

**REFLECTIONS OF NATIONALISM
ON
HOLLYWOOD AND TURKISH FILM INDUSTRY**

Thesis submitted to the
Institute of Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Sociology

by

Arif Burcay Yılmaz

Fatih University

June, 2010

© ARİF BURCAY YILMAZ

All rights reserved, 2010

APPROVAL PAGE

Student : Arif Burcay YILMAZ
Institute : Institute of Social Sciences
Department : Sociology
Thesis Subject : Reflections of Nationalism on Hollywood and Turkish Film
Industry
Thesis Date : June 2010

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

Assoc. Prof. Ali Murat Yel
Department Chair

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

Assoc. Prof. Ali Murat Yel
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Ali Murat Yel

Prof. Charles Allen SCARBORO

Assoc. Prof. Savaş Genç

It is approved that this thesis has been written in compliance with the formatting rules laid down by the Graduate Institute of Social Sciences.

Assoc. Prof. Mehmet Karakuyu
Director

June 2010

AUTHOR DECLARATION

1. The material included in this thesis has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than that for which it is now submitted.

2. The program of advanced study of which this thesis is part has been comprised of: courses in Sociology, including social movements, political sociology, sociological perspectives, sociology of knowledge, power and expertise, and statistical methods of analysis.

i) Research Methods. The thesis incorporates research methods taught on both the undergraduate and, on the graduate level (by thesis advisor) during the course of the study. See ii below.

ii) Sources examined in this thesis include articles from scholarly journals, magazines, conference proceedings, books and secondary sources on nation, national identity, nationalism, Turkish cinema and Hollywood cinema. The thesis style guides of Turkish universities and international universities as well as many relevant books published by university presses on this subject.

ARİF BURCAY YILMAZ

June, 2010

ABSTRACT

ARİF BURCAY YILMAZ

JUNE, 2010

REFLECTIONS OF NATIONALISM ON HOLLYWOOD AND TURKISH FILM INDUSTRY

This thesis is prepared with the aim of analyzing the role of both Hollywood and Turkish cinema in the construction of nationalism in American and Turkish societies. Detailed analysis of six movies, three movies from Hollywood cinema and three movies from Turkish cinema, are made. The factors that are effective in making nationalistic movies, the reasons why governments support these kinds of movies and the patriotic and nationalistic images that are used in the movies are handled.

This thesis is composed of three major chapters. Chapter One will focus on the concepts of nation, nationalism and national identity. In this chapter, meanings of nation, characteristics of national identity, theories of nationalism, and the effect of media on the construction of national identity will be studied. Chapter Two will analyze the effect of Hollywood on constructing American national identity by examining three Hollywood war movies. Finally, Chapter Three will focus on the role of Turkish cinema in the construction of Turkish nationalism by studying three Turkish movies.

Key words: Nation, national identity, nationalism, Hollywood cinema, Turkish cinema

KISA ÖZET

ARİF BURCAY YILMAZ

HAZİRAN, 2010

MİLLİYETÇİLİĞİN HOLLYWOOD VE TÜRK FİLM ENDÜSTRİSİ ÜZERİNE YANSIMALARI

Bu tez Hollywood ve Türk sinemasının, Amerikan ve Türk toplumu içinde milliyetçiliğin oluşturulması üzerindeki etkisini incelemek amacıyla hazırlanmıştır. Üçü Türk Sinemasından üçü Hollywood Sinemasından olmak üzere toplam altı film ayrıntılı olarak incelenecektir. Milliyetçi filmlerin yapımında etkili olan faktörler, hükümetlerin bu tür filmleri destekleme nedenleri ve bu tür filmlerde kullanılan milliyetçi ve patriotik imgeler ele alınacaktır.

Bu tez üç ana bölümden oluşmaktadır. Birinci bölüm millet, milli kimlik ve milliyetçilik kavramları üzerinde duracaktır. Bu bölümde millet kavramının tanımı, milli kimliğin içerikleri, temel milliyetçilik teorileri ve milli kimlik oluşturulmasında medyanın oynadığı rol incelenecektir. İkinci bölümde Hollywood sinemasının Amerikan milli kimliğinin oluşturulmasındaki etkisi üç örnek Hollywood savaş filmi üzerinden analiz edilecektir. Son olarak, üçüncü bölümde Türk sinemasının Türk milli kimliğinin oluşturulmasındaki rolü üç örnek Türk filmi üzerinden incelenecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Millet, milli kimlik, milliyetçilik, Hollywood sineması, Türk sineması

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval Page.....	iii	
Author Declarations.....	iv	
Abstract.....	v	
Kısa Özet.....	vi	
Table of Contents.....	vii	
Acknowledgements.....	ix	
Introduction.....	1	
CHAPTER 1: NATION, NATIONALISM, AND NATIONAL IDENTITY		
1.1 Definitions of ‘Nation’.....	5	
1.2 National Identity	13	
1.3 Theories of Nationalism	19	
1.3.1 Primordialism	22	
1.3.2 Perennialism	23	
1.3.3 Modernism	24	
1.3.4 Ethno-Symbolism	26	
1.4 The Effect of Media on the Formation of Nationalism	28	
CHAPTER 2: NATIONALISM IN HOLLYWOOD		32
2.1 <i>The Patriot</i>	37	
2.2 <i>Black Hawk Down</i>	46	
2.3 <i>We Were Soldiers</i>	55	

CHAPTER 3: NATIONALISM IN TURKISH CINEMA	64
3.1 <i>Tarkan, the Sword of Mars</i>	68
3.2 <i>Kara Murat against Kara Şovalye</i>	74
3.3 <i>Kurtlar Vadisi Iraq</i>	80
Conclusion	89
Bibliography	93

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express the deepest appreciation to my advisor, Professor Ali Murat Yel, who continually motivated and assisted me. Without his guidance and help, this thesis would not have been possible.

I also would like to thank Arda Özdemir for his support and tolerance during the completion of my thesis. In addition, I want to thank İskender Arslan, who always motivated me from the very beginning of this long process.

I also owe a deep gratitude to all my precious friends for supporting me from the very beginning, for believing in me, for motivating me to finish my thesis on time and for being the passionate and trusting people that they are.

I express my appreciation to my parents who have supported me in every way they could since the beginning of my education.

Lastly, but more than anybody else, I would like to thank my beloved wife, Fadime Aktürk Yılmaz, without whose love, patience, and support I would have neither begun nor finished this thesis. She endured this long process of thesis writing with me patiently, always offering her support and love and made me laugh when I needed it the most.

INTRODUCTION

REFLECTIONS OF NATIONALISM ON HOLLYWOOD AND TURKISH FILM INDUSTRY

Nation, nationalism, and national identity have recently been very popular topics and played an important role in politics, society and literature. Definitions of nation and nationalism are as various as the nations. The roots of the word 'nation' go back to the Latin word '*natio*' which means 'to be born'. In our modern world, the word 'nation' is used with a political meaning as the synonym of "people". (Zernatto, 1944: 23)

'Nation' is an indefinite term which doesn't have a single definition. Some scholars believe that there are some objective characteristics of nation, such as "ethnicity, language, religion, territory, common history, common descent or ancestry, and common culture." (Özkırıklı, 2005: 16) However, some others argue that it is unclear which characteristics are required to be named as a "nation". The most important requirement of a nation is commonly believed to be the belief and desire of members. As long as the members believe in the existence of a nation, that nation will survive.

The second group, who argue that existence of nations depends on the belief of its members, claim nationalism is dynamic concept which can be constructed and strengthened. Therefore, it is important for governments to construct national feelings among their people in order to provide the continuance of their power and unity. There are lots of ways to convey nationalistic messages to people.

One of the most effective and efficient ways to provoke nationalistic feelings among people is the language of cinema industry. Cinema is a cumulative art form which includes all art forms and which has the power to influence wide masses. Many institutions that are aware of the impact of the cinema want to make use of this power for their own benefit. This effect can comprise a process which has the ability to change the social, cultural and economical values of societies. With this power, cinema has become an important industry in the world.

