of IR" (p. 3). Weldes takes films to be foreign policy instruments that serve to naturalize a state's foreign policy objectives by "interpellating citizens into foreign policy discourses' through ideological processes" (1999: 122). Weber focuses on the way films, by identifying the visual with the actual, create 'truth effects' in the perception of international relations. Finally Jameson defines the film as "the hegemonic formal expression of late capitalist society" (Walsh, 1996: 481), exploring the question of how it serves as "an instrument of global distribution of cultural power (Jameson, 1992: xv)

I would like to argue that there is a correlation between making use of films in the

analyses of International Relations and making international relations the subject of films, which directs the attention to the role of Hollywood in US policymaking. Instrumentalization of films for national propaganda goes back to the 1920s' Soviet revolutionary cinema. Such use of films reached its maturity with the Nazi cinema in the first half of the 1930s. However both the Soviet and the Nazi cinema aimed to facilitate the identification of the people with the state. The uniqueness of Hollywood is that the first time ever national cinema was used for purposes going beyond facilitating the citizen's identification with the state; Hollywood tried to do it for all humanity constantly demonstrating the 'American difference' from the 'other' nations. Through what kind of a regime of representation has Hollywood performed this function? How has it made and fixate the 'other' nations, divided into the good and evil, and the American self?

2.2.1. FILM AS A VALUABLE WINDOW TO REALITY

Can films as 'relations' between nations be used as a means to understand international politics? In his work entitled *International Relations on Film* Gregg takes films as distinct entities in themselves severing their relations with the relations between states, and states' policy objectives, yet proposes that they can be most "valuable window to the reality of international relations" (1998: 23).

For Gregg films are one of the most common and most powerful learning tools for dispensing information about the world, complex interactions among its countries and peoples (p. 2). It is the visual form, rather than the narrative content, that gives film its power. For instance, historical fictions, although certainly distorting history, have contributed a lot to an increase in awareness of history (p. 1). It is this pedagogical function rather then the truth-value of the information conveyed that one should focus on in film studies.

Films also "give valuable history lessons", by making closer the increasingly remote but important times and events, and by telling something about how the state defines

its interests and the place it occupies in the world of international relations (p. 229) Yet the fact that films are valuable learning tools do not make them objective instruments of truth. Films do reflect their producers' perspectives, mostly Eurocentrism. Yet this is because, "some perspectives are much better represented on the screen than others: this is a situation that owes more to the nature of film and film industry than to any conscious strategy of exclusion" (p. 10)

Films, Gregg states, focus on individuals "who become surrogates for groups, for armies, for governments and nations" (p. 4). This transformation wrought on the screen help concretize the great but faceless and impersonal abstractions of IR like "sovereignty, nationalism, balance of power, hegemony and deterrence" (p. 4), and make them accessible to masses. Yet Gregg fails to question how do the techniques of representation operate in films? The author regards "personification" as a means of enabling people's access to complex issues of IR, ignoring that it is through this constructed personas that the difference between 'us' and 'them', good and evil, is manifested.

Beside his reservations, there arise extra problems in applying his approach to films. According to Gregg, war, espionage, revolutionary nationalism and other kinds of conflictual themes are what is mostly treated in films on international relations. This statement leads us to certain questions: Do international relations consist of that kind of relations? Or, how can one learn from films if they distort the truth, reflect the author's perspective, and change the events to make it more attractive?

Gregg does not offer a method to overcome the limitations of the films, except some general cautions: if viewed with "open-mind and a healthy skepticism" (p. 260), these limitations can be turned to advantage (p. 15).

2.2.2. FILM AS MYTHMAKING

In her "critical introduction to international relations", Cynthia Weber uses film analysis to investigate different approaches in IR theory. Rather than compirising generalized truths about international relations, Weber defines IR theory as a site of cultural practice (2001: xviii) that make sense of the world by telling stories about it. Each IR theory imposes its own vision about what is going on at the international level. Putting this aspect of IR theory at the basis of her inquiry, Weber investigates how it 'evolves' into being the truth of the actual course of things in international relations from being a meaning making activity. Her answer is precise: "by means of IR myths." The myth function in IR theory is the transformation of what is particular, cultural and ideological into what appears to be universal and natural (p. 6).

For Weber films are the instruments by means of which certain worldviews are naturalized in the popular culture. They also offer us valuable examples to analyze how myths function in IR theory by helping us to get a sense of the everyday connections between the popular and the political (p. 9). In her analysis Weber matches each theory-myth couple with a popular film that enable us to access what "IR theory says, how it plots its story, and how all this together gives a particular vision of the world" (p. 132). This pairing has further implications:

Pairing serious IR theory with superficial popular films suggests that IR theory may not be located in the realm of truth and reality any more than popular films are. May be IR theory is just a bunch of stories that, like popular films, mixes and mythologizes fact and fiction (p. 133)

The pairing of the film *Lord of the Flies* (1963) with Realism, for instance, intends to disclose how the film consolidates the 'Realist' myth that anarchy is the permissive cause of war. A plane crashes down on a remote island, leaving only a group of English schoolboys as survivors. The boys have no one, no parent or teacher, to take care of them. The youngsters' initial ability to maintain their social behavioral patterns fades away after a while: nature imposes itself upon them and the

relationships between them become conflictual. In the end anarchy reigns over the initial hierarchical order; the aggressors, the enemies of hierarchy, portrayed in the image of savage cannibals, kill those that defend order. The lack of parental care in the film stands for the lack of a higher authority in international relations. The film *Independence Day* (1996) exemplifies the Idealist myth "there is an international society". The world is under attack by an alien spacecraft. Yet there is still hope because a group of American men are committed to save the world. For Weber this version of international society means "international society as US leadership" (p. 55).

2.2.3. GOING CULTURAL: *STAR TREK*, STATE ACTION AND POPULAR CULTURE

In his analysis of the representation of US foreign policy in the film series *Star Trek*, Jutta Weldes basically defines films as popular cultural artifacts that "contribute to the reproduction and … popularization of official foreign policy discourses and … state actions" (Weldes, 1999: 117), and that "produce consent for foreign policy" (p. 119). Weldes makes an ideological analysis to see how the US foreign policy is naturalized and made commonsensical through certain textual practices functioning in the film in question.

Weldes argues that the film offers a prescription for post-Cold War world order. To overcome the identity crisis it probably confronted towards the end of Cold War, the US stages through the film how the new world order would look like. The journey of Starfleet, read as the US, to discover new places, races, and different life-forms, reflects the search of new others to re-construct its own identity. The Starfleet seems to be highly respectful of other races, species, and cultures they encounter; they believe in "infinite diversity in infinite combinations" (p. 124). As the manifestation of its respect for different life-forms, the Starfleet General Order #1 prohibits its personnel from intervening in the 'internal developments' of other societies (p. 124). Respect towards the peaceful coexistence of the different is the driving principle in its exploration of the 'dark' sides of the universe. The Starfleet crew does not resort

to militaristic means, except when it is necessary for self-defense.

Does the film 'depict' the true-picture of the post-Cold War order as peaceful, multicultural, multiethnic, individualistic, and non-interventionist? Even if we accept these 'principles' as the mottos of the current era, we should consider the manner in through which these mottos are turned into principles to understand how they function in the factual world. Non-interventionism is upheld by intervening in the internal affairs of the cultures which would probably exterminate the conditions of non-intervention. Is this not an intervention? Multi(..)ism is achieved by the hierarchical ordering of the species, cultures, and races as if hierarchical ordering is the only way to peaceful coexistence. And equally important, military actions are not militaristic when deployed for the freedom of slave cultures, races, and species.

The Starfleet recognizes three types of civilizations: the technologically and socially 'advanced' civilizations that are invited to unite (civilizations to be 'we'ized); the 'descent' but 'ill'equipped/governed civilizations that should be intervened to be 'cured'; and the 'evil' civilizations which, if not dealt with, would wipe out this multicultural, peaceful and harmonious world order.

For Weldes, this pro-filmic world of *Star Trek* reflects the official foreign policy objectives of the US which finds its expression in the words of Kennedy: "Our nation is on the side of man's desire to be free and the desire of nations to be independent" (Weldes 127). *Star Trek* serves this aim by offering a frame to the public to make sense of the official foreign policy of the US.

2.3. REPRESENTATION AND THE PLACE OF FILM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

I am informed by the approaches that take film as ideological products, yet I also seek to develop an approach that takes this statement as the starting point of analysis, not as its conclusion. Following the Lacanian dictum that every representation is mis-

representation as the real always becomes accessible to us from within ideology (Lacan 1994), in my reading of the Cold War films in relation to the Unites States' foreign policy, I am rather interested in investigating what kind of reality effects, truth effects and subject effects are produced through these films. That is to say, resisting the separation between reality and its representation, I suggest that films constitute the American nation, state and self at the moment of representation. As such, films should not be analyzed in isolation from actual politics, or as posterior to it, but as constitutive sites of politics.

In her inspiring study on the Columbian modernization, Christina Rojas argues that modern regimes of representation, whereby Self and Other are hierarchically reconfigured through reifying techniques and discourses, are spaces of violence (2002: xx). She takes those regimes also as "spaces of cessation of old orders of representation, and therefore spaces where violence has to be resolved" (2002: xix). Following her insights I take a regime of representation to be a violent space of encounter between the self and the Other; a space of presence and absence that is structured around a 'lack' filled in by desire and fantasy whereby the integral identity of the Self is constructed at the moment of the fragmentation, segmentation and exclusion of the Other.

Philip K. Lawrence discusses the relation between representation and violence in a very similar vein in his work Modernity and War (1997). Lawrence suggests that the production of paranoid or imaginary fear, 'danger' or 'threat', which is always a process of symbolic production, is an essential element in the imagination and production of modern identities; and relates the process of exclusion whereby the outside is constructed as the primitive and undomesticated "other" to the general trajectory of Western civilization. (p. 160). For Lawrence this processes of exclusion has been an enormously significant tool in the realm of identity formation in many nationalisms, where the moral rights of the dehumanized 'other' are swept to one side, a process through which the 'other' is denied the ontological status of a subject, or it is denied both a history and sociality (pp. 164, 166, 169). Richard Flores' discussion on the representation of the Battle of Alamo (1836) which eventually led

to the incorporation of Mexican inhabited Texas to the United States, in the movie *The Alamo* (1960) follows a similar theoretical frame. Flores' discussion offers a powerful account on how the logic of modernity offers a distinctive turn on mastery, where the forces of differentiation and reification lead not to separate socio-spatial domains with their concomitant Self-Other identities but to a hierarchical engagement whereby Self and Other are reconfigured through multiple discursive mechanisms and practices that slot social actors through relations of dominance. As such, the "Self" and "Other" of modernity are constructed not on the same social plane but on the structured and hierarchical field of reified, disembedded, and socially constituted difference" (p. 157). Flores suggests that the structured relations of dominance between Anglo Self and Mexican Others, also performed in the movie *The Alamo*, emerge from the logic of modernity that slots masterful selves and subjugated others (p. 159). For Flores such construction of the Self and Other works in the following way:

> On the one hand, the logic of a masterful self and subjugated Other is one that stems from reified notions of social life that construct difference by essentializing Others; on the other hand, essentialized Others serve the social, economic, and political imagination of the dominant (p. 160).

Guided by these analysts, my investigation of the Hollywood cinema in this section will be concerned with how representation-as-violence and representation-of-violence operate in the creation of the American Self and its enemy-Others. However, before proceeding I would like to briefly refer to the works of two other scholars, Homi Bhabha and Michael Shapiro, whose works on the relation between nation and narration have been very influential in the theoretical trajectory of my own analysis.

In his introduction to the edited volume of *Nation and Narration*, Homi Bhabha defines the nation, after having praised Benedict Anderson's work for clearly expressing its "cultural temporality" (Bhabha, 1990: 1), as "an agency of ambivalent narration that holds culture at its most productive position" (p. 3). "As a form of cultural elaboration (in the Gramscian sense)", the nation defined as such, functions "as a force for 'subordination, fracturing, diffusing, reproducing, as much as

producing, creating, forcing, guiding" (pp 3-4). For Bhabha, the narrations of nations are crucial in understanding the development and transformation of nationality as according to him nation(al space) is constructed through "narratives and discourses that signify a sense of 'nationness'"(Bhabha, 1990: 2), wherein the inside is constructed as "the field of meanings and symbols associated with national life" (p. 3), while the outside stands for "the unheimlich[2] terror of the space or the race of the other" (p. 2). The uncanny character of the outside is constructed in direct opposition to the homeliness of the inside and vice versa. The logical consequence of that dialectic construction is that the nation incessantly creates various "alien threats" to establish itself as the inside.