The aim of this study is to look deeply into the meanings of nation, nationalism, and national identity, and the reflections of these concepts in both Hollywood and Turkish Film Industry.

Every nation has its own nationalistic movies which depict their people as very brave and heroic. Most of the nationalistic movies convey the message that their nation is very brave and fight off any enemy who challenge them. Nationalistic cinema functions as propaganda in its depictions of feelings of a strong nationalism, infusing the people with enthusiasm to defend their country when it is necessary. Another function of nationalistic movies is to form a unity and fraternity among the people of the same nation, especially at the times of chaos. They try to strengthen the dependence of the people to their nations and have people feel that they belong there.

In the first chapter, I review research on the nation, nationalism, and national identity. First, I try to make a clear definition of nation, what the origin of the word is, and what its characteristics are. I focus on the idea that we can not mention about any objective characteristics for the definition of nation, because belief of its members is important for the existence of national communities. Second, I analyze the concept of national identity, how national identity is different from other types of

identities, and what some characteristics of national identities are. Then, I have a close look at the theories of nationalism. I write about the differences between four main theories of nationalism, which are primordialism, perennialism, modernism, and ethno-symbolism. Finally, I draw attention to the role of media in the construction of nationalism. Radio, cinema, newspapers, advertisements, and all other types and products of media give us powerful elements to use in order to form and strengthen national identity.

In the second chapter, I study the reflections of nationalism on Hollywood movies. Hollywood, the American film industry, has been the centre of film industry. Hollywood movies not only have a crucial role on the configuration of American society but also lead the perception of other nations about the United States. I take a close look at three example movies from Hollywood cinema, *The Patriot* (2000), *Black Hawk Down* (2000), and *We Were Soldiers* (2000), all of which include a lot of nationalistic and patriotic images and messages, and analyzed them in order to bring light to the nationalistic elements in them. American soldiers are portrayed as brave, strong, talented, and patriotic. We are touched by their fraternity, union, and sacrifice. There is the message that American soldiers are able to fight very bravely for the sake of their country when it is necessary.

Finally, the last chapter is about the reflections of nationalism on Turkish Cinema. Nationalistic images in Turkish Cinema started after the War of Independence, especially with the support of Atatürk, who believed that nationalistic movies were very important in creating national consciousness for the next generations. Therefore, he advised the Turkish people to shoot movies about the War of Independence and the foundation of Republic. However, after his death, Turkish

nationalistic cinema was neglected. After 1960s, there was an increase in the number of nationalistic movies, especially with the *Tarkan* and *Kara Murat* series. These movies aimed to remind Turkish people how brave and patriotic their ancestors were, and how they challenged to the whole world. Both Tarkan and Kara Murat are strong characters who can fight against numerous enemy soldiers without being killed or injured. When we come to 2000s, we see that nationalistic movies are different from the earlier ones. Nationalistic movies started to be popular again in the last ten years. From “*Deli Yürek: Bumerang Cehennemi*” (2001) to *Nefes* (2009), various films which contain nationalistic images have been made. These movies are usually made as a reaction and an answer to both national and international political events. Therefore, nationalistic movies after 2000s have more political images than the earlier ones. In this chapter, I closely analyze three example movies from Turkish Cinema, *Tarkan Marsın Kılıcı* (*Tarkan, the Sword of Mars*) (1969), *Kara Murat Kara Şovalye'ye Karşı* (*Kara Murat against Kara Şovalye*) (1975), and *Kurtlar Vadisi Iraq* (2006) and explain the nationalistic images they include.

CHAPTER I

NATION, NATIONALISM AND NATIONAL IDENTITY

1.1 Definitions of “Nation”

One of the most important and effective identities in history has been the national identity. National identity derives from the reflection of the concept of nation on its members by emphasizing and reinforcing the unity which is based on idea of proceeding from the same ancestors. According to many modern social scientists, nations and nationalism started to come to stage towards the end of the 18th century and it is strongly believed to be related to the events that took place after the French Revolution. (Smith, 1995: 29) However, in some holy books of different religions, there are stories and verses which narrate that God created different nations in the early history.

For example, according to a biblical story, after Noah’s boat landed, he and his family in the boat repopulated the world. Therefore, all the people in the world spoke the same language and used the same words. One day they decided to build a high tower in order to reach up to the God and they believed that if they achieved this, people would follow and worship them. When the God saw the tower and realized that the people were proud of what they had done and behaved like a God, he got very angry with them. He wanted people to rely on Him; not on themselves. All of a sudden, he made them speak different languages. This caused the people who speak the same languages come together and form a group. They all forgot about the tower and scattered across the surface of the world in groups who could

speak the same languages. (Genesis 11:1-9) (<http://www.missionarlington.org/d/OT-2YR-5-Babel.pdf>). God said;

Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be withheld from them, which they schemed to do. Come, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech (Genesis 11:6-7)

This story is believed to be the mythical description of the beginning of the nations. God spread people around the world and divided them into nations and thus, he caused the diversity in the world.

On the other hand, in Holy Quran the thirteenth verse in Sura of Hujurat (The Inner Apartments) says that God created people from a single pair and made them into nations in order for them to know and meet each other. In this verse it is emphasized that God created each individual from the same parents, so no one is superior to another, and no nation is superior to other nations. However, they are divided into different nations and tribes so that they should know and help each other. (<http://www.kuranikerim.com/telmalili/hucurat.htm>)

“O mankind! We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes, that ye may know each other (not that ye may despise each other). Verily the most honored of you in the sight of Allah is (he who is) the most righteous of you. And Allah has full knowledge and is well acquainted (with all things). (<http://www.kuranikerim.com/english/49.html>)

When we think about the meaning of “nation”, it is as various as the diversity of nations. The roots of the word ‘nation’ go back to the Latin word ‘*natio*’ which means ‘to be born’. In ordinary speech, this word meant a group of people who were born in the same area (ed. Dieckhoff and Jaffrelot, 2005: 2). With its original meaning which implied “a native community of foreigners”, the word ‘nation’ attributed to communities of students in medieval universities. Students who came

from geographically related areas formed their own groups in order to meet their needs, such as eating their native food, speaking their native language, maintaining their native culture, and they named these groups as a ‘nation’ (Zernatto, 1944: 15).

Later the word started to be used in another context, the “ecclesiastical councils of the late Middle Ages.” There were representatives of diverse princes and emperors in these councils who debated on various topics. Different groups which shared similar ideas in the debates were also called as “nations.” This time, the word assigned not only “community of foreigners” or “students.” Since it expressed the delegates in the council, the word ‘nation’ acquired an “honorific and aristocratic meaning.” (Zernatto, 1944: 18-22)

“In the course of time, the term ‘nation’ was expanded from the below, the privileged group was increased, gained in significance.” ‘Nation’ gradually gained its modern political meaning and it is now used as the synonym of “people” (Zernatto, 1944: 23).

Today ‘nation’ is still an ambiguous term which doesn’t have a single definition. According to some scholars, there are objective elements in the definition of the nation, whilst some others argue that all attempts to agree on an objective definition of nation have failed. Some of the objective elements which are commonly used to define “nation” are “ethnicity, language, religion, territory, common history, common descent or ancestry, and common culture.” (Özkırmılı, 2005: 16) Umut Özkırmılı quotes Joseph Stalin’s definition of nation as one of the most famous definitions based on the objective elements”: “A nation is a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.”

Moreover, Anthony Smith defines nation as a “named human population sharing a historic territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members” (Smith, 1991: 14). Furthermore, Montserrat Guibernau writes that a nation is “a human group conscious of forming a community, sharing a common culture, attached to a clearly demarcated territory, having a common past and a common project for the future and claiming the right to rule itself.” (Guibernau, 1996: 243)

Some other scholars, such as David Miller, Yael Tamir, Ernest Renan, and Benedict Anderson, on the other hand, believe that it is not clear which characteristics a group of people need in order to be named as a “nation”. They believe that the objective characteristics of a nation, such as territory, myths, common memories or common culture, are not enough to constitute a nation as some scholars argue. They emphasize that the most important characteristics to form a nation are belief and “present day approval” of members. According to them, nation is something created and it is strongly related to feelings and belief. For example, David Miller, one of the most cited scholars on nationalism, argue that these objective characteristics will be important for a nation only if the members of that nation believe in their significance. For example, French will be a significant characteristic of their nation only if the French believe the importance and role of their language as a unifying element of their nation.