The construction of the alien threat in the process of the making of the American home through the Hollywood cinema and the operations of this construction is discussed in detail in Micheal Shapiro's work *Cinematic Political Thought* (1999). For Shapiro the cinematic representation of the alien others, who in various periods have been 'Indians', French-speakers, Catholics, Irish, southern Europeans, eastern Europeans, Asians, and Third world immigrants, and in the 1990s, 'illegal aliens' crossing the US border with Mexico, has been crucial not only in the construction of the United States of America as an autonomous geopolitical unity (p. 46); but also in the making of a mythic connection between nationhood (Americannes) and personhood (being American); in the territorialization of a collective identity whereby the origin, character and fate of the individual and the collective; that is the history and future of the two appears to be congruent.

In this chapter, I tried to set the frame to approach 'cinema' as an ideological state apparatus. The ideological nature of the cinema lays not only in its narrative content, in which character identification ─intended or unintended─ happens, but also in its technical peculiarity, which is to do with its 'perspectival look' that locate the spectator in a place "that coincides with that of the King" (Browne, 1990: 9). Hence, the spectator is challenged both by the narrative content and by the viewing position

---

[2] The term is used by Freud. Bhabha uses the terms in the meaning of uncanny. However in the original usage the term bears a double meaning; that is *unheimlich* is both familiar and unfamiliar; both homely and strange.

the apparatus simultaneously provides for it. It is precisely this feature, I believe, that makes cinema an important unit of analysis in the study of International Relations. Yet, unlike the three examples to the study of cinema from within the IR theory which I briefly discussed above, I argue that beyond the narrative content cinema performs its function through the truth-effect(s) of its visual form. The following chapter presents a theoretical framework for this approach.

III. CHAPTER TWO: IDEOLOGY AND CINEMA

The history of the subject and of cinema intermingled in 1970s' cinema theory. This is not an easy coexistence, but a merging with each other in the crucible of left theorizing. The history of the 'subjecthood' of the subject in Jacques Lacan's writings and the history of cinema as a social institution which "serves to the reproduction of bourgeois ideology" (Browne, 1990: 3) theorized in the Marxist tradition became the two sides of the same coin in the work of Louis Althusser. Althusser's work is distinctive in that it proposes that rather than being the false consciousness of the subject, ideology, with its interpellating force, is the very condition of the possibility of the subject. This is analogous with the Freudian depiction of consciousness as an essential part of unconscious. But how does Althusser come to this theorizing? By appropriating the three- stage history of Lacanian psychoanalysis: the mirror phase, the fort-da game, and the Oedipus complex. (Lapsey and Westlake, 1988: 68)

Thus a new dimension was added to the debates on the ideological nature of cinema: the ideological nature of the subject, and the relationship between the two, the subject and cinema, becomes the central theme of the theory of cinema.

The following is an analysis of this encounter. My take on the issue proceeds on two opposite directions: first from cinema to the subject: the works of the theoreticians who focus mainly on the ideological nature of cinema and its effects on the subject around the issue of 'reality and cinema'; second, from the subject to cinema: the works of those who focus on the history of 'subjecthood' of the subject and its connection with cinema, around the issue of 'identification'.

3.1. IDENTIFICATION AND THE HISTORY OF SUBJECTHOOD

One should keep in mind that the process, or instance, of identification cannot be constricted merely to the 'during' of a cinematic experience. In this respect, Christian Metz's question "with what does the spectator identify during the projection of the film?" (Metz, 2000: 411- emphasis added) is important for our analysis. Drawing on Fenichel's definition of the term identification as "characteristics which were previously perceived in an object are acquired by the perceiver of them" (quoted in Friedberg, 1990:39), we come to ask 'why does the perceiver identify with the object, or the character in cinema, in question'? The answer comes from the Lacanian psychoanalysis. In his article "The Mirror-phase as Formative of the Function of the I," Lacan focuses on the first stage of the history of the subject. In this phase, from the age of six to eighteen months, the infant, "outdone by the chimpanzee in instrumental intelligence, can nevertheless already recognize[s] as such his own image in a mirror" (Lacan, 1994: 93). The infant identifies with its mirror image. Contrary to its "anatomical incompleteness" (p. 96), the infant projects itself as complete on its difference from its environment in its mirror image. This identification is based on the infant's misrecognizing itself as gestalt. In the mirror stage the infant fantasizes a difference between the "I" and its environment, and this very fantasy "situates the instance of the ego" (p. 94). This primary identification of the infant with its complete mirror image, furthermore, will be "the root-stock for secondary identifications" (p. 94)

Let's turn back to Metz's question: "with what does the spectator identify during the projection of the film?" The answer is 'primarily with its own look'. Metz appropriates the primary identification of the infant in front of the mirror and applies it to the primary identification of the spectator in front of the screen. Thus, the screen becomes the mirror. However, the screen does not reflect the body of the spectator, and even the only thing the screen cannot show is the body of the spectator. However, for Metz, this contrast does not pose any problem. The spectator, says Metz, does not have to identify itself literally with its own image at the screen. Instead, the spectator identifies itself with its own looking; as an absolute perceiver

17

of the screen. The gaze of the spectator or rather the spectator as the gaze is signified by its absence in the reflected space. Here Metz makes use of the term used by Freud: "scopophilia," which means the desire to see. The spectator is duped in the process in which it places itself in a position whereby it sees everything at the screen. The gaze means, in Metz's use, mastering over what is gazed at.

But Metz's reading of Lacan's article, and even his way of using Lacanian psychoanalysis in cinema theorizing is open to contestation. Firstly, his grounding of the process of identification in the mirror stage is doubtful. Lacan's article does not reveal a kind of 'mastering/mastered relationship' between the infant and its mirror image. Furthermore, Lacan mentions about "spatial identification" which is very important in understanding the relationship between the infant and its mirror image: Lacan means, I argue, that the infant sees in the mirror what it does not see in the absence of the mirror. The infant recognizes the environment in the mirror, but the environment is partly filled by another 'space' with which the infant is unfamiliar. What the infant identifies, in this respect, is the unfamiliar space that filled its environment around it. The infant does not identify literally with its own image but with the space, the absence, in its environment. The space, this absence, within the environment is the possibility of this initial identification.

Metz's recognition of identification as mastery over the image reflected is criticized by two analysts, Todd McGowann and Joan Copjec. In his article "Looking for the Gaze: Lacanian Film Theory and Its Vicissitudes," McGowann claims that the Lacanian film theory is not Lacanian; and even it counters it. The traditional Lacanian film theory, he argues, is based on the misreading of Lacan's article on the mirror stage. McGowann instead looks at Lacan's another writing: "Of the Gaze as Object Petit a" in Seminar XI. Contrary to Metz understanding of the gaze "[It] is not the look of the subject at the object, but the point at which the object looks back. The gaze, thus, involves the spectator in the image disrupting her/his ability to remain all-perceiving and unperceived in the cinema" (McGowann, 2003: 28).

McGowann points to one of the oft repeated misreading of Lacan's mirror stage

article. What Lacan means by "the illusion of mastery" is not a "desire for mastery," instead it is the 'desire to be seen'; more masochistic than sadistic. It is less about having the gaze than belonging to the gaze. The subject wants to see the gaze of the object/screen; and "through fantasy, the subject imagines a scenario in which the desire of the other… becomes clear". The argument goes on: "Contrary to the claims of traditional Lacanian film theory, the ideological dimension of classical Hollywood film lies not so much in the way that it employs a mastering gaze but in its use of fantasy to domesticate the object-gaze" (p.36).

Joan Copjec claims, in her article "Orthopsychic Subject: Film Theory and the Reception of Lacan", that the principal weakness of the traditional Lacanian film theory is its considering screen as the mirror. This analogy as a starting point , she states, paved the way for the "Foucaultization of the Lacanian theory." (Copjec, 2000: 440) This analogy of screen as the mirror is understood in such a way that the representation on the screen will be accepted by the spectator "as its own" (p. 441) This "belong to me aspect" (quoted from Lacan) "allows the subject to see in any representation not only a reflection of itself, but a reflection of itself as master of all it surveys. The imaginary relation produces the subject as master of the image" (p. 441).

Instead of this, Copjec offers a "more Lacanian" one: "the mirror as screen." Copjec's analogy departs from the classical subject position which is readily deluded as master of the image. The spectator, Copjec maintains, "doubts the accuracy of even its most 'scientific' representation" (p. 449). What the classical Lacanian theory failed to see, for Copjec, is that the subject knows about what the screen 'offers' for it, that there is something invisible in the screen, something "missing from the representation" (p. 450). Copjec says that this is "the point of the Lacanian gaze" and this is what the subject identifies. This missing part, this lack, is an "unoccupiable point." (p. 450) This impossibility of seeing what is lacking in the representation, far from being exhausting, is the subject's condition of existence. The subject's desire for this missing part "institutes the subject in the visible field." (p. 450)

19

3.2. REALITY AND IDEOLOGY

Standing before one of Picasso's picture, a woman began to grumble about what she had just seen: what kind of fish is this? Picasso answers: "This is not a fish, a picture!"

The exemplary dialogue between Picasso and the spectator, regardless of being real or just a rumor, is crucial to make sense of the relationship between the spectator and what it spectates. Why the spectator takes the picture of a fish for a real fish? Furthermore, is the discrepancy between the fish and the picture of the fish a failure of Picasso? Or this variance symbolizes the peculiarity of Picasso, and a reference to the relationship between 'realism' and 'ideology' in the work of art?

During the last part of the 1960s and the early 1970s, the discussions among Cinéthique, Cahiers du Cinéma, Screen, Nouvelle Critique, etc., concerning the ideological feature of cinema, revolved around the 'part' to which the sides of the discussions take as the source of cinema's being ideological. Is it a sort of congenital defect? Namely, cinema is an ideological apparatus on account of its outfit that makes it 'cinema'? Or cinema is ideological due to the representational system it uses?

For both instances, the discussion leads us, with the sides of discussion, back to Quattrocento and Renaissance pictorial system which, at the same time, serves us to fathom the answer Picasso gave to the spectator.

In his article "The Reality Effect" Jean-Pierre Oudart traces cinema's 'inherent' ideology back to Renaissance pictorial system. He deals with the trajectory of ideology at two levels: "the reality effect" the picture diffuses, and "the inscription of the spectator" in the space of the representation. (Oudart, 1990a: 190) The reality effect originates from the representational system of the Renaissance painting. Each figure in the picture is drawn so as to have a "referent in reality" and "imply an assumption of existence" (p. 190). However, the reality effect originates not only

from the figures portrayed, but from a new mode of representation elaborated in order that the spectator takes the representation as real: this new mode of representation is called "perspective artificalis." (Baudry, 1999: 345). The distinctive feature of this new mode is its locating the 'eye' at the center of the space portrayed; that is the owner of the 'eye', the subject, will be "the active centre and origin of meaning." (p. 345). One picture and one position concretized in the eye of the subject. This positionality in which the picture signifies the spectator depends on the subject's misrecognition of the picture and of itself. The spectator misrecognizes the relationship between figures and their 'real' referents as analogon insofar as it is inscribed in the representation. But how the spectator is inscribed in the representation? Through 'absences' and a 'lost side' that is supposed to be filled by the spectator. By means of optical tricks, "effects of shadow, reflection and spatial discontinuity," (Oudart, 1990a: 190), implied is a space which is not represented but on which the spatial structure of the picture is based. This off-space signifies the place of the spectator. The picture, in this way, incorporates the place of the spectator in its spatial structure.

The two examples are seminal on account of their influence on 1970s' cinema theories: one is Mona Lisa by Leonardo da Vinci and the other Las Meninas by Diego Velasquez. The former is the prototype of 'monocular vision', that is "the organization of the visualized object by reference to a fixed point." (Baudry 347) From wherever one looks at the picture s/he encounters with a couple of eye gazing at him/her. The eye of the figure is the fixed point on which the spatial structure of the picture is based. Important is both the choice of a human eye as the fixed point of the picture and the direct relationship between the spectator and the figure. The spectator sees, and in turn is seen by, the picture. The spectator's awareness of its being seen depends on its misrecognizing the picture as real.