National communities are constituted by belief: a nationality exists when its members believe that; it does. It is not a question of a group of people sharing some common attribute such as race or language. These features do not to themselves make nations, and only become important insofar as a particular nationality takes as one of its defining features that its members speak French or have black skins. (Miller, 2000: 28)

Yael Tamir is another academian who mentions the importance of having the common feelings of fraternity and belief in common ancestry in order to make up a nation. She argues that they not only share these feelings and beliefs but also they try to preserve the existence of their community and form a secure place where they can carry out their culture.

A nation, then, may be defined as a community whose members share feelings of fraternity, substantial distinctiveness, and exclusivity, as well as beliefs in a common ancestry and a continuous genealogy. Members of such a community are aware not only that they share these feelings and beliefs but they have an active interest in the preservation and well-being of their community. They thus seek to secure for themselves a public sphere where they can express their identity, practice their culture, and educate their young. (Tamir, 1995: 424)

Moreover, Ernest Renan, the famous French philosopher, also rejects the objective elements that define “nation” and he thinks that a nation can only exist by the desire of the people to live together. He asks in his famous lecture at the Sorbonne, Paris in 1882 entitled “Qu’est-ce qu’une nation?” (“What is a Nation?”):

How is it that Switzerland, which has three languages, two religions, and three or four races, is a nation, when Tuscany, which is so homogeneous, is not one? ... In what ways does the principle of nationality differ from that of races? ... France is [at once] Celtic, Iberic, and Germanic... The United States and England, Latin America and Spain, speak the same languages yet do not form single nations. Conversely, Switzerland, so well made, since she was made with the consent of her different parts, numbers three or four languages. (Renan, 2003: 12-14-16)

Renan doesn't accept the objective characteristics in the definition of nation and he stresses the importance of some subjective elements. He avers that a nation is something about feelings and he extends the topic by emphasizing the importance of both the present and the past for this feeling to be constituted. He

writes that a nation is “a soul, a spiritual principle” and “the existence of a nation is a plebiscite of every day, as the existence of the individual is a perpetual affirmation of life, but it is a plebiscite on whether or not to maintain an existing inheritance.”(Renan, 2003: 19) He goes on by arguing that present day approval and desire to live together are as important as the common memories of the same ancestry and territory for the existence of this soul. And out of all these requirements, he puts the most emphasize on the common ancestry, brave people from a heroic past and glory.

A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle. Two things, which in truth are but one, constitute this soul or spiritual principle. One lies in the past, one in the present. One is the possession in common of a rich legacy of memories; the other is present-day consent, the desire to live together, the will to perpetuate the value of the heritage that one has received in an undivided form.... The nation, like the individual, is the culmination of a long past of endeavors, sacrifice, and devotion. Of all cults, that of the ancestors is the most legitimate, for the ancestors have made us what we are. A heroic past, great men, glory (by which I understand genuine glory), this is the social capital upon which one bases a national idea (Renan, 2003: 19).

In summary, objective characteristics, such as ethnicity, language, religion, common history, ancestry, and culture are not enough to constitute a nation. A heroic past, great leaders and glory are necessary characteristics. He emphasizes the importance “to have common glories in the past and to have a common will in the present; to have performed great deeds together, to wish to perform still more” as the essential conditions for being a nation. (Renan, 2003: 19)

Another important characteristic of nations, according to Renan, is forgetting. He argues that members of nations have forgotten many things which are likely to

eliminate their nationalistic feelings and sentiments so that they can form a unity and collective consciousness.

...the essence of a nation is that all individuals have many things in common; and also that they have forgotten many things. No French citizen knows whether he is a Burgundian, an Alan, a Taifale, or a Visigoth, yet every French citizen has to have forgotten the massacre of Saint Bartholomew,' or the massacres that took place in the Midi in the thirteenth century. (Renan, 2003: 19)

Moreover, David Miller compares nations with teams and he gives the example of England cricket team. He argues that in fact, it is not really a team, they are only a group of individuals, but we call them a team because they act together. "Nations are like teams in this respect", Miller states. (Miller, 1995: 18)

One of the most effective names who pioneered theories of nationalism is Benedict Anderson. Anderson gives us modernist definitions of "nation", "national identity" and "nationalism" and he writes about the basic characteristics which contributes the formation of nations in his most famous work, *Imagined Communities*. He proposes his very famous definition of "nation" in this book as "an imagined political community and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign" (Anderson, 1983: 6).

First of all, Anderson suggests that a nation is an imagined community because the members of even the smallest nation will never be able to meet and see each other. However, he argues, they "imagine" that they share the same feelings and belief and constitute a nation in their imagination. As they can not know and understand the feelings and ideas of each others, he avers every community which is larger than an early village where people can have a face-to-face interaction is imagined. And people name these imagined communities as nations.

It is *imagined* because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion (Anderson, 1983: 6).

Secondly, Anderson claims that a nation is imagined as limited because even the largest nations are restricted. They have borders beyond which there are other nations. He believes that even the most messianic nations do not think of a day when everyone around the world gathers in their nation, because the existence of nation depends on the existence of other nations as identity is something constructed against others. Therefore, nations are imagined as limited.

The nation is imagined as *limited* because even the largest of them encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic boundaries, beyond which lie other nations. No nation imagines itself coterminous with mankind. The most messianic nationalists do not dream of a day when all the members of the human race will join their nation in the way that it was possible, in certain epochs, for, say, Christians to dream of a wholly Christian planet (Anderson, 1983: 7).

Moreover, Anderson argues that the nation is sovereign, because the concept was born during the Enlightenment and Revolution when the power of monarchical kingdoms and religions started to decrease.

It is imagined as *sovereign* because the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm. Coming to maturity at a stage of human history when even the most devout adherents of any universal religion were inescapably confronted with the living pluralism of such religions, and the allomorphism between each faith's ontological claims and territorial stretch, nations dream of being free, and, if under God, directly so. The gage and emblem of this freedom is the sovereign state (Anderson, 1983: 7).

Finally, Anderson writes, a nation is imagined as community. Although there may be some “inequalities and exploitations”, a nation can not be thought without fraternity and friendship. Furthermore, Anderson believes that only this fraternity and friendship can explain the willingness of people to die for their nations.

Finally, it is imagined as a *community*, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings (Anderson, 1983: 7).

1.2 National Identity

Identity is an individual's or a group's perception of themselves. Samuel P. Huntington describes identity as “a product of self-consciousness, that I or we possess distinct qualities as an entity that differentiates me from you and us from them.” (Huntington, 2004: 21) Identities are significant in determining the roles and behavior of people. There are many types of identities and each one is very difficult to define. Moreover, it is impossible to avoid identities. As Huntington quotes from Erik Erikson “the concept of identity is as indispensable as it is unclear. It is manifold, hard to define and evades many ordinary methods of measurement.” And also as he quotes Leon Wieseltier; “Identity, it appears, is like sin: however much we may oppose it, we cannot escape it.” (qtd. in Huntington, 2004: 21)

Huntington goes on by underlining some key points concerning identities. First of all; he indicates that every individual and group has identities. However, individuals “find and redefine their identities in groups.” He argues “the need for identity leads individuals even to seek identity in an arbitrarily and randomly

constructed group.” An individual may join more than one group and can change groups, thus identities. However, group identity can not be changed easily. Second, Huntington avers that people construct and define their own identities “under varying degrees of pressure, inducements and freedom”, except from ancestry, gender and age. Third, although identities are self-defined, they are constructed as a result of the interaction between self and others. “How others perceive an individual or group affects the self-definition of that individual or group.” Finally, both individual and group identities are multiple, such as “ascriptive, territorial, economic, cultural, political, social, and national” identities (Huntington, 2004: 22)

Anthony Smith defines the basic characteristics of national identity as follows:

1. an historic territory or homeland
2. common myths and historical memories
3. a common, mass public culture
4. common legal rights and duties for all members
5. a common economy with territorial mobility members (Smith, 1991: 14)

David Miller also examines the features of national identity. According to Miller, on the other hand, a national identity “is constituted by shared belief and mutual commitment, extended in history, active in character, connected to a particular territory, and marked off from other communities by its distinct public culture.” And all these five elements differentiate national identity from other identities. (Miller, 1995: 27)

In *Encyclopedia of Nationalism*, national identity is defined on the basis of a “common territory, a common language or culture, a common religion, a common history, a common will, and shared political and legal principles” (Motyl, 2001:

360). National identity can be defined in either 'civic' or 'ethnic' terms. When it is defined in civic terms, nationality is connected to 'citizenship' and has a 'political' and 'legal' meaning. This type of national identity can put up and assimilate new members from other cultures. For example, one can subsequently become an American, English or Turkish. The borders of national identity are open and people are able to choose their nationalities. However, when it is defined in ethnic terms, national identity comes from birth and it can not be chosen or changed. All individuals of the nation derive their most necessary identity from this membership. (Motyl, 2001: 360) Moreover, Lloyd Kramer defines national identity as "a socially constructed and continuous process of defining 'friend' and 'enemy'" He continues; "national identities ... do not depend on the existence of any objective linguistic or cultural differentiation but on the subjective experience of difference." (Kramer, 1997: 526) For Gellner, furthermore, national identity is simply the identification of citizens with a public, urban high culture. (Gellner, 1983: 129)

According to many scholars, out of all these multiple identities, national identity provides the most persuasive identity in the modern world. Anthony Smith, for example, believes that national identity is perhaps the most fundamental and inclusive identity among all other identities, because nations constitute the source of all present political regimes. Moreover, national identity is important for individuals because as Smith believes it supplies people with the ability to 'define and locate' themselves in the world because it is by the help of a 'unique and shared culture' that we are able to know who we are in our modern world. (Smith, 1991: 16) And he asks the reasons why national identity and nationalism have become so primary and popular in the modern world. First, he thinks, it is because of their "ubiquity." They

are global and they exist everywhere; in other words, they are “pervasive” and “pervade the life of individuals and communities in most spheres of activity.”

If any phenomena are truly global, then it must be the nation and nationalism. There is scarcely an area of the world that has not been marked by ethnic and national conflicts or witnessed the rise of movements claiming national independence for their chosen populations. ... In the cultural sphere national identity is revealed in a whole range of assumptions and myths, values and memories, as well as in language, law, institutions and ceremonies. Socially, the national bond provides the most inclusive community, the generally accepted boundary within which social intercourse normally takes place, and the limit for distinguishing the 'outsider'. The nation may also be seen as the basic unit of moral economy, in terms both of territory and of resources and skills. (Smith, 1991: 143-144)

In our modern world, it is obvious that national identities have invaded every part of our lives. They have various influences on a wide range of spheres, such as, cultural, social and economic spheres; therefore, national identity “has become the only recognized source of 'international' legitimacy, of the validity of a system of states in each region and continent, and ultimately in the world as a whole.” (Smith, 1991: 144)

Another reason why national identity has become so primary and popular in the modern world is that, Smith indicates, “there is the sheer complexity and variety of the ‘nation’ and ‘national identity.’” Today some historians believe that the concept of national identity was exaggerated by some earlier scholars and they try to restrain the range of nationalism. He criticizes these historians and avers that national identity shouldn't be regarded as “conceptual refugees”, and the complexity of national identity shouldn't be condemned.

The point that is often missed is that national aspirations tend to combine with other non-national economic, social or political issues, and the power of the movement often derives from this combination. It is not that nationalism feeds on other 'rational' issues and interests, as is sometimes assumed. Rather, neglected, oppressed or marginalized ethnic communities or categories fuse their national grievances and aspirations with other non-national aspirations and grievances; so that at a particular point in time there is often a single set of interests being pursued by a given population, which we divide for analytic purposes into 'national' and 'non-national' categories, to isolate the 'national factor.' (Smith, 1991: 145)

Moreover, Anderson points to the strength and importance of national identity by attracting attention to the desire to die for one's country because people feel that their nation is their common destiny. He argues that "dying for one's country, which usually one does not choose," is a kind of nobility which "dying for the Labour Party, the American Medical Association, or perhaps even Amnesty International" can not rival because people can join and leave these bodies easily when they wish. (Anderson, 1983: 144) Yael Tamir agrees with Anderson and she also thinks that national identity is superior to other identities, for members of nation, unlike members of a gender, class or region, are able to locate themselves both in the world where they live and "in an uninterrupted chain of being." National identity encourages fraternity and union among the "fellow members and across generations." (Tamir, 1995: 432)

After she emphasizes that national identity has more strength than other identities, Tamir goes on by describing the reasons why national identity is so powerful in her article. First of all, she acknowledges; national identity guarantees its members 'redemption' from personal unconsciousness. She advocates her idea with a statement of Smith, and quotes "identification with the nation is the surest way to

surmount the finality of death and ensure a measure of personal immortality.” (qtd. in Tamir, 1995: 433). Tamir acknowledges that “as long as the nation endures, it will show gratitude to all who struggle and sacrifice their lives for its survival. It will turn them into heroes; perhaps canonize them, even if they come from vile or ignoble background.” (Tamir, 1995: 433)

Second, national identity is significant because membership in a national identity provides individuals hope of intimate awakening through national renewal. Personal status and self-confidence of members of a national identity is a sign of the circumstance of their nation. When a nation is in a bad condition, the members lack self-confidence; when the nation prospers, self-esteem of the members develops (Tamir, 1995: 434). She elaborates;

The continuous existence of the nation provides individuals with a glorious past they can admire and a no less glorious future they can aspire to share. Pride in the past and hope for the future give them power to cope with their present humiliation and fight for the nation’s redemption. (Tamir, 1995: 434)

Next, being a member of a nation provides people with the ability to avoid “alienation, solitude, and anonymity.” As a national identity constitutes a fellowship among its members, it gives people the feeling that ‘they are not alone, they are cared for and they have someone to care for.’ Here, caring has the meaning that all members are an organic part of a natural social body which is both primordial and perpetual. (Tamir, 1995: 434)

Finally, national identity guarantees that all members have an equal status. “When the term nation came to refer to the populace at large rather than to the elite only, it allowed each member of the people to feel that he or she partook of a

superior elite quality.” Hence, being a member of a national identity has an inspiring effect. By the help of national identity, class and status differences were ignored and national population is regarded as homogenous. She expands her ideas by quoting Greenfeld and emphasizes that democracy and nationalism are terms which are strongly related with each other.