The other example, Las Menias, consists of three dimensions: the painter itself, Margarita and her nursemaids, and the reflection of the queen and the king, whose position matches that of the spectator, at the back center of the picture. Oudart's précis on the painting is fascinating (Oudart, 1990a: 190):

[T]he figures are addressing other absent, imaginary figures who appear in the representation in the form of a lure, the reflected image of the king and queen. This lure gives the scene a new dimension, that of the real: it turns it into a spectacle seen by a spectator excluded from its field, the reflection being the term through which the spectator is himself reinscribed as subject the index of his existence.

The picture can be 'read' in two different but complementary ways: the spectator identifies himself with king and queen and appropriates the relationship between them and the people metaphorically. He becomes the reflection to the detriment of its own 'being'; or the spectator is put in a position by the spatial structure of the picture wherein he can see both the picture gazed at (by the king and by himself) and the king gazing at it. In both instances, the 'subject' is transformed into the 'spectator', the object of the picture.

It is Oudart, this time in another article, "Cinema and Suture," who brings in the process of the "inscription of the subject" to the cinema theorizing. Through the camera's shot/reverse shot sequences the subject "sutured" into the representation. Before looking at how Oudart understands the concept, let's look at the concept's initial formulation by Jacques-Alain Miller:

Suture names the relation of the subject to the chain of its discourse…it figures there as the element which is lacking, in the form of a stand in. For, while there lacking, it is not purely and simply absent. Suture, by extension–the general relation of lack to the relation of structure of which it is an element, is as much as it implies the position of a taking-the-place-of.   (Miller, 1977-78: 26)

Oudart makes use of the concept to elucidate the function of the camera in the making of film. Primarily, this is a reaction to those who takes the camera as an 'objective machine' that films, in technical terms, the outside world as it is, and transmits it to the spectator. Contrary to this definition Oudart's account is that the camera functions not by showing something to the spectator, but by signifying what is not shown, what is absent, in the scene. This is the "forth side", the "Absent one" (Oudart, 1990b: 46), which is signified by the "signifying Sum," the figures represented. As for the process of signification, Oudart puts shot/reverse shot formation at the center. In the first shot the spectator,

experiences with vertiginous delight the unreal space separating the two groups; he himself is fluid, elastic, and expanding: he is at the cinema. A moment later, he retreats; he has discovered the framing. Suddenly he senses the space he cannot see, hidden by the camera, and wonders, in retrospect, why such a framing was used (Oudart 1990b: 50)

and he wonders whose gaze is this if it is not his own[3]. In the reverse shot the camera turns with180º angle and shows the bearer of the look: a fictional character becomes the seer and the camera, the "castrating Other," (Silverman, 1999: 140) vanishes accordingly. Hence the spectator turns back to the fictional space as a lack, in the form of an absence.

Kaja Silverman maintains this discussion in her article "On Suture". She correlates the suturing process with the history of the subject in the Lacanian sense: the spectator beholds the first shot as an "imaginary plenitude," experiencing no exclusion and suffering from no Other; the first shot is "the site of a jouissance akin to that of the mirror stage" (p. 139). The spectator, then, discovers the frame that demarcates the screen and the off-screen space. There is something which the subject is deprived of; the experience of "manqué à être" (Lapsey and Westlake, 1988: 67), in the form of objet petit a. The remedy is the "narrative" (Silverman 140): "It is only by inflicting the wound [castration, experience of lack] to begin with that the viewing subject can be made to want the restorative of meaning and narrative."

However, Silverman does not stop where Oudart stands: the shot/reverse shot formation is not the only way of suturing the spectator into the symbolic structure of the film. She illustrates an alternative process with one of Hitchcock's films, *Psycho* (1960). In the shower sequence the reverse shot is continually procrastinated, and the "field of speaking subject", the enunciator, the absent one, the Other is interminably "implied." (Silverman 143) Silverman suggests that what sutures us at this juncture is "the fear of being cut off from the narrative" (p. 145). The viewing subject sticks to the narrative to the end wondering the bearer of the gaze.

---

[3] This 'generalizing' approach that fixes the spectator's initial relation with the scene is criticized by Kaja Silverman. Silverman alleges in lieu that the relationship between the two varies as the sides of the relationship change.

Jean-Louis Baudry deals with same issue at two levels in his articles, "Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematic Apparatus" and "The Apparatus: Metapsychological Approaches to the Impression of Reality in Cinema". Considered as a whole the two articles analyze the process from the 'Action!' command of the director up to the projection of the final product in the cinema. This process includes the relationship between objective reality and the camera, the projection of the final product, and the effects of the cinema[4].

In the first article, Baudry touches upon the habitual ignorance of the technical basis of cinema on the part of the cinema theorists and critics. The possibility, or the inevitability, of cinema's being ideological is ascribed to its content, and thanks to its scientific origin the camera is kept immune to being ideological. However, "the scientificness of science", as Jean Louis Comolli puts it in "Technique and Ideology: Camera, Perspective, Depth Of Field", is open to discussion, and before its content the technical basis of the cinema, the camera, inflicted the dominant ideology on the spectator.

Like Oudart, Baudry goes back to Renaissance. The camera, he says, is based upon "the construction of an image analogous to the perspective projections developed during the Italian Renaissance" (Baudry 1990a: 347). The centered space around which the visualized objects are organized. At the center is the subject who supposedly judges the visual, and who takes the succession of still-images in continuity. Illusion at twenty four frames per second. So comes the meaning not only from the content of the images, but as a result of the "illusion of continuity." (p. 349) Far from being a machine par excellence, the camera "constitutes the "subject" by the illusory delimitation of a central location-whether this be that of a god or of any other substitute. It is an apparatus destined to obtain a precise ideological effect, necessary to the dominant ideology: creating a phantasmatization of the subject" (p. 354).

---

[4] Baudry uses the term here as *the movie theatre*. We will use the term *the cinema* in the same meaning as Baudry.

In the second article, Baudry goes on discussing the effect of the projection, the Apparatus, meaning the projection and the place of the subject in the cinema. In analyzing the effects of the projection and the cinema, Baudry recourses to Plato's "cave metaphor", Lacan's "mirror stage", and Freud's "dream condition". What all have in common is the perception of the visual images in each as 'real' and the symbolization in each of a turning back into "maternal womb."

The apparatus, Plato employs in his cave metaphor, is "a fire burning behind… at some distance higher up." (Baudry, 1990b: 764) Baudry compares this with the projection machine in the cinema. Furthermore both apparatuses show "prisoners", not the shadow or reflection of real objects but the reflection/shadow of "simulacrum of the real objects" (p. 765) However, due to the darkness of the cinema, the relative solitude of the viewer, which is valid for both the cave and the cinema, the viewer takes the images as real. Baudry discloses the effect of the cave/ cinema with reference to Freud's explanation of the dream situation: "a revivescene of one's stay in the body of the mother, certain conditions of which it recreates: the rest position, warmth, and isolation which protects him from excitement." (quoted in Baudry 769) in this condition the dreamer experiences a "temporal regression" which:

> follows two paths- regression of the libido back to a previous period of hallucinatory satisfaction of desire; and regression in the development of the self back to a primitive narcissism which results in what has been defined as the totally egotistical nature of dream. (p.769)

The cinema, in it resemblance to the Platonic cave to which Baudry refers as the condition of dream, explained by Freud as a "revivescene of one's stay in the body of mother," makes the viewer believe the reality of what he/she sees on the scene, not because of his/her stupidity, but because the reality of the images makes him/her real, in just the same way as the baby constitutes the "I", in the mirror stage, as "the mirror image of a unified body" (Baudry, 1990a: 353).

3.3. HOLLYWOOD AND THE IDEOLOGY OF CINEMA

The spectator's 'pleasure of reading'[5] the film is exploited by Hollywood cinema in two different instances. In contrast to traditional method which ascribes the ideological character of the films to the process of hiding the 'truth', I argue, instead, that ideology functions either by attempting to show or by multiplying the 'hidden' meaning. The former method used by American political cinema is based on the belief that the political 'content' of the film vaccinates it against being ideological. I will return the issue in Chapter 4 in analyzing selected Cold War films.

The latter method multiplies the hidden meaning of the film. The reason is that the spectator is authorized to get the "most general" hidden meaning. In this process the spectator fantasize itself to revealing the hidden meaning which it thinks hidden from it. The spectator misrecognizes itself as the reader of the text, and it is interpellated as it 'read' the 'text'. I want to elucidate this process by analyzing the film *Spiderman* (2002).

The film takes 'national propaganda' as the most general hidden meaning which is designed not to infuse the American ideology into the spectator's mind but instead to make the spectator identify with this hidden meaning: the color of the Spiderman's costume, his uncle's counsel to him, "big power necessitates big responsibility", his uncle's death because Spiderman's 'irresponsibility, which is so reminiscent of the American national policy after 9/11 events, are all intended to be read by the spectator. Hence the spectator is to be interpellated not by identifying with the character or the narrative but a kind of superegoic stance toward both: the spectator situates itself on the imperfection of the film.

---

[5] What I mean by pleasure of reading is that in addition to a scopophilic feature it has, the spectator at the same time takes pleasure from 'reading' the film. This feature is in harmony with Copjec's definition of narcissism: the subject does not find its expression it the completenes of its image represented. instead, it is aware of the imperfection of its image and "seeks the self beyond self-image" (Copjec, 2000: 451).

IV. CHAPTER THREE: HOLLYWOOD CINEMA AND THE U.S. GOVERNMENTS DURING THE COLD WAR

This chapter analyses the relationship between the United States governments and the Hollywood cinema during the Cold War era. The relationship between the two is important in two respects: first, by analyzing the relationship we can explore the very process of the construction of 'the political' within the 'national' landscape, and second, one can see how during the period in question the actual practices, namely 'high' politics, were shaped and made meaningful by the discursive practices, namely 'low' issues. The films of the era are treated not as "Cold War cultural text[s]" (Chapman 2001) or "cultural artifacts" of the era (Van Riper, 2001), rather, the thesis argues that the films of the period in question serve to naturalize the American foreign policy (ambitions) and providing moral-political mood through which to see the foreign policy initiatives. Ernest Giglio ascribes this to the "political expediency factor in Hollywood that requires that a film never alienate its audience, especially by challenging the dominant political ideology" (Giglio, 2000: 181).

Two films, released in the late 1990s, seem to summarize the quest of American cinema throughout its history. The films are *Independence Day* (1996) and *Armageddon* (1998). But here, before dealing with the quest of American cinema we should make the stance the thesis is going to keep in the following paragraphs. Films, more than any other works of art, have a direct relationship with the political ethos of the time within which they are produced. This special feature of the films is appreciated by a wide range of scholars, for example in his book From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological Study of German Film, Siegfried Kracauer suggest that "the films of a nation reflect its mentality in a more direct way than any other artistic medium." (Kracauer, 1974: v) Other writers whose works are cited in this chapter reiterate the basic assumptions of this approach. That the output of a national cinema "mirrors" the national mood (Lipscut, 2000), or that films offer "significant evidence peculiar to itself (Leab, 1993: 118), would be a not-so shortsighted summary of

the driving logic in the approaches that are to be discussed in this chapter. Even though this thesis shares with these scholars the attitude of carving out important similarities between the reels of the film and the realities surrounding it, it departs from that attitude in its conviction that there is also certain bargain mechanisms between power and the film industry which dictate the outputs of the latter: more than reflecting, the films of a nation structures the national mood to a great extent. However, the experience of structuring fails most of the time as in the case of our study.

Let me return to the films mentioned at the outset. I take these films as the spectacular examples through which Washington's foreign policy ambitions glitter as bright as in1950s. However, the films expected America "to beat the Vietnam syndrome" with the Gulf War so to return to 'old glamorous days'. Looking at the two themes of the two films, we examine the characteristics of American foreign policy (ambitions) and how they were treated in the films with c/overt foreign policy content.