Democracy was born with the sense of nationality, the two are inherently linked, and neither can be fully understood apart from this connection. Nationalism was the form in which democracy appeared in the world, contained in the idea of the nation as a butterfly in a cocoon. (qtd. in Tamir, 1995: 435)

1.3 Theories of Nationalism

A single red line crosses over the history of the modern world “from the fall of the Bastille to the fall of the Berlin Wall.” This line appears in sixteenth and seventeenth century in England and Holland, it flourishes in late eighteenth century in France and America. It divides lands and peoples, it broadens the length of “Central and Latin America, pushes across southern, central, eastern, then northern Europe into Russia, India and the Far East, and then winds its way in many guises into the Middle East, Africa and Australasia.” Finally, the red line fades, and gets weaker. The name of this red line is “nationalism.” (Smith, 1998: 1) Smith defines nationalism in this way in the introduction of his book *Nationalism and Modernism*. Although nationalism has been popular for at least two centuries, which is, in fact long enough for it to be understood and defined, it is still confusing. There is still a conflict about the definition of the term and when exactly it originated. (Anderson, 1996: 1) Timothy Baycroft argues that nationalism reached its peak at the end of the eighteenth century. He writes; “it wouldn’t be an exaggeration to say that the history

of Europe from 1789 to 1945 is synonymous with the history of the growth and development of modern nations.” (Baycroft, 1998: 3)

There are various definitions of nationalism. In fact, Paul Zawadzki is afraid that the term ‘nationalism’ has the risk of no longer meaning anything because it refers to many phenomena. (Zawadzki, 2005: 165) For example, Hans Kohn thinks that nationalism is an idea “which fills men’s brain and heart with new thoughts and sentiments, and drives him to translate his consciousness into deeds of organized action.” (Kohn, 2000: 64) For Katherine Verdery, nationalism is “the political utilization of the symbol nation through discourse and political activity, as well as the sentiment that draws people into responding to this symbol’s use.” (Verdery, 1996: 227) Dieckhoff and Jaffrelot writes that nationalism is an “explicitly articulated devotion to the nation” (Dieckhoff and Jaffrelot, 2005: 3); moreover, Eric Hobsbawm acknowledges that nationalism is a political programme which “holds that groups defined as ‘nations’ have the right to form territorial states.” (Hobsbawm, 1996: 256) Therefore, Jyoti Puri argues, it is easier to consider things that can be connected with nationalism, such as flags, wars, passports, place of birth or belonging, than it is to limit nationalism with a specific definition. (Puri, 2004: 2)

Moreover, Umut Özkırımlı argues that there are four different ways in which nationalism operates. First of all, he attributes, nationalism divides the world into “us” and “them”. It is an exclusive discourse and it forms two sides like “friends” and “enemies.” (Özkırımlı, 2005: 32) For the survival and unity of a nation, having a common “enemy” and defining the “other” are important. Kramer also defines nationalism as a socially “constructed and continuous process of defining ‘friend’ and ‘enemy’.” (Kramer, 1997: 526) Second, Özkırımlı argues, nationalism homogenizes.

Nationalist discourse is about power and authority and it legitimizes and produces hierarchies; therefore it “authorizes particular formulations of the nation against others.” Third, “nationalism naturalizes itself”. National values aren’t regarded as social values because they are usually taken for granted. Therefore, they look like natural. And finally, nationalism “operates through institutions.” Nationalism doesn’t exist in “a social vacuum” and it is “produced and imposed by a whole gamut of institutions.” (Özkırımlı, 2005: 33)

On the other hand, John Breuilly distinguishes three different functions which nationalist ideas can perform: ‘coordination’, ‘mobilization’, and ‘legitimacy’. By ‘*coordination*’ he means that ‘nationalist ideas are used to promote the idea of common interests amongst a number of elites which otherwise have rather distinct interests in opposing the existing state’. By ‘*mobilization*’ he means ‘the use of nationalist ideas to generate support for the political movement from broad groups hitherto excluded from the political process.’ And by ‘*legitimacy*’ he means ‘the use of nationalist ideas to justify the goals of the political movement both to the state it opposes and also to powerful external agents, such as foreign states and their public opinions.’ (Breuilly, 1996: 166-7)

Eric Hobsbawm classifies three stages in which nationalism developed. The first stage is between the French Revolution and 1918. This period is the time when nationalism was born and gained a growth. There are, Hobsbawm argues, two types of nationalism in this period. One is the nationalism of ‘great nations’ which were affected by the ideals of French Revolution, and the other is the nationalism of the ‘small nations’ which were trying to gain independence against the empires. (1990: 109) Second stage is the period from 1918 to 1950. Hobsbawm calls this period as

‘the apogee of nationalism’, which was the result of two unplanned developments: “the collapse of the great multinational empires of central and eastern Europe and the Russian Revolution which made it desirable for the Allies to play the Wilsonian card against the Bolshevik card.” (1990: 131) And the final stage of nationalism is the late twentieth century. He argues that nationalism in this period is different from the earlier periods, because nationalisms in this period are “unificatory as well as emancipatory” and “a central fact of historical transformation.” (1990: 169-170)

Ideas about the origins of nationalism and when it emerged are as various as the definitions of nationalism. Many scholars can not agree whether nations and nationalism are modern phenomena. The attempts to resolve this conflict have paved the way for the foundations of the most basic theories on nationalism. There are mainly four different theories of nationalism; primordialism, perennialism, modernism, and ethno-symbolism.

1.3.1 Primordialism

The earliest theory of nations and nationalism is the primordialism. It refers to the approach which advocates that nationality is a natural part of people, such as speech, sight, or smell. Primordialists believe that nations have always existed since the beginning of time. The term comes from the English word primordial which means “existing at the beginning of time or the beginning of the Earth.” (<http://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary>) Özkırımlı argues that Edward Shils used this term for the first time in his famous article and he wrote that the strength of the connection that an individual feels for his/her family members doesn’t result from the interaction or relation, but from “a certain ineffable significance ... attributed to

the tie of blood. (Özkırmılı, 2000: 65) Özkırmılı notes that many other scholars were influenced by this primordial relationship. And he quotes a similar definition of primordialism as a theory of nationalism:

By a primordial attachment is meant one that stems from the ‘givens’- or, more precisely, as culture is inevitably involved in such matters, the assumed ‘givens’- of social existence: immediate contiguity and kin connection mainly, but beyond them the givenness that stems from being born into a particular religious community, speaking a particular language, or even a dialect of a language, and following particular social practices. These congruities of blood, speech, custom, and so on, are seen to have an ineffable, and at times overpowering, coerciveness in and of themselves. (qtd. in Özkırmılı, 2000: 65)

Philip Spencer and Howard Wollman suggest that, according to primordialists, nationalism has deep roots in society. Biology, psychology, and culture may all agree on the idea that nations are “an ancient, necessary and perhaps natural part of social organization, an organic presence whose origins go back to the mists (or myths) of time.” (Spencer and Wollman, 2002: 27) Primordialists are trying to understand why people are so attached to their nations and why they sacrifice themselves so easily for the sake of their nationalities by attributing these nationalistic sentiments to primordial social and cultural phenomena such as “language, religion, territory, and especially kinship.” (Smith, 1998: 223)

1.3.2 Perennialism

Perennialists advocate the constant or continually persistent characteristic of nationalism throughout human history (Smith, 1998: 22). Perennialists do not maintain that ethnic communities and nations are natural; they exist in every

continent and every period of history. They are “perennial and immemorial”, but not “primordial and natural.” (Hutchinson and Smith, 2000: xxvii)

Adam Smith praises perennialism in his book *Nationalism and Modernism* in terms of having contributed to our understanding of the “functions of language and ethnic ties, and the power of myths of origin and familial metaphors, in rousing popular support for nationalism.” (Smith, 1998: 223) Perennialists believe that the nation is ‘rooted’ in place, time and a historic homeland. It is a popular or common community and it reflects their necessities and goals. Therefore, they believe that belonging to a nation means to have certain traits. Nations have a single will and character. (Smith, 1998: 22)

Smith divides perennialism into two versions in the Introduction of the book *Nationalism* which he edited with Hutchinson. First one is called continuous perennialism which supports that nations are immemorial and their roots go back to pre-modern periods. The second one is called the “recurrent perennialism.” It is less concerned with the antiquity of nations and more concerned with the circular recurrence of nations in general. Nations are ‘ubiquitous’ and ‘perennial’, but their members always flourish and disappear, in every period and continent. (Hutchinson and Smith, 2000: xxviii)

1.3.3 Modernism

Modernism, according to Özkırımlı, came out as a reaction to the primordialists who accepted the main statements of the nationalist theory. (Özkırımlı, 2000: 85) However, it is undeniable that, many of the most famous and cited scholars of nationalist theory today believe nations and nationalism are recent and novel

terms. Most of them, argue that nations and nationalism were unknown in pre-modern periods and they emerged as a result of some social, political and economic changes of the last few centuries, which are caused by the rise and development of “industrial capitalism, imperialism, the French and American Revolutions, and the modern bureaucratic state.” (Puri, 2004: 45)

In comparison to primordialists and perennialists, modernists believe that nationalisms and nations are not natural phenomena, but they are historical. They argue that nations are modern because they have recently emerged in history. Thus, they think there are significant differences between nations and pre-modern ethnic groups. However, primordialists and perennialists fail to see these differences. Jyoti Puri avers that the influence of nationalism is strengthened “through the modern state, social and political elites, and civil institutions.” However, participation of the people is also required. Therefore, modernist theories are expected to see nations and nationalisms as “forms of power but not simply as ideological instruments in the hands of social elites.” (Puri, 2004: 45)

For the modernists, the nation is a local community of legally equal citizens in a particular territory. They believe that nations are constructions. They are intentionally created and constructed by their members, especially by elites in order to manage the sentiments of the masses to achieve their goals. Hence, nations mean possessing certain resources. Moreover, according to modernist theories, nations are divided into some social groups such as regional, class, gender, religious, etc. and each of these groups has its own interests and necessities. (Smith, 1998: 23)

Anthony Smith writes that there are some assumptions that the modernists made about nations and nationalism. First and the most important one is that,

according to modernist theory, nations are ‘real sociological communities’. A nation is composed of ‘discrete populations, a given territory, a distinct set of institutions and roles, and parallel, but unique, cultures.’ Therefore, the nation is a ‘specific kind of sociological community, on whose behalf leaders could mobilize its population to make sacrifices, including the ultimate sacrifice.’ Second, they believe that nations and nationalism are historically rooted in terms of both ‘temporal sequence’ and in ‘geo-cultural terms.’ Nations might not have ‘ethnic navels’, but they have to possess some characteristics which differentiate a population from others. Finally, according to modernists nations are communities of ‘action and purpose.’ They think that nationalism is the ideology of ‘dynamic collective effort and sacrifice on behalf of the nation’. (Smith, 2009: 7) In summary, according to modernist theories, ‘sociological realism, historical embeddedness, collective political action’ are the fundamental characteristics of modernist theories of nationalism.

1.3.4 Ethno-Symbolism

Ethno-symbolism is an approach which stands between primordialism, perennialism and modernism. Ethno-symbolists blame modernists for underestimating the importance of the myths, symbols, values, customs and memories of pre-modern ethnic communities on the formation of modern nations. (Smith, 2009: 25) For ethno-symbolists it is impossible to understand the characteristics of modern nations without analyzing the myths, cultures, traditions, and values of pre-modern ethnic communities. They accept that nationalism is a modern concept; however, nations are older than nationalism. Nations take their roots from the pre-modern ethnic communities although they have significant

differences. Moreover, ethno-symbolists emphasize the ways in which “symbols, myths, memories, values and traditions structure communities and maintain social solidarity and social boundaries.” These are the long-term components which preserve identities. They provide the normative characteristics of pre-modern ethnic structures, and also the origins and sources of modern nations. (Hutchinson and Smith, 2000: xxxvi)

Adam Smith indicates some reasons why ethno-symbolists emphasize the importance of the customs and values of pre-modern ethnic communities on the emergence of modern nations. First of all, these elements have always played, and continue to play, a significant role in determining social structures and cultures. By these means, “they have ensured a degree of common consciousness, if not cohesion, even in periods of crisis and rapid change, and even when some of the preceding myths, symbols and traditions have been amended or rejected, as occurred during the French, Russian and Chinese Revolutions.” Second, these cultural elements have provided each community with a unique symbolic repertoire in terms of “language, religion, customs and institutions”, and they help to differentiate one community from others “in the eyes of both its members and outsiders.” Moreover, they have demarcated the social boundaries, defined the community and divide ‘us’ from ‘them’, ‘friend’ from ‘enemy’. And finally, common values, memories, cultures and traditions have given a sense of “continuity with past generations of the community” a feeling that is strengthened by the general acceptance of collective symbols such as “the flag, anthem or national holiday whose meanings may change over time but whose forms remain relatively fixed.” (Smith, 2009: 25)

Therefore, ethno- symbolist theories propose a different definition of nation from the other approaches. They define nation as “a named and self-defining human community whose members cultivate shared memories, symbols, myths, traditions and values, inhabit and are attached to historic territories” or “homelands”, create and disseminate a distinctive public culture, and observe shared customs and standardized laws.” (Smith, 2009: 29)

1.4 The Effect of Media on the Formation of Nationalism

The relation between the attempts of government policy makers to guide and manage people and the media has always been significant. Radio, cinema, newspapers, advertisements, and all other types and products of media give us powerful elements to use in order to form and strengthen our identities such as gender, ethic, class, cultural and, of course, national. With the effect of media images, we decide how to behave, how to dress, what to eat, or how to react to certain events. They not only entertain us but also try to educate and guide us in certain ways. Kellner argues:

Radio, television, film, and the other products of media culture provide materials out of which we forge our very identities; our sense of selfhood; our notion of what it means to be male or female; our sense of class, of ethnicity and race, of nationality, of sexuality; and of "us" and "them." Media images help shape our view of the world and our deepest values: what we consider good or bad, positive or negative, moral or evil. Media stories provide the symbols, myths, and resources through which we constitute a common culture and through the appropriation of which we insert ourselves into this culture. (Kellner: 1)

If we consider how much media images have penetrated into our lives, it will be easier to understand how much we can be affected by them. National identity is

perhaps one of the most important targets of media to shape and to provide continuance. In order to form a unity among their people, and in order to sharpen the ideas of “us” and “them”, forms of media, especially cinema, are the most effective ally of the governments and play a vital role.

In fact, the origins of nationalism and national identity are believed to be related to the reporting of some widely accepted and believed stories and events about a nation which develop national sentiments. According to Benedict Anderson these feelings were first shaped after the ‘emergence of print capitalism in the late 18th and early 19th centuries.’ After printing technology made it possible to copy newspapers and books, millions of people began to imagine themselves as a part of a community. A lot of stories about the celebrated history of nations were illustrated and the present day events were reported in the newspapers. Newspapers “made it possible for rapidly growing numbers of people to think about themselves, and relate themselves to others, in profoundly new ways” (Anderson, 1983: 36). And he stresses the role that print technology and language played in the creation of modern nations:

...the convergence of capitalism and print technology on the fatal diversity of human language created the possibility of a new form of imagined community, which in its basic morphology set the stage for the modern nation (Anderson, 1983: 46).

Lloyd Kramer agrees with Anderson and he emphasizes the importance of print technology and argues that books and newspapers made it possible for millions of people to see themselves as part of the same community because they are informed about each other and get in touch with the other members.

This imaginative act of identification depended from the beginning on new cultural institutions, because the dispersed people in these societies would never meet, never see most of the places in which their "imagined" compatriots lived, and never know anything about the millions of individuals whom they envisioned as their community (Kramer, 1997: 529).

The emergence of print media played an important role in developing feelings of fraternity and unity among people. However, today, TV, internet and cinema have taken the place of print media as they appeal to numerous people from every age, class, gender, and education level. For example, cinema sometimes takes us to the places where we have never been, introduces us with the people who we have never met, and illustrates some important historical events that we haven't experienced; therefore, it is one of the most effective and fascinating forms of media. While doing all these things, movies are affected by the cultures, myths, values, and traditions of the nations where they emerge and they are released to the world carrying all these subjective elements. Therefore, movies, intentionally or not, affect both the national and international audience. Sometimes they try to lead and educate the national audience, but sometimes they are used as a means of propaganda and they try to impose their own cultures to international audience.