The films *Armageddon* (1998) and *Independence Day* (1996) bear the message that the United States is the center of the 'universe', hence destroying Washington, the center of the United States, means destroying the Universe (*Independence Day*). And the Americans bear the 'burden' of saving the world from even the hands of the nature itself (*Armageddon*). The exaltation of the Americans as the saviors of the mankind and of Washington as the center of the world is not novel in 1990s; rather these two characters of the American foreign policy (ambitions) are the yield of American movie/policy-making during the Cold War years.

In *Armageddon*, a Texas-size asteroid is going to smash the earth into pieces. NASA is hopeless not because it cannot destroy the asteroid, but because if it does, pieces of the asteroid may hit the earth and no matter where it hits it will have hit somewhere that is under the responsibility of the United States, as the whole Earth is under its responsibility. The world's best deep core drilling team, led by Harry S. Stamper (Bruce Willis), who is seemingly more American than John Wayne, is asked for a

casual national duty of saving the earth by exploding the asteroid from within. Harry asks "Why me?" and the answer is again casual: there is no one else to do it. The computers in the headquarter pan throughout the capitals of the world as if there is always someone who is deliberately looking after them. Hopefully what persuades Harry eventually are the people of the earth smiling, eating, walking, luckily being unaware of the dangers the Americans encounter for them.

In *Independence Day*, an alien ship would claim the earth aiming at the center, Washington. Even though the government is myopic, the Americans are the sole nation who are capable of saving the world and indeed they are aware of the limits their responsibility goes to.

I relate these themes, the total responsibilization of Washington as the center of the world, to the 1950s American policy/movie-making practices which emerged as a response to the alleged Soviet intention of total annihilation of the free world. The best example of this kind of movies is *The Day the Earth Stood Still* (1951) in which a flying saucer lands on the earth, joyfully in America, and tries to discuss the calamitous future of the earth if the states maintain mutual disagreement. The issue is reworked in the film *Superman* (1979) in which the superhero falls down to America, but nowhere else, and is recruited in a newspaper Daily Planet whose area of responsibility is not solely America but all around the world.

4.1. POWER AND CINEMA

> Hollywood and Washington have shared a marriage of convenience for almost a century. The connection between film and politics is demonstrated in the world of practical politics, where money buys access and influence, and on the big screen, where the industry controls the content of a medium with the capability to deliver explicit and covert political messages. (Giglio, 2000: 207)

There is a symbiotic relationship between the construction of nationhood and cinema, for the latter, since its very appearance, serves to a great extent to 'visualize' the former. This process of visualization includes its history, culture, and the space

within which the former two can be possible to take place.

The close relationship between the second 'M' of the MGM studio Louis B. Mayer and the presidency candidate Herbert Hoover is said to be "the first of numerous personal Hollywood-Washington associations that developed into political support" (Giglio, 2000: 5). Simultaneously, the 'G' of the same MGM claims that "American motion pictures continue to be free from any but the highest possible entertainment purpose" (quoted in Giglio, 2000: 10). With these two examples in mind, one can figure out two kinds of relationship between the U.S. government and Hollywood: Hollywood is the most influential part in the political campaigns; and once the president is elected the rhetoric of the new president dictates the fortune of Hollywood. Secondly, the most conspicuous aspect of the relationship can easily be seen in the 'reported' function of the films produced: the films are not ideological instruments, but serve entertainment purposes. The separation of the entertainment from ideology is one of the most important achievements of Hollywood.

The distinctive characteristic of the Cold War films produced in the United States lies in their characteristic of being both "national stories" of the United States and International Relations documents. The content of the films produced is fashioned by the nature of the relationship enjoyed with the Soviet Union. And sometimes the content of the films which is very appropriate for the time they were produced might later pose serious problems for the producers, directors and writers if the direction of the relationship shifts. Thought as a caution for not to being 'ideological', Hollywood cinema personalized the conflicts and served them as the manichean war between good and evil.

But why, with the beginning of the Cold War era, did Hollywood cinema achieve such a distinctive place in the United States' policy making that all the presidents invariably commented on the very 'role' of it?

Hollywood already had had an important place in American policy make-up up until that time. As early as 1915, after seeing D.W. Griffith's film *Birth of a Nation*

(1915), President Wilson reportedly described movies as "history written in lightening." (Giglio, 2000: 13). For Roosevelt, cinema is an economically and socially important component of American 'national projection.' (Williams, 2002, 14) When America entered WW I in 1917, the U.S. government asked the film industry to volunteer its most important stars to aid in the war effort (Giglio, 2000: 5). As a response, the studios sent their celebrities Charles Chaplin, Douglas Fairbanks, Theda Bara, Mary Pickford, etc. on tour as fun-raisers for Government Bonds, Liberty loans, and the Red Cross. And during WW II, Hollywood would produce a series of films *Why We Fight*? (1942-1945) under the aegis of the U.S. War Department, by a group of filmmakers led by Frank Capra, Anatole Litvak, Antony Veiller (Furhammar, Isaksson, 1971: 64)[6]. The series was scheduled for screening for the military personnel, but the first film Prelude to War was considered so powerful that President Roosevelt urged it be put into commercial distribution (Matelsky, Street, 2003: 5). During WW II Hollywood was selling over 4 billion tickets and releasing 400 films annually (Holt, 2001: 6) And right after the war its foreign revenues was $125 million in 1946 and $120 million in 1947 (Schats, 1997: 140).

4.2. WAR AND CINEMA

That the most lucrative and politically advantageous time for the cinema is the worst time for humanity is not a mere coincidence, since the cinema has the capacity to embellish even the worst. This is why the cinema industry's profits skyrocketed during war times. And the governmental regulations on the magnitude of the cinema industry betray the very place of it for the government. During the first months of WW I, the German authorities gave a film company the authority to record the combat at the front in order to use it for agitation. For the fighting sides, accomplishment at the front is the duty of army. Nevertheless, it must be maintained in psychological terms. However, until America entered into the war, the Hollywood cinema contributed to the isolationist policy of the country. A box office success in

---

[6] The series is composed of seven films: *Prelude to War, The Nazis Strike, Divide and Conquer, Battle of Britain, Battle of Russia, Battle of China*, and *War Comes to America*.

itself, the film, Civilization, was an important factor for Wilson's re-election in 1916. The film was a visualization of Wilson's election slogan: "He kept us out of war". (Furhammar, Isaksson, 1971: 9). And when Wilson decided to enter into the war, the industry had already gotten the first round. The Committee of Public Information (CPI) was set up as a coordinated propaganda unit (p. 11). The task was "to sell the war to America". The CPI would support the studios with its own staff making suggestions on the stories and providing them with unlimited numbers of extras for the battle scenes (p. 11).

The war films must belong to war times! And the industry has a responsibility to entertain peoples and not to be 'political'. Until 1938, when the first 'politically engaged' (p. 63) film the *Blockade* (1938) was made, Hollywood kept itself in the line.

On December 18, 1941, following America's declaration of war, President Roosevelt set up the Bureau of Motion Picture Affairs within the Office of War Information to "mobilize the studios for the national defense effort" (Cook, 1990: 439). In 1942, Hollywood became indispensable for the government: its "equipment and materials were subject to price controls" and its "personnel could not be drafted". Moreover, the Justice Department backed out its antitrust suit against the studios (p. 439).

During the war times, shooting war films was without pain: there was a huge stock of military shootings and German newsreels and documentaries. The WW II series *Why We Fight?* primarily made use of Leni Riefenstahl's films and German sources. Colossal planes and courageous soldiers accompany John Wayne and Humphrey Bogart in the Saturday matinee before wannabe like them children and long waiting wives and fiancées. Going to the cinema was a social practice at that time and winning hearts at the home front was deemed as important as winning at the battlegrounds.

Then came the Cold War. The war that wasn't a war … demanding the passions of war in a time of peace (Biskind, 1983: 57). Apparently, Kennan's 'Long Telegram'

had a great share in how to manage a war without waging it. In the Long Telegram, Kennan outlined the possibilities for the following years:

> we have here a political force committed fanatically to the belief that with US there can be no permanent modus vivendi that it is desirable and necessary that the internal harmony of our society be disrupted, our traditional way of life be destroyed, the intrernational authority of our state be broken, if Soviet power is to be secure (http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/coldwar/documents/episode-1/kennan.htm) .

Kennan speaks of Soviet power as if it is a highly contagious disease. And the most susceptible organ is brain. "We must see that", Kennan furthers, "our public is educated to realities of Russian situation"… [and] "it must be done mainly by Government." And Hollywood was a "silent partner" throughout the education (Matelsky, Street, 2003: 5). However, "the greatest danger …is that we shall allow ourselves to become like those with whom we are coping." Because the enemy is not merely beyond 'our' borders, it is long among 'us'. The most suspicious place as always was Hollywood. And in 1947, House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) reincarnated for the symptoms of the 'red' disease.

Ironically, Hollywood, besides being the hotbed of the disease, was the strongest weapon against the disease itself. It had the capacity to tell people what they should do and what to believe in; it had the capacity to tell the reason why such a massive military expenditure was taking place. Throughout its history Hollywood cinema asked 'Why?' three times in order to explain the reason for entering the war: for the first time it asked 'Why We fight?' when it enters the WW II, and it was 1951 that it asked "*Why Korea?*" for the defense of Truman administration foreign policy (Murray, 1975: 16). And in 1965 Hollywood asked for the last time '*Why Vietnam?*' in order to explain the reasons why America entered the Vietnam War: what was common to all films is vowing that America entered the war as a last resort and to save the free world.

Until 1950s, despite all propaganda films produced, newsreels and other documentaries from the battlefields, movies were in the entertainment category[7] but at that time U.S. Justice Department brought movies under the protection of the First Amendment to the U. S. Constitution. (Giglio, 2000: xxi)

Washington and Hollywood entered the Cold War with the burden on their shoulder of not really fighting it. If the Cold War began with the 'Iron Curtain' speech of Churchill in 1946, it was the film *The Iron Curtain* (1948) that implied the beginning of the Cold War in Hollywood. By the time the film was produced, however, the U.S. had already cleared the way out of all not-quite-anti-communists through various means ranging from financial and institutional measures, like blacklisting or canceling their licenses, to criminal procedures.

The content of the Hollywood film had already been under control for a long time. The HUAC was founded in the late 1930s with the 'negotiated' duty of purging the country of any Communist influences. While numerous industries were investigated by HUAC, Hollywood became the best known target of this committee. Due to WW II the activities of the Committee were suspended. And on October 20, 1947, HUAC was on the scene for the second time after it first appeared in the late 1930s. The Second World War could not change the fate of the Americans; they were still under the threat of communism. The epicenter of the threat was once more Hollywood. However it is incongruous that the U. S. Government would scrutinize the films which for the time they produced both ordered by Roosevelt and apposite to the foreign policy of the U.S. Government.

The threat of communist infiltration had been evergreen since the 1917 revolution. But for a short time during WW II, right after the Nazi invasion, when the Soviet Union joined the Allied Forces they were elevated from the rotten Russians to splendid Soviets (Leab, 1993, 119). At least four films, *North Star* (1943) (Goldwyn), *Days of Glory* (1944) (RKO), *Song of Russia* (1944) (MGM), *Mission to*

---

[7] While the propaganda films are taken as entertainment, the movies, produced in the Soviet Union and Germany of this kind, were said to be ideological.

Moscow (1943) (Warner Bros), released in 1943 and 1944, glorified Stalin, the military, and the courage of the Russian people (Giglio, 2000, 49).

Their pro-Soviet ideology put the films on HUAC's subversive list. The director of the film *North Star* (1943) Lewis Milestone, the screenwriter Lillian Hellman, the screenwriter of the film Mission to Moscow Howard Koch were called before the HUAC. Ironically, one of the episodes of the *Why We Fight?* Series, *The Battle of Russia*, regarded as one of the best propaganda films, was to be accepted as a strategical accident because of its pro-Soviet stance.

4.3. THE RESPONSE OF HOLLYWOOD

In 1928, The Motion Picture Producers and Distributors Association[8] announced that

> [m]otion pictures are the most conspicuous of all American exports. They do not lose their identity. They betray their nationality and country of origin… They are demonstrably the single greatest factors in the Americanization of the world and as such fairly may be called the most important and significant of America's exported products. (quoted in Williams, 2002: 217)

One can infer from this statement that the industry did it with patriotic intuitions. But the fact is that patriotism is self-sacrifice of the industry to government support. Especially in war times there is no way round. During WW II, Hollywood lost 33-50 percent of its foreign revenues as markets in Europe and Far East closed (Cook, 1990. 439)The propaganda films produced for, and with the support of, the government provided the industry with the Latin American market which was the only foreign market for exploitation for that time (Lopez, 2002: 198). The Government's "good neighbor policy" towards Latin America is complemented by the "softening of ethnic images of Latin Americans in mainstream films (Williams, 2002: 14). Moreover, Eisenhower exempted the movie industry and other media institutions from Government censorship regulations during WW II.

---

[8] MPPDA was set up in order to protect the industry's economic power. The main stimulus was internal regulation of the industry. In that way the industry aimed to cut the hands of the Government on the industry's output. Later the name of the association changed as Motion Picture Associations of America.

The relationship between Hollywood cinema and the U. S. government faced a structural transformation at the outset of the Cold War era. The belief that the actual war with bombs and missiles would lead to a nuclear Armageddon forced Washington to wage it with words and ideological slogans and cinema was the most convenient one (Cassels, 1996: 207). Moreover an emphasize upon PSYWAR (psychological warfare) (Lipschuts, 2001: 68) was an indispensable part of Eisenhower's 'New Look' which aimed at reducing the budgetary costs of containing the Soviet Union (Gaddis, 1982: xx).

On Hollywood's side the situation is apropos of the political circumstances in Washington. Within two years of the end of the War the studios' net profit dropped off from $125 million in 1946 to $48 million (Holt, 2001: 6). Lawrence L. Murray sees 1947 as a decisive year in leading to the Cold War mentality which swept America until the late 1950s. The "Paramount decision" leading the distributors and producers to "divest themselves of having their own theater ownership", and "establishing admission prices and block booking" (Murray, 1975: 14) was another difficulty encountered. On the other hand European countries began instituting "a quota system" on foreign films, increasing taxes and freezing distributor assets (p. 14) but these were not the only problems that the industry encountered. There was burgeoning of anti-communism in America thanks to the Truman Doctrine and Kennan's Long Telegram. The studios' patriotic films saluting the Soviets as the new companion after the Nazi invasion during WW II were in the new era un-American pieces of work.

Hollywood hedged its bets firstly, by reducing the production of social problem films and if they were not the producer they would cut their distribution abilities from the films of this kind. As a result social problem films declined from 28 percent of the industry's output in 1948 to less than 10 percent of the 1954 output (Leab, 1993, 123).

Secondly, they would not hire those who were said having communist past (or now a

communist) and did not name the names of their companions or those who committed perjury before the HUAC[9]. The studios instituted a blacklist to show to the government its loyalty. The blacklisted directors and writers would wait for the coming of the mid-1960s to use their own names in the industry.

Thirdly, the industry would produce a lot of anti-communist films during the following years which Murray called "Cold War response films". Murray groups the Cold War films under four categories. In the first category, there are "blatantly anti-communist" films. The main concern common to all is informing "the public about the goals and techniques of an international conspiracy, directed from Moscow, which intended to undermine the American way of life" (Murray, 1975: 15). The films in this category are *The Iron Curtain* (1948), *The Red Menace* (1949), *I Married a Communist* (1949), *The Conspirator* (1950), *I Was Communist for the FBI* (1951), *Walk East on Beacon* (1952), *My Son John* (1952), *Big Jim McClain* (1952).

The second category films are "hot war" films. The films depict America's 'righteous' war against those who threaten its national security. The enemy can be of all kind; but the important point is that America symbolizes the right side. For the films under this category, the industry was provided with military equipments. The films of this category are *Command Decision* (1948), *Battleground* (1949), *The Sands of Iwo Jima* (1950), *The Halls of Montezuma* (1950), *Steel Helmet* (1951), *Battlezone* (1952), *One Minute to Zero* (1952), *Desert Fox* (1951), *Hell and High Water* (1954), *The McConnel Story* (1955), *Strategic Air Command*, (1955), *The Court Martial of Billy Mitchell* (1955), *Bombers B52* (1957), *Jet Pilot* (1957), and *Thundering Jets* (1958).

The third category consists of science-fiction films. The enemy is not so human; instead radiation inflicted animals such as giant ants in *Them* (1954), as grasshoppers in *The Beginning of the End* (1957), as sea monsters in *It Came From Beneath the Sea* (1955) and *The Beast from Twenty Fathoms* (1953) as aliens in *The Thing* (1951)

---

[9] In 1947,the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) issued a declaration that "anything un-American had never occurred in films" and the MPAA would "fire... [and] not re-employ the unfriendly witnesses" until they accept the error they did (Furhammar, Isaksson, 1971: 72).

and *Invaders From Mars* (1953), and as mutants in *The Incredible Shrinking Man* (1957) (Lipschutz: 2001: 37).

The fourth category includes those which may not be directly related to the Cold War but with "the technique of inserting a line or a scene" expressing a political stance the films get overtones of the 'Cold War mentality' (p. 16): *She Wore a Yellow Ribbon* (1949), *Viva Zapata* (1952), *Springfield Riffle* (1950), and *On the Waterfront* (1954).

The paranoid mood in the films, and more importantly in the relationship between the U.S. Government and Hollywood, would soothe towards the last years of 1950s. The new decade was not without its peculiar perplexities. Despite all its patriotic films and loyalty clearances, Hollywood lost its two important studios. RKO went out of business and MGM quit making movies (Christensen, 1987, 112). The lesson the industry learned is that a success in the relationship with the power comes at the expense of the moviegoers. This will be the guiding principle in the forthcoming decades. The movie industry becomes more inclusive to the politically oriented filmmakers and moreover the blacklisted persons such as Dalton Trumbo and Abraham Polonsky return to the work. The content of the films varies importantly from the 1950s films of the same concern. The U.S. Government had nothing to give the movie industry and the situation would not change until the 1980s when the Ronald Reagan reevaluated the Paramount decision during his presidency.

There are indeed more important problems the new government has to face. The lunch of Sputnik in 1957 made the U.S. government to state that there is a "missile gap" between the Soviet Union, and the new administration has a confidence that towards the end of 1960s this gap will be closed. President Reagan boosted the military spending and introduced an active cold war interventionism which includes the beginning of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. (Christensen, 1987: 111) However the policy leads to Cuban Missile Crisis which according to McNamara, then secretary of defense, was the closest point to nuclear catastrophe. The assassination of Kennedy even worsened the circumstances which lead to a series of

conspiracy thrillers of the era. The situation did not change in the presidency of Lyndon B. Johnson who dedicated himself to the "great society" but the Vietnam War would undercut this project.

If the 1960s were a failure for the governments of the era it was a time of recuperation for the movie industry. The five films, *Seven Days in May* (1964), *Fail Safe* (1964), *Dr. Strangelove* (1964), *The Manchurian Candidate* (1962), *The Planet of the Apes* (1968), successfully dealt with the 'rationality of war' and instead of cursing the Soviet Union as the aggressor, the films delineated the undercurrents of 'war mentality'.

To this critical stance added the rotten bureaucracy and total nihilism about the nature of the Government during the 1970s. The Nixon Administration's decision to invade Cambodia in 1970, the Watergate scandal, and illegal activities of FBI and CIA (Combs, 1990, 75) found their expressions in the movies within which individual heroes would undo the activities of the Government. The movie industry responded to this process with four films *Three Days of Condor* (1975), *All the President's Man* (1976), *The Conversation* (1974), and *Chinatown* (1974).

However, the films of the 1960s and 1970s became more important during the 1980s, the decade of "new conservatism". The critical stance of the movies of the 1960s merged with the individual hero of the 1970s, who was the victim of the officialdom, in the conservative movies of the 1980s. The old themes of the 1950s were revived during the 1980s: *Invasion, USA* (1985), *The Hidden* (1986), *Alien Nation* (1988), *They Live* (1988), and *No Way Out* (1987) are classical examples of communist infiltration. But the Government was, at that time, unreliable and no better from the alien government (Combs, 1990: 100)

4.4. THE HOT WARS IN THE COLD WAR: THE KOREAN AND VIETNAM WAR

Although there were two important hot wars during the Cold War only the war in/for Vietnam was seen exploitable for Hollywood. The first experience, the Korean War, was not suitable for its very nature to make projections about the courage and superiority of American soldiers. Firstly, the war was not of the United States, but it responded to the challenge through the United Nations. Secondly, the war, unlike WW II that was "a struggle between good and evil" (Suid, 1978: 113) was not for the victory, it was a "police action" (p. 113), which aimed to put an end to the conflict. The result was poor reception from the movie industry. One film *One Minute to Zero* (1952) is released without "the traditional acknowledgement of the armed forces assistance" (p. 114) because the film depicted an "artillery fire" which is "directed against "innocent civilians" (p. 114). The film *Retreat, Hell!* (1954) is important in Hollywood history because it is " the first Hollywood production to visualize a major defeat" (p. 114). The film *Bridges at Toko-Ri* (1954) attempted to explain the reasons of "American involvement in Korea" (p. 114)[10].

The second hot war, which took place in Vietnam, was very lucrative unlike the first one; and Hollywood played its part for about twenty years. Costing an estimated $165 billion and 58.000 dead with another 300.000 wounded (Giglio, 2000: 172). The Vietnam War was lost with the fall of Saigon in 1975. After the first film *'Why Vietnam?'* (1965), John Wayne would produce "the only American film to unequivocally support U.S. involvement in the war" (p. 173), *The Green Berets* (1968) with the support of U.S. military. in his letter to the President Johnson, Wayne says that it is "extremely important that not only the people of the U.S. but those all over the world should know why it is necessary for us to be there … the most effective way to accomplish this is through the motion picture medium." (p. 173) Wayne maintains in the letter that "the film [*The Green Berets*] would inspire a patriotic attitude on the part of fellow Americans" (p. 173). The time the film was produced was crucial in that until after the war ended the studios were reluctant to

---

[10] The other films on korean War are: *M*A*S*H* (1970), *Park Chop Hill* (1959), *The Glory Brigade* (1953), *Battle Circus* (1953), *Battle Hymn* (1957), *MacArthur* (1977), *Love is a Many Splendered Thing* (1955), *Torpedo Alley* (1953)

produce a film on the war because the U.S. involvement in the war was not so much open to discussion and even though the studios could not dare to dispute the government decision, they were unwilling to overlook the social distrust accompanying the war. Hence, the studios would wait for the late 1970s filming the war. The handling of the war by the studios and other independent directors varied according to the time the films produced. In the first period[11] the films focus either on the war itself as *Go Tell the Spartans* (1978), *Apocalypse Now* (1979), *The Boys in Company* (1978) or returning veterans as *The Deer Hunter* (1978) and *Coming Home* (1978). The second period films can be divided into two categories, the first category including more critical works such as *Platoon* (1986), *Full Metal Jacket* (1987), *Hamburger Hill* (1987), and *Casualties of War* (1989). The second category includes Rambo and Braddock films: *First Blood* (1982), *First Blood II* (1985), *Missing in Action* (1984), *Missing in Action II*: *The Beginning* (1985), and *Braddock: Missing in Action III* (1988).

While the first period Vietnam films and the "auteur"[12] films of the second period are more critical than the Rambo and Braddock films, all Vietnam films played it safe by personalizing the syndrome. There are crazy grunts, rotten bureaucrats, and bloodthirsty commanders, but no film dared to oppose the government mentality.

---

[11] Giglio uses the wave theory which separates films about the war in two waves: the first group spanning from 1978 to 1979 and the second from 1985 to 1987. Here we take this separation without using the mentioned theory.

[12] The auteur films include the works of Stanley Kubrick, Oliver Stone such as *Full Metal Jacket* and *Born on the Fourth of July* can be counted. The films are independent productions and shot without official support such as military equipment.

V. CHAPTER FOUR: INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN DIEGESIS

In this chapter, I discuss how the construction of the boundary between inside/outside, self/other, and Heimlich/Unheimlich is achieved in the Hollywood cinema during the Cold War era in relation to the larger context of the U.S.' Cold War policy under four interrelated themes: The construction of the U.S. national space; the construction of the national self or the making of the white male the subject; the representation of other national prototypes as the Other; and the construction of the U.S. as the global power. The films on which my discussion is based are as follows: *Born on the Fourth of July* (1989), *Superman* (1978), *Indiana Jones series* (1981-1984-1989), *The Day the Earth Stood Still* (1951), *Deer Hunter* (1978), *Star Wars: A New Hope* (1977), *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (1978 version), *Apocalypse Now* (1979), *Invaders From Mars* (1953), *Close Encounters of the Third Kind* (1977), and *Full Metal Jacket* (1987).