Group identities, individual identities, public identities, private identities, gendered identities, sexual identities, national identities, subclass identities, hero/villain identities, and Otherness all emerged as lively vectors increasingly problematising the construction and interpretation of identities and ideologies within cinema. (Cheung and Fleming, 2009: 6)

Cinema, without doubt, has a vital role in forming national identity and feelings of nationalism among the people. Making movies about their glorious past, common victories and failures, illustrating the character of the "enemy" and in this

way identifying the enemy of the nation constructs a collective consciousness among the people and help to form national identity. Ruby Cheung and D. H. Fleming argue:

The growing popularity of cinema as a mass entertainment highlighted beyond doubt its power to communicate and project powerful (and programmatic) images and ideas to large numbers of people. During the early twentieth century as narrative cinema became ever more popular, films ... were increasingly found to project ideologically sound images that displayed and relayed how someone of a certain nationality... should behave, act and be perceived (both at home and abroad). (Cheung and Fleming, 2009: 4)

CHAPTER II

NATIONALISM IN HOLLYWOOD

In our global world producing knowledge is a means of being powerful; therefore, controlling the communication sources for the purpose of producing knowledge becomes more crucial. In this respect, cinema is very important because it is an international way of communication:

From its inception, the motion picture has, by its very nature, been an important medium in international communication. By making meaning explicit in pictures, the film transcends barriers of language, and can be understood by people everywhere. The film has also, since its earliest days, provided a means for familiarizing people with the sights as well as the customs and living conditions that exist in parts of the world far distant from their own (Jones, 1957: 362).

With its naturalistic mode of expression cinema assumes the role of representation which gives it the power of determining how people perceive their own country and other societies. Therefore, countries have always been sensitive to cinematic portrayals of their countries but America has a special place among other countries in terms of this sensitiveness. Since the 1920s, the American film industry has made more money every year than that of any other country. (wikipedia)

Cinema has always been very important in America's political and economical history. By constituting an ideal of nation and meaning of America, Hollywood films have been a powerful force in popular culture because "it is public debate that gives the nation meaning, and media systems with a particular geographical reach that give it shape. Those who inhabit nations with a strong sense of self-identity are encouraged to imagine themselves as members of a coherent,

organic community” (Higson, 2005: 58). In this respect, cinema, as an apparatus of mass communication, makes people reimagine themselves as a part of value-sharing collectivity experiencing nationhood so the depiction of national identity is still a vital feature in contemporary films, and many Hollywood films are concentrated on the superiority of the West over the East, and especially encouraging American nationalism which is achieved mostly by presenting war in the movies. The importance of war in constituting American nationalism is stated in these words:

America, as Geoffrey Perret puts it, is “a country made by war.” “War” in American history, he argues, “is a factor as important as geography, immigration, the growth of business, the separation of powers, the inventiveness of its people, or anything else that contributes strongly to its unique identity among the nations of the Earth.” If war is this important to the creation of American culture and its perception of American’s uniqueness and its cult of endless victories, then Hollywood’s war stories take on added significance since almost all that Americans knew about war, up to Vietnam, the first “television war”-came from the movies. (Wetta, and Novelli, 2003: 862-863)

The Rambo series is an important example of the movies glorifying the American nationalism by war. Although America was not successful in Vietnam, this movie was successful in erasing its failure in the cinema. With the first film of the Rambo series, Rambo is presented as a brave soldier and a hero who returned from Vietnam War. When he goes back to save the Vietnam soldiers, the Soviet Union is shown as helping the enemy and Hollywood gives the message that a soldier like Rambo can cope with the whole Soviet Union. The Rambo series were watched by soldiers in the American army, and thus they were given the nationalistic message that they were all supposed to be Rambos.

American government has used Hollywood movies during and after their important wars, especially World War II because national unity was very important at these times, and the movies were expected to present national unity, therefore; the OWI's Bureau of Motion Pictures asked Hollywood industry to depict a united and harmonized image of America, with laborers and managers, blacks and whites, men and women in a harmonized way and away from distinction (Limerick, 1988: 473). As a result of this co-operation whenever it is needed American army forces are ready to help Hollywood.

In addition to promoting American nationalism, cinema is also a way of introducing America to the world. Hollywood introduced America to the world and presented its messages through Hollywood, and especially since WWII, most American film producers was aware of the fact that movies has an important role of introducing the United States to the world and this fact gave an important responsibility in the selection and depiction of subjects in American movies. During World War II American military propoganda was practiced in the movies since Hollywood directors went to work for the government and injected a sense of drama into documentary formats (Springer, 1986: 151). "Hollywood knows that it must play its role in creating the world of tomorrow by combining fact and fiction, Hollywood has produced many dramatically powerful movies to vivify the war for the American people" (Wetta, and Novelli, 2003: 862).

Great Britain was also aware of the American policy of film-making, and they thought that American movies posed a profound threat to their empire because American government advertised themselves, their country and their policies.

America was trying to convey the message that America was the only country which had a real importance for the world:

There is evidence that by the middle 1920's Great Britain looked upon the American film as a serious threat to the empire. Lord Newton, speaking in the House of Lords stated: The Americans realized almost instantaneously that the cinema was a heaven-sent method of advertising themselves, their country, their methods, their wares, their ideas and even their language, and they had seized on it as a method of persuading the whole world that America was really the only country that counted (Jones, 1957: 364).

Britain also knew that America was successful in creating a common consciousness through Hollywood. The first role of film producers has been to unite American people and promote their feelings of fraternity and comradeship. They also tried to increase the morale of the people especially after the attack on Pearl Harbor. The second role of Hollywood industry has been to propagate their deeds and to justify their policies all around the world.

Hollywood always creates new enemies to unite its people and serves as an important weapon of American government. To give the example of WWII, for those at home Hollywood served as a connection to the war and almost half of the American population went to the movies at least once a week during the war (Sheppard, 2001: 307). Being aware of this power, Hollywood builds nationalism whenever it is needed, and its subjects in movies has direct connection to the American strategy of propaganda as it can be seen in the statistics regarding the movies made on the Japanese:

From shortly after the entrance of the United States into the war in late 1941 to the end of the American occupation of Japan in 1952, Hollywood produced a large number of films offering negative depictions of the Japanese. The Japanese had been relatively ignored in American film in the 1930s. From 1931 to 1940, approximately

twenty-five films dealt with Japan or with Japanese characters, and eight of these formed the "Mr. Moto" detective series, which actually had little to do with Japan. In contrast, approximately twenty-five anti-Japanese feature films were released in the United States in 1942 alone...Following Japan's surrender; no anti-Japanese films were produced for almost three years (Shephard, 2001: 307).

Similarly, after 9/11 there was a need of Hollywood's help again, and it was not a coincidence that the American government regarded the attacks as a second Pearl Harbor. Hollywood was ready to play its part and shortly after the event some movie executers went to the White House and asked for their roles:

Having waved the flag for so many years before September 11, Hollywood's first reaction was to put the industry at the government's disposal. Less than a month later, forty Hollywood executives made the pilgrimage to the White House for a two-hour discussion with Chris Henick, deputy assistant to the president, and Adam Goldman, associate director of the Office of Public Liaison. Leslie Moonves, president of CBS, explained their mission: "I think you have a bunch of people here who were just saying, 'Tell us what to do. We don't fly jet planes, but there are skill sets that can be put to use here.'" With its usual relaxed attitude toward historical accuracy, the New York Times stated that while "not new to Hollywood," such patriotic sentiments had been "rarely in evidence since World War II." ...There was a clear need, both "domestically and internationally to tell the story that is our story" (Young, 2003: 256-257).

They played their role and many movies made after 9/11 were not only aimed at promoting nationalism and fraternity among American people, but they also tried to legitimize the Iraq attack in the international arena. Therefore, as it is seen in the examples of WWII and 9/11 Hollywood has always been a way of propaganda and a powerful weapon of producing knowledge in America.