However, before proceeding further I should make a point clear: While taking films as cultural artifacts that mediate the process of identity making, I am not suggesting that the spectators are passive receptors of what is projected through the camera. Instead, they are active participants of the meaning-making process; the spectator factor is no less important than the intention of the film. In other words, the way the spectators meaningfully receive the films is not determined by the encoding system embedded in films themselves; the films encode the real in a certain way, but the way the spectators decode these messages always intermingle with the larger context of their existence (Hall 1997).

5.1. THE FIRST THEME: THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE U.S. NATIONAL SPACE:

One of the distinguishing features of the nation-state is a clearly demarcated territory over which the political power exercises its authority. In this part I seek to explore

how this territoriality is constructed in the films to be discussed is the concern of this part. In my analysis, I distinguish between three narrative strategies that the films employ to this end: a) Representation of the outside as dangerous space within which the law of the jungle is effectual. b) Symbolization of the national space with nuclear family home space, c) Making the outside responsible for the violence of the members of inside applied within the outside. Through these strategies the inside is constructed through what the outside lacks: homely order and safety.

The first strategy is effectively employed in the *Indiana Jones* series. The protagonist, Indiana Jones, is an American professor of anthropology commissioned with guarding ancient historical artifacts. The artifacts belonging to different cultures and civilizations are endowed with special powers that would be fatal for humanity may the artifacts fall into the hands of wrong persons. All episodes of the series follow the same plot: A group of bad-willed bandits or scoundrels, who may happen to be of every ethnic or cultural origin but white protestant American, try to take hold of an artifact for using its powers for their own dirty ambitions, but are eventually prevented from reaching their aims thanks to Indiana Jones. Tracing the bad guys in all parts of the earth to save the artifacts Indy not only saves the past of humanity but also its present and future. Indy's adventures in dangerous and uncanny foreign lands act as the mirror image of the safe and civil of the American home. This contrast between inside and outer landscapes is reflected in Indy's own contrasting images in two spaces: We see Indy in safari outfits almost every time when he is on mission tracing dangerous and bloodthirsty savages in the murky jungles of the outside, whereas he appears in his courtly suits at home. Through Indy's persona and his adventures the American landscape is constructed as the guardian of the history of all human cultures and the most developed and civilized of all.

The second strategy is dominant in the sci-fi-fantasy films *Invaders From Mars* and *Close Encounters of the First Kind*. The film *Invaders From Mars* opens in a nuclear family home. The son who is curious about the outer world watches the sky through a telescope. After he goes to bed, a flying saucer from outer space lands right outside the fence of the courtyard that demarcates the borders of the home. The son wakes up

to the voice of the flying saucer. Then he wakes his parents up to see the event. The father goes outside to check what is happening, but as soon as he passes through the fence, he suddenly disappears. After spending the night outside, he returns home in the morning with a somewhat bizarre expression in his face. As the story unfolds, we realize that whoever goes beyond the fence falls into a dangerous pod. There the victims are exposed to a medical operation with which a microchip is placed in their brain completely altering their psychic and mental make-up. In the film the fence separates the safe-sweet home from the uncanny outside. Going beyond the fence, that is leaving home, brings fatal consequences, if not for physical life than in the form of loss of identity. As the number of victims increases, the armed forces get mobilized in full capacity to uproot the danger. The mobilization of the armed forces for a non-military problem gives the message that any threat to people within home, even when it does not have anything to do with military conduct justifies the intervention of the armed forces; and that the armed forces are the prime protectors of not only the American home, but also the American Self.

In the film *Close Encounters of the Third Kind* the flying saucers wander about the sky over an American town. Whenever they appear in the sky they project marvelous lights, which seduces the people looking at them. At a night when the flying saucers appears again in the sky a children follows the lights beyond the fences and is taken hostage by a flying saucer. Both films use the fence of the house as the symbolic demarcation line between inside and outside of the national space. The sudden and uncanny encounter with the unfamiliar following the act of leaving home helps construct the unfamiliar as the unfamiliar. The national space is made the family space by the same symbolic transference.

The third strategy, that is the responsibilitization of outside for the violence inside, is used in some Vietnam War films that are conventionally associated with left wing or oppositional ideologies. The title of the film Apocalypse Now implies that the film would be about hell, the eternal place of all sinful souls. But with the opening sequence we realize that the film represents the Vietnamese landscape as apocalyptic within which all normal human conduct becomes impossible. When the Commander

of the U.S. Marine Corps in Vietnam, Colonel Walter E. Kurtz, falls victim to the savagery of the Vietnamese space, Captain Benjamin L. Willard based in Saigon is commissioned to go to kill Colonel Kurtz and take the lead of U.S. Corps. As the Captain gets closer to war field he goes mad. When he finally gets there, he comes to believe that Colonel is doing the right thing. The delirium of two highly educated, overachiever American soldiers in the course of cruising Vietnam, necessarily at the front, implies that the Vietnamese landscape is not appropriate for normal human behavior. The massacres carried out by Colonel Kurtz are because of the apocalyptic space of Vietnam, not war. This presentation works to justify American presence in Vietnam right at the moment o questioning it due to its delirious effects on the American soldiers. It is the absence of order in Vietnam that threatens human normality and the American presence is required for the restoration of order. The apocalyptic presentation of Vietnam is fortified by the use of special filters and lenses to create the fire effect throughout the landscape. Through these techniques, the military excess of the U.S. forces fade before the spectacularity of the spatial excess of Vietnam, while the latter helps justify the former at the same time.

The making of the Vietnamese space a space of emergency or exception on the screen is complemented by denying it any tangible social life; all we can see within the Vietnam borders is the fronts as if Vietnam is only the conglomeration of war fronts. Except for a single sequence in Stanley Kubrick's *Full Metal Jacket*, there is no other scene in Vietnam movies that is located in an urban space. In the only city sequence in we are shown a prostitute her pimp, and a thief. In *Apocalypse Now*, Vietnam is hell where the souls get crazy. There is no normal landscapes in Vietnam in *Deer Hunter*, either; all we see is bloodthirsty men playing Russian roulette at the front, in whorehouses, or gamble houses. The Vietnamese landscape is normally like that and this is the reason, not result, of American presence there.

Through these spatial representations the films help nationalize the geographical space of America in the cultural symbolic space, and function as pedagogical and performative tools to make individuals inhabiting that space national American subjects. These representations also serve to justify the American foreign policy

legitimizing the American presence outside. The United States while protecting the inside; locates the outside where the values defining the inside do not reach. We witness the extension of physical borders to include the outside. Corollary to this, all possible threats, be it from outside or inside, threatens the home wherein American values are effective. In this context war or any kind of conflict would not be not about physical frontiers, but the frontiers define the values of America. The difference between inside and outside becomes defiance and threat against the safety of home.

Two examples in Indiana Jones series and *Star Wars: A New Hope* make clear the operating strategy in these films. In *Indiana Jones* series the presence of Indy within other landscapes is tied to an actual danger people outside are suffering, but are unable to overcome. A lost Ark, the Holly Grail, and a magical stone become the reason for Indy's existence. In *Star Wars: A New Hope*, the fight is because of the empire's possession of Death Star "with enough power to destroy an entire planet" and the action of Princes Leia is justified on account of "restoring freedom to the galaxy".

5.2. THE SECOND THEME: THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SELF: THE MAKING OF THE WHITE MALE THE AGENT

Rather than analyzing films according to what they tell, my concern is looking at the ways through which they tell what they tell: the way the white American male is constructed as the agent/subject of the narrative. In such an approach differentiating between good politics and bad politics would scarcely be meaningful since the subject in both is the same character: white American male. Even if he is morally corrupt as Colonel Walter E. Kurtz in *Apocalypse Now* or keen on violence as Michael Vronsky in *Deer Hunter*, it is the white male character who runs the narrative. My aim here is to explore the strategies structuring the subject in the films under investigation.

The production of the white male as the subject appears in its purest form in rescue fantasy films such as *Superman, Indiana Jones*, and *Rambo: First Blood* (1982). The earth or a smaller part of it like Vietnam or Afghanistan may be under attack by the enemy. The government officials[13] are so weak to retrieve the threat, while the hero combines in him all the physical and moral capabilities to deal with the threat sufficiently. Still what makes the hero what he is not his own capabilities but the inability and insufficiency of other actors. There must be a galactic threat for a hero to emerge, but the consequences of his retrieving the threat goes far beyond the possible physical destruction posed by the threat. The effect of the hero's action is invariably to do with the freedom of the people of the world. While the aggressor violates freedom, the hero's fight would be for it. This transformation of reason for the emergence of the hero, the physical threat, around an abstract principle, freedom, leads to an intended misrecognition that the fight is between those who violate the freedom and those who defend it. Hollywood cinema always disguises the cause effect sequence. Threat precedes the birth of a superhero. In the Indiana Jones series valuable, antique, and more importantly dangerous artifacts had already been in the wrong hands or lost, and the presence of Indy is tied to the presence of threat. The *Superman* series begin with a law court sequence in which the traitors were judged. Superman falls down to the earth during the Great Depression in a social chaos and disorder. John Rambo goes to Vietnam to save the American hostages. The threat works as the reason for the existence for the hero, and for this to happen the other should precede the hero as the source of threat.

In the rescue fantasy films the American character is good and has a reason for presence but in other genres this need no be so. In many feature films the American character is either morally corrupt or becomes delirious during the course of action. This type of character formation is operative in left wing[14] Vietnam films. In *Deer Hunter* the would be U.S. Marine Corps protagonists are already keen on violence before they are recruited. Deer hunting is used as a metaphor for a particular

---

[13] In the classical Hollywood texts during the Cold War the individual is located against the collective nature of government which is seen as the symbol of bureaucratic corruption in which communism shares an important part.

[14] The distinctive character of "left wing films" is their critical stance to the decisions and policies of the United States government.

masculine identity. The film opens in a factory where immigrant men work under apparently hard conditions. In the second scene we see the men in a pub and half drunk. Violence against women in the third scene completes the prototype of working class masculinity. That is to say, the protagonists of the film are not the proper American subjects. But this does not challenge the idea of the American male subject, either. By choosing the protagonists from among working class immigrant men, the film deflects the disunity inside to the already not-quite-insiders. In the *Full Metal Jacket* the mentality of the military is cursed for its irrational means of conduct but at the expense of vindicating the social order as if irrationality begins after the recruit. In *Apocalypse Now*, the Colonel Walter E. Kurtz resorts to extreme violence in Vietnam but it is the jungle that is responsible for his violence. In the film, we are shown all the extremities but none of these does criticize the American presence. Even when the film questions the American presence in Vietnam due to its delirious effects on the American subjects, it eventually reinforces the official U.S. discourse on the need to put thing in order in the disorderly Vietnam. In *Deer Hunter* irrationality begins in town, but what and who is responsible for the madness of the soldiers is the extreme violence they experience in Vietnam and bloodthirsty Viet-Kong guerillas. In the *Born on the Fourth of July* we are shown the dead bodies of the civilians ruthlessly shot dead in a house by the U.S. soldiers. Ron Kovic, the protagonist, cannot believe his team and himself had killed civilians. In effect he becomes the culprit in the dark and murky air by shooting his own teammate. Yet despite their irrationality or bad moral records, it is the American protagonists, and not their enemies or those they victimize that are the subjects of these narratives. In order to better analyze how the process of subject making works, one should take into consideration several questions: Who does run the narrative? Whose gaze the camera does appropriate? Who is the object of the gaze? Who is the winner? And what does he get?

In these films the self, the American heroes such as Superman, Indiana Jones, Rambo, or anti heroes such as Colonel Walter E. Kurtz, Ron Kovic, and Michael Vronsky are at the center of the narrative. They are the subject of either courage or violence. They are the subject of the gaze of the camera. The victims and evils

denied the gaze, which is the formative of the subjecthood. They are the object of the self's gaze: they are either ruthless culprit or at best miserable victims.

5.3. THE THIRD THEME: THE REPRESENTATION OF OTHER NATIONAL PROTOTYPES

As I have discussed at the beginning that the crafting of Self as a complete, coherent subject is always managed through the construction of the Other around a lack, and that the Self and Other are made not on the same social plane but on the structured and hierarchical field of reified and disembedded difference. The Other characters in Hollywood films enable the making of the American self by acting as the latter's mirror image: the relation between the American self and its enemy others are structured around the binaries like compassionate versus bloodthirsty, deceitful versus honest, savage versus modern, primitive vs. civilized, etc. Still different strategies of otherization are dominant in different genres.

In the *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (1978) the immigrant-filled, French-run kitchen is shown as the source of pathology that would invade the body. The French chief in the restaurant kitchen is represented as the threat to public health not because he acts treacherously, but because his chiefly tastes and ideas about cuisine are sharply contested by the American inspector. That is to say, it is the tastes and ideas, not necessarily the art, of the French man that would threaten the public health. The other characters in the kitchen are immigrants, mostly Asian, look at the inspector with full of hatred and suspicion. Within the ideological and discursive context of the Cold War, the film performs a symbolic enactment of the paranoia produced around the liberal and libertarian French and the subversive 'yellow peril'.

In the *Born on the Fourth of July*, the representation of the Vietnamese runs around the trope of victimization, a strategy common in most somewhat critical films on Vietnam. The Vietnamese who appear in the film are those constantly victimized by the U.S. soldiers; but there is no sight of any Vietnamese person who fights against

the U.S. forces and for freedom from them.

The victimization strategy is effective in *Deer Hunter*, too. In the first sequence from Vietnam we are shown U.S. soldiers throwing grenades at some twenty civilians, composed mostly of children, women and the elderly, who try to hide themselves. Throughout the movie, the Vietnamese women are those killed, maimed, sold, raped by men, both Euro-American and Vietnamese. I see these representations highly problematical for at least two reasons: by portraying the women as the victims, these narratives foreclose the stories or agencies of other Vietnamese women, say those who resist men American or Vietnamese. The representation of women as victims of a male-chauvinist culture also work to reify the official discourse on Vietnam; on the need to bring order and freedom to there.

I see the high mobility of U.S. characters in the movie an important strategy of the making of Self and Other. In his celebrated work Culture and Imperialism (1993), Edward Said discusses how in the imperial novels the unimpeded mobility of the British men and women over the Earth both reflected and help consolidate the idea of the naturality of the Empire and the universality of the imperial subject. The same holds true for Hollywood fictions. In the films that I investigate, too, the U.S. characters are able to move unproblematically across spaces, hence be present everywhere. This undoubtedly adds to the idea of the American subject as the global subject, or of the globe as the backyard of the U.S. In the *Born on the Fourth of July* the availability of Mexico, its bars, beaches and women for the rehabilitation of disabled or traumatized Vietnam veterans, in *Deer Hunter* the protagonist's ability to go back and forth between New York and Saigon as a civilian in the midst of the war, in *Close Encounters of the Third Kind* the NASA executives ability to move as far as Mexico and Mongolia in a few days stand in stark contrast with the immobility of all Others. The same is true for the immigrant characters stay stuck in a kitchen in the *Invasion of Body Snatchers*. Furthermore the mobility of the Americans is always tied to a moral cause of freedom or saviorship which is made further visible through the corrupt or unable characters they encounter in other spaces; such as Mexican whores or thieves; bloodthirsty Vietnamese or naïve Mongolians scared to death at

the sight of aliens. In the *Indiana Jones* series, the Latin Americans in *Raiders of the Lost Ark*; Turks, and Arabs in *The Last Crusade* and Chinese and Indian peoples in *Temple of Doom* are all but obstacle to the quest of Indy. Indy is not only able to move freely among these spaces, but also he has to be present in all these spaces to retrieve the threat posed against the peoples of the world by the inhabitants of these spaces who are portrayed as the treacherous culprits that are so clumsy and untalented that they are doomed to fail even in their own treachery. In *Superman*, the traitors brought in line by Superman's fathers are in complete likeness of Russians. In *Star Wars: A New Hope* all strangers pose deadly threats to Luke Skywalker and his team.

Another effective strategy of representation of the Other in the Hollywood cinema is the denial of representation to them. While the lives of the American characters are displayed in detail through their family ties, romances, emotional outbursts etc., the other characters are even denied personal names. No information is given about their personal lives, relations, thoughts or emotions; indeed they are not present at all outside of their encounters with the Americans. This is also apparent Vietnam films in which the war is said to be for the freedom of Vietnamese people, but except for those dead or wounded at the front, but there is no civilians. The Vietnamese civilians are denied representation and stay invisible unless they become the objects of violence.

5.4. THE FOURTH THEME: THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE U.S. AS A GLOBAL POWER: HOW GLOBAL RESPONSIBILITY LEADS TO GLOBAL DOMINANCE?

Throughout the Cold War years one of the most common themes of the Hollywood films is the possibility of third World War that would inescapably lead to the extermination of the earth. The third world war would be between the nations of the world or with the aliens from outer space. Although the perpetrators can vary, the savior would not: the white American hero. Defending the earth against other,

invariably evil, nations or against various unworldly unions becomes the responsibility of the United States. Even further, as in the examples of *The Day the Earth Stood Still*, *Close Encounters of the Third Kind*, *Superman*, and *Invaders From Mars*, the United States represented as the gravity center of the world. The flying saucers begin dangerous activities in the American national frontiers as in *Invaders From Mars* and *Close Encounters of the Third Kind*. The United States is also the only address for guests from outer space. In *The Day the Earth Stood Still*, a flying saucer lands on in the American borders to warn the inhabitants against a likely catastrophic war. The representative of the, itself an admirer of President Eisenhover, tries to persuade the U.S. officials to organize a worldwide meeting in which the presidents of the nations have to join. This worldwide mission of the United States is also suggested in *Superman*. Clark Kent is hired in a magazine named the Daily Planet that aims to inform the readers of all around the world about the worldly affairs, particularly those that relate to security issues.

However, global responsibility leads to global dominance. Vietnam films offer powerful narratives in this vein. Even though the United States has received no direct threat from Vietnam, it goes to Vietnam to fight the enemy on behalf of the free world, and no film in this chapter questions why the United States was there. The responsibility discourse, refined in the rescue fantasy films, conceals the actual reasons of intervention in Vietnam.

In this chapter I proposed an additional approach to the study of film in IR discipline. In addition to the approaches that take films as ideological supplements to actual politics among nations, I take them as the constitutive sites of the relationship among them. In my analysis of the Cold War films, I focused upon two American foreign policy discourses: 'world domination' which finds its expression in 'legal representative of the world' discourse and legitimating the American presence within outside which finds its expression in 'dangerous outside' discourse. The films I analyzed above and many others throughout the history of Hollywood circulate these discourses through the same strategy: proving the difference of white American from various others in various times. As early as D.W. Griffith's *Birth of a Nation* (1915),

the threats to American unity are aptly depicted at the scene: at the very beginning of the film, the play card writes, "The bringing of the African to America planted the first seed of disunion". The possibility of disunion frames both the films of the nation and its self. The threat of communist infiltration into America, the threat of nuclear explosion, in the production of which the Hollywood has undoubtedly a great share, the countless threats to the freedom of other nations and non-nations of the world lay down the strategies of self-identity formation of American nation.

VI. CONCLUSION

The main hypothesis of this thesis is that far from being an entertainment sector, the Hollywood industry functions as an ideological state apparatus in the Althusserian sense (1994) in the American policy making process. I argued that the discursive space opened by films is a constitutive element of the making of the state and national identity. The study of film necessitates an integrated investigation of the text and the context of its production; whereas textual analysis should develop at the interstices of content and form. Framing my investigation around the discussions opened by journals like *Cahiers du Cinema, Screen, Cinethique* in the 1970s, I argued that cinema functions as an ideological apparatus not only due to its narrative content, but also because of its visual form. As for the discussion of contextuality, I explored how the Hollywood cinema functioned as an ideological institution within the larger context of American politics during the Cold War era through specific examples from different periods. My exploration attests that the Hollywood functions as an apparatus devised by the political power, and that even there is a symbiotic relationship Hollywood and the political power. In the last part I related my discussions on the relation between the reality and its representation to the problematization of the national self making in socio-cultural scholarship. Inspired by the works of Michael Shapiro, Christina Rojas, Philip K. Lawrence and Homi Bhabha I argued that films act as a medium in the construction of the nation and its state. In this respect, it does not suffice to explore how political power makes use of films to its own ends; the study of film in its relation to the relations of power should rather take into consideration the intrinsic capacity of the film in performing such a function. Films help construct and consolidate the legitimacy of power not only by directly endorsing the policies and practices of political power. More than that, it helps constitute power and provides a discursive space for the construction of its proper subjects.

In Chapter 1, I explored the works of those analysts that base their discussion on the ideological functioning of the film in International Relations.

In Chapter 2, I discussed how and why the relation between film and reality, or more correctly the relation between film and what it represents is both enabled and shaped by the medium's physical techniques of representation.

In Chapter 3 I explored the nature of the relation between cinema and political power. My basic point was to contest the perception of Hollywood as a mere entertainment industry by focusing on its politically affirmative function as it is manifested in the historical relations between Hollywood and the Department of the State.

I take films as constitutive elements of both power and reality. Following the formation of the "I" in the Lacanian frame, I understand the working of power as a from outside to inside process. And following Homi Bhabha's study on the formation of the nation through the activity of narration, I argued that the nation is constructed in relation to what remains outside of it.

I argued that through specific technical and narrative strategies like the use of special filters in outer spaces, the desert-yellow effect, the depiction of the Other as the object of the gaze of the camera, the Other is constituted in the films as the object of the gaze of the proper subject, which is the white American male. The outside is represented as the dangerous space within which the white male realizes himself. I argue that the white male is hereby projected as the beholder of the nation and its state.

My analysis of films is based on three general thematic categories. The first is concerned with the construction of the inside and outside, which is defined by Michael Shapiro as the fetishization of national space. The second relates to the construction of proper subject. The protagonist in the films, the white American male, is the subject that has the right and capacities to represent and to be represented. That is "he" becomes both the epistemological and the ontological subject at the moment of representation.

My aim in this thesis has been to develop a productive theoretical frame to integrate film and cinema studies into the study of International Relations. In conclusion, I argue that neither the cinema industry nor its products are exterior to inter-state relations, but are their very constitutive elements. Since the limitation of film studies to films' thematic contents produces a spurious difference between political/ideological films and non-ideological ones, the analysis of films' political/ideological function(ing)s should take into consideration, in equal weight, the role the physical representation techniques used in films function ideologically. The Hollywood industry greatly benefited from this aspect throughout the era in question.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno, T. W., "How to Look at Television", *The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television*, Vol. 8, Spring 1954, pp. 213-235.

Adorno, T. W., *Aesthetic Theory* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1997).

Adorno, T. W., *Minima Moralia: Reflections from Damaged Life* (London and New York:Verso, 1978).

Allen, Richard, "The Aesthetic Experience of Modernity: Benjamin, Adorno, and Contemporary Film Theory", *New German Critique*, No. 40, Special Issue on Weimar Film Theory, Winter 1997, pp. 225-240.

Althusser, Louis, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Towards an Investigation)", in Slavoj Žižek (ed.), *Mapping Ideology*, (London and New York: Verso, 1994).

Baudry, Jean-Louis, "Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus" in Leo Braudy (ed.) *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Baudry, Jean-Louis, "The Apparatus: Metapsychological Approaches To The Impression Of Reality In Cinema" in Leo Braudy (ed.) *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Benjamin, Walter, *Illuminations* translated by Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1986).

Bhabha, Homi K. (ed.), *Nation and Narration* (London and NY: Routledge, 1990).

Biskind, Peter, *Seeing is Believing: How Hollywood Taught Us to Stop Worrying and Love the Fifties* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2000).

Browne, Nick (ed.), Cahiers du Cinéma 1969-1972: The Politics of Representation (Cambridge: Harward University Press, 1990).

Bullock, Marcus, "The Rose of Babylon: Walter Benjamin, Film Theory, and the Technology of Memory" *MLN,* 103-5, Dec 1988, pp. 1098-1120.

Cassels, Alan, *Ideology and International Relations in the Modern World* (New

York: Routledge, 1996).

Chapman, Roger, "George F. Kennan as Represented by Chuck Jones: Road Runner and the Cold War Policy of Containment (1949-1980)", *Film & History*, Vol.31.1 2001.

Christensen, Terry, *Reel Politics: American Political Movies From Birth of a Nation to Platoon* (Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1987).

Comolli, Jean-Louis, Narbony, Jean, "Cinema/Ideology/Criticism" in Nick Browne (ed.) *Cahiers Du Cinéma 1969 – 1972: The Politics Of Representation* (Cambridge: Harward University Press, 1990).

Comolli, Jean-Louis: "Technique And Ideology: Camera, Perspective, Depth Of Field" in Nick Browne (ed.) *Cahiers Du Cinéma 1969 – 1972: The Politics Of Representation* (Cambridge: Harward University Press, 1990).

Cook, David A., *A History of Narrative Film* (New York: Norton, 1990).

Copjec, Joan, "Orthopsychic Subject: Film Theory and the Reception of Lacan" in Robert Stam and Toby Miller (eds.) *Film and Theory: An Anthology* (Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000).

Der Derian, James, "War Games" in Bromley, Carl (ed.), *Cinema Nation: The Best Writing on Film from The Nation. 1913-2000* (New York: Thunder's Mouth Press/Nation Books, 2000)

Flores, Richard, *Remembering The Alamo* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002.

Freidberg, Anna, "A Denial of Difference: Theories of Cinematic Identification" in Psychoanalysis and Cinema in E. Ann Kaplan (ed.), *Psychoanalysis & Cinema* (New York: Routledge, 1990).

Fuhrammar, Leif and Isaksson, Folke, *Politics and Film* (New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1971) translated by Kersti French [Original name: *Politik och Film* (Bokförlaget PAN/ Norstedts: Sweden, 1968)].

Gaddis, John Lewis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American Nation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).

Giglio, Ernest D., *Here's Looking at You: Hollywood, Film, and Politics* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000).

Gregg, Robert W., *International Relations on Film* (Boulder and London: Lynne

Reinner Publishers, 1998).

Holt, Jeniffer, "Hollywood and Politics Caught in the Cold War Crossfire", *Film & History*, Vol 31.1 2001.

Horkheimer, Max & Adorno, Theodor W., *Dialectics of Enlightenment* translated by John Cumming (New York: Continuum, 1994).

Jameson, Fredric, *The Geopolitical Aesthetic: Cinema and Space in the World System* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1992).

Kracauer, Siegfried. *From Caligari to Hitler : A Psychological History of the German Film* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974, c1947).

Lapsley, Robert and Westlake, Michael, *Film Theory : An Introduction* (Manchester : Manchester University Press, c1988).

Lawrence, Philip K., *Modernity and War: The Creed of Absolute Violence* (New York and London: St. Martin's Press and Macmillan Press 1997).

Leab, Daniel, "Hollywood and the Cold War 1945-1961", in Robert Brent Toplin ed., *Hollywood as Mirror: Changing Views of "Outsiders" and "Enemies" in American Movies* (Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1993).

Lipschutz, Ronnie D., *Cold War Fantasies: Film, Fiction, and Foreign Policy* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001).

Lopez, Anna M., "Are All Latins From Manhattan? Hollywood, Ethnography, and Cultural Colonialism" in Alan Williams (ed.), *Film and Nationalism* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2002).

Lurray, Lawrence L., "The Film Industry Responds to the Cold War, 1945–1955: Monsters, Spys, and Subversives", *Jump Cut: A Review of Contemporary Media*, No. 9, 1975, pp. 14-16.

Matelsky, Marilyn J. and Street, Nancy Lynch (eds.), *War and Film in America: Historical and Critical Essays* (North Carolina: McFarland & Company Inc., Publishers, 2003).

McGee, Patrick, *Cinema, Theory, and Political Responsibility in Contemporary Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

McGowan, Todd, "Looking for the Gaze: Lacanian Film Theory and Its Vicissitudes", *Cinema Journal*, 42-3, Spring 2003, pp. 27-47.

Metz, Christian, "The Imaginary Signifier" in Robert Stam and Toby Miller (ed.), *Film and Theory: an Anthology* (Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000).

Oudart, Jean-Pierre, "Cinema and Suture" in Nick Browne (ed.) *Cahiers du Cinéma 1969 – 1972: The Politics of Representation* (Cambridge: Harward University Press, 1990b).

Oudart, Jean-Pierre, "The Reality Effect" in Nick Browne (ed.) *Cahiers Du Cinéma 1969 – 1972: The Politics of Representation* (Cambridge: Harward University Press, 1990a).

Rojas, Cristina, *Civilization and Violence: Regimes of Representation in Nineteenth-Century Colombia* (London and Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 2002).

Said, Edward, *Culture and Imperialism* (London : Chatto & Windus, 1993).

Schatz, Thomas, *The Genius of the System: Hollywood Filmmaking in the Studio Era* (New York: Hery Holt and Company Inc., 1997).

Shapiro, Michael J., *Cinematic Political Thought: Narrating Race, Nation, and Gender* (Washington: New York University Press, 1999).

Silverman, Kaja, "On Suture" in Leo Braudy (ed.) *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Stam, Robert, *Film Theory: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 2000).

Suid, Lawrence H., *Guts & Glory: Great American Movies* (Massachusettes: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1978)

Van Riper, A. Bowdoin, "From Gagarin to Armageddon: Soviet - American Relations in the Cold War Space Epic", *Film & History*, Vol. 31.2 2001.

Walsh, Michael "Jameson and Global Aesthetic", in David Bordwell and Noel Carroll (eds.), *Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies* (Madison : University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), pp. 481-500.

Weber, Cynthia, *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001).

Weldes, Jutta, "Going Cultural: Star Trek, State Action, and Popular Culture", *Millenium: Journal of International Studies*, 28-1, 1999, pp. 117-134.

Williams, Alan, *Film and Nationalism* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2002).

Žižek, Slavoj, *Enjoy Your Symptom! Jacques Lacan in Hollywood and Out* (London: Routledge,1992).

Http Pages

(http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/coldwar/documents/episode-1/kennan.htm)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FILM INDEX

Alamo, The (1960) Directed by John Wayne

Alien Nation (1988), Directed by Graham Baker

All the President's Man (1976), Directed by Alan J. Pakula

Apocalypse Now (1979), Directed by Francis Ford Coppola

Armageddon (1998) Directed by Michael Bay

Battle Circus (1953) Directed by Richard Brooks

Battle Hymn (1957), Directed by Douglas Sirk

Battleground (1949), Directed by William A. Wellman

Battlezone (1952), Directed by Lesley Selander

Beast from Twenty Fathoms, The (1953) Directed by Eugène Lourié

Beginning of the End, The (1957), Directed by Bert I. Gordon

Big Jim McClain (1952). Directed by Edward Ludwig

Birth of a Nation (1915) Directed by D. W. Griffith

Bombers B52 (1957), Directed by Gordon Douglas

Born on the Fourth of July (1989), Directed by Oliver Stone

Boys in Company C, The (1978) Directed by Sidney J. Furie

Braddock: Missing in Action III (1988). Directed by Aaron Norris

Bridges at Toko-Ri (1954), Directed by Mark Robson

Casualties of War (1989). Directed by Brian De Palma

Chinatown (1974). Directed by Roman Polanski

Close Encounters of the Third Kind (1977) Directed by Steven Spielberg

Coming Home (1978). Directed by Hal Ashby

Command Decision (1948), Directed by Sam Wood

Conspirator, The (1950), Directed by Victor Saville

Conversation, The (1974), Directed by Francis Ford Coppola

Court Martial of Billy Mitchell, The (1955), Directed by Otto Preminger

Day the Earth Stood Still, *The* (1951), Directed by Robert Wise

Days of Glory (1944) (RKO), Directed by Jacques Tourneur

Deer Hunter (1978), Directed by Michael Cimino

Desert Fox (1951), Directed by Henry Hathaway

Dr. Strangelove (1964), Directed by Stanley Kubrick

Fail Safe (1964), Directed by Sidney Lumet

First Blood (1982), Directed by Ted Kotcheff

First Blood II (1985), Directed by George P. Cosmatos

Full Metal Jacket (1987), Directed by Stanley Kubrick

Glory Brigade, The (1953), Directed by Robert D. Webb

Go Tell the Spartans (1978), Directed by Ted Post

Green Berets, The (1968) Directed by Ray Kellogg John Wayne

Halls of Montezuma, The (1950), Directed by Lewis Milestone

Hamburger Hill (1987), Directed by John Irvin

Hell and High Water (1954), Directed by Samuel Fuller

Hidden, The (1986), Directed by Jack Sholder

I Married a Communist (1949), Directed by Robert Stevenson

I Was Communist for the FBI (1951), Directed by Gordon Douglas

Incredible Shrinking Man, The (1957) Directed by Jack Arnold

Independence Day (1996) Directed by Roland Emmerich

Indiana Jones series (1981-1984-1989), Directed by Steven Spielberg

Invaders From Mars (1953), Directed by William Cameron Menzies

Invasion of the Body Snatchers (1978), Directed by Philip Kaufman

Iron Curtain, The (1948) Directed by William A. Wellman

It Came From Beneath the Sea (1955) Directed by Robert Gordon

Jet Pilot (1957), Directed by Josef von Sternberg

Lord of the Flies (1963) Directed by Peter Brook

Love is a Many Splendored Thing (1955) Henry King

MacArthur (1977) Directed by Joseph Sargent

Manchurian Candidate, The (1962), Directed by John Frankenheimer

M*A*S*H (1970), Directed By Robert Altman

McConnel Story, The (1955), Directed by Gordon Douglas

Missing in Action (1984), Directed by Joseph Zito

Missing in Action II: The Beginning (1985), Directed by Lance Hool

Mission to Moscow (1943) (Warner Bros), Directed by Michael Curtiz

Modern Times (1931) Directed by Charles Chaplin

My Son John (1952), Directed by Leo McCarey

No Way Out (1987) Directed by Roger Donaldson

North Star (1943) (Goldwyn), Directed by Lewis Milestone

On the Waterfront (1954). Directed by Elia Kazan

One Minute to Zero (1952), Directed by Tay Garnett

Park Chop Hill (1959), Directed by Lewis Milestone

Planet of the Apes, The (1968) Directed by Franklin J. Schaffner

Platoon (1986), Directed by Oliver Stone

Red Menace, The (1949), Directed by R.G. Springsteen

Sands of Iwo Jima, The (1950), Directed by Allan Dwan

Seven Days in May (1964), Directed by John Frankenheimer

She Wore a Yellow Ribbon (1949), Directed by John Ford

Song of Russia (1944) (MGM), Directed by Gregory Ratoff

Spiderman (2002) Directed by Sam Raimi

Springfield Riffle (1950), Directed by André De Toth

Star Wars: A New Hope (1977), Directed by George Lucas

Steel Helmet (1951), Directed by Samuel Fuller

Strategic Air Command, (1955), Directed by Anthony Mann

Superman (1978), Directed by Richard Donner

Them (1954), Directed by Gordon Douglas

They Live (1988), Directed by John Carpenter

Three Days of Condor (1975), Directed by Sydney Pollack

Thundering Jets (1958). Directed by Helmut Dantine

Torpedo Alley (1953) Directed by Lew Landers

Viva Zapata (1952), Directed by Elia Kazan

Wag the Dog (1997) Directed by Barry Levinson

Walk East on Beacon (1952),

Why Korea?(1951) Documentary

Why Vietnam?'(1965) Documentary

Why We Fight? Series (1942-1945)

1. *Prelude to War* (1943)

2. *The Battle of Russia* (1943) Directed by Frank Capra Anatole Litvak

3. *The Battle of Britain* (1943) Directed by Frank Capra

4. *Divide and Conquer* (1943) Directed by Frank Capra

5. *The Nazis Strike* (1943) Directed by Frank Capra Anatole Litvak

6. *The Battle of China* (1944) Directed by Frank Capra

7. *War Comes to America* (1945) Directed by Frank Capra Anatole Litvak

Documentary Film

People's Century: *1927 Great Escape*, BBC Documentary Series