2.1 *The Patriot*

The Patriot (2000), directed by Roland Emmerich, employs big name stars, such as Mel Gibson and Heath Ledger. The movie mainly tells the story of the American Revolutionary War and a brave American soldier with his family. Historians from the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History contributed to the movie as consultants. Therefore, "the sets and scenery show much attention to historical detail. Colonial Charleston, the plantations, villages, and taverns-all convey an atmosphere of period authenticity." (Ross, 2000: 1146) The producer of the movie, Mark Gordon, said that, "While we were telling a fictional story, the backdrop was serious history." (*The Patriot*, 2001) Moreover, the screenwriter of the film, Robert Rodat, declared that Mel Gibson's character, Benjamin Martin, is a composite character made up,

Thomas Sumter, whose exploits on the battlefield won him the nickname the "Carolina Gamecock"; Daniel Morgan, the rifleman who stated that he would risk everything for the American cause; and Francis Marion, who was popularly known as the "Swamp Fox" because of his ability to slip unnoticed into the Carolina swamps and gather together his hapless band of militia who mounted from there a series of successful guerrilla raids against the British (qtd. in Pease, 2000: 32).

Although the character of Benjamin Martin is a mixture of real American patriots who took an active part in the Revolution, and setting, scenery and costumes are authentic, much of the movie is not historically accurate. Gibson acknowledged, "If one were to adhere to historical accuracy all the way, you'd probably have the most boring two hours on earth, but firstly it's entertainment and we've taken license with history to make it more compelling." (Ross, 2000: 1146)

The film was released in 2000. There are also some arguments that the release of the movie had already been planned and the time when the movie was released served a purpose. Donald E. Pease argues that the time was not a coincidence. It was a time when the political landscape was changing after the cold war. He writes;

The time in which the film takes place mirrors the moment in which it was released, a historical moment when the political landscape was rapidly changing and the nature of domination was itself in ferment. This film appeared in the aftermath of the cold war, when U.S. nationalism no longer needed to be endowed with ideological substance out of opposition to a common enemy, when the private sector had become a replica of the market, and when the state had been reduced to its policing function. *The Patriot's* reconfiguration of central themes and agents organizing the national mythology is also indicative of a fundamental shift in governmental policy, which the film at once reflects and represents (Pease, 2002: 30).

The Patriot (Emmerich, 2000) takes place in South Carolina in 1776. The movie tells the story of Benjamin Martin, a widower bringing up his seven children on his farm and a veteran of the French and Indian wars. Because of his horrifying experience of the war, he tries to avoid his family from the war between the American forces and the British. However, Gabriel, his oldest son, is filled with the enthusiasm of fighting for his country and is very eager to join the American army. Although his father rejects, Gabriel joins the Continental Army, and only after a very short time, he returns home wounded. At the same time, British forces come to take Gabriel prisoner and Gabriel's younger brother, Thomas, is killed while trying to free Gabriel, by the cruel Col. William Tavington. This forces Martin to save Gabriel with the help of his two younger sons Nathan and Samuel and then be the leader of a band of guerilla style militiamen leaving his five young children with his sister-in-law. During the war, Gabriel marries Anne Howard. However, Anne, her father and

mother, with all the people in the town are burned alive while they are locked in the church by Tavington and his soldiers. Gabriel finds Tavington and fights to death. In the final battle, Benjamin and the militiamen that come from various classes of society defeat the British with the help of Col. Harry Burwell and Jean Villeneuve and the French who came to block the British off. During this final battle, Benjamin Martin kills Col. Tavington, who is responsible for the deaths of two of his sons.

The movie opens with the scene in which we see the uniforms, war materials and medals of Benjamin Martin that remained from the French and Indian war and that had already been placed in a chest. We hear him confessing that “I have long feared that my sins would return to visit me. And the cost is more than I can bear.” He is a very talented and brave soldier who fought heroically during the French and Indian war. He killed many enemies and he has learned the atrocious and bloody side of the war. As Mel Gibson informs us about Benjamin Martin, “he was kind of savage during the French and Indian War.” (qtd. in Wetta and Novelli, 2003: 870) He confesses that he is afraid his sins of the crimes he committed during this war eighteen years earlier will come for revenge. Therefore, he is unwilling to attend the Revolution war.

On the other hand, Benjamin’s eldest son, Gabriel, is very eager and enthusiastic about attending the Continental Army. Thus, according to the director, the Patriot of the movie is Gabriel, not Benjamin (Wetta and Novelli, 2003: 870). From the beginning of the movie, Gabriel tries to convince his father to let him join the army. We share his disappointment when he reads the names of the people who have joined the Continentals in the newspaper. When he sees the name of a boy who is younger than him, he forces his father for permission.

The assembly is convened for a final decision if South Carolina should declare a war against the British or not, and Benjamin Martin is also invited. When they go to Charles Town to attend the assembly, they witness the propagandas against Britain and King George. There are a lot of people who want South Carolina to fight against Britain and declare its independence. Colonel Harry Burwell of the Continental Army is one of them. He is the first one to speak in the assembly and he tries to arouse the nationalistic feelings of the people there. First, he stresses that eight of the thirteen colonies have been successful in the search of independence in support of a continental army. After he illustrates that gaining independence is not very difficult and there are examples who have already achieved it, he asks that South Carolina should be the ninth. When others like Martin rejects attending the war, Colonel Burwell says “This is not a war for the independence of one or two colonies, but for the independence of one nation: an American nation.” There is an emphasis on being a nation. And the fact that some people want to fight against the British for the ‘American nation’ and that some others believe there is nothing like an American nation reminds us Renan’s and Miller’s definitions of nation. Ernest Renan claims: “a nation’s existence ... is a daily plebiscite.” (Renan, 2003:19) and Miller argues: “National communities are constituted by belief: a nationality exists when its members believe that it does.” (Miller, 2000: 28) Colonel Burwell and some others who agree with him believe that there is an American nation; therefore, they are ready to fight and sacrifice everything for their nation. However, others who do not believe the existence of the American nation are unwilling to fight.

When Martin also rejects having a war and claims that they should find the alternatives of war, Burwell gets disappointed and says to him that he understood

him to be a patriot. Colonel Burwell is not the only person who gets disappointed with Martin's speech. Benjamin Martin's sons, Gabriel and Thomas, also feel disenchanting. Gabriel shares his disappointment with his father and says to him "Father, I thought you were a man of principle....When I have a family of my own, I won't hide behind them." When the levy passes in the assembly, he enlists for the Continentals without his permission. The insistence and enthusiasm of Gabriel for the independence of an "American nation" in spite of his father influences the audience and infuses them with the feelings of nationalism.

The ones who want to have a war against Britain are the heroes of the movie while the ones who do not want to fight are accused of thinking only of themselves. For example, when Benjamin Martin tells that he does not want to fight because he has a family and he has to think of them, most of the people there, even his own sons, blame him for being selfish. They feel disappointed because they all believed that Martin was a patriot and had principles. On the other hand, Colonel Burwell is a hero who fights for an independent American nation. Gabriel and Thomas are also depicted as patriots and heroes of the movie as they are very eager and enthusiastic to fight for the American nation despite their young ages and their father's unwillingness.

South Carolina declares war against Britain and the British army invades the city of Charles Town. Gabriel joins the Continental army. As the war goes on, Gabriel learns for himself the cold face of the war. We learn how he feels from the letters that he writes to his brother, Thomas. We are informed that their campaign has been marked by defeat and they have given grievous losses. One of Gabriel's good friends has died in his hands and he writes that his death is difficult for him to bear.

He writes that he envies Thomas for his youth and his distance from the cruel conflict. He is having some difficulties in the army; however, he still considers himself fortunate to be serving the cause of Liberty, and although he fears death, every day in prayer he reconfirms his eagerness to give his life in the service of his nation. It is of course inevitable for the audience not to be affected by the aspiration and motivation of a young boy to fight and even die for the independence of his nation.

The cruel image of the enemy is first depicted when Colonel William Tavington of the British army and his men come to Martin's house. Tavington orders his men to take Gabriel prisoner, kill the wounded American soldiers that Martin is treating, burn Martin's house since he helped the 'traitors' and capture the black slaves who work in Martin's farm. When Thomas tries to save his brother, Col. Tavington kills him without any mercy. We, as the audience, can even see the pleasure and satisfaction in his eyes while all this tyranny is happening. This scene drives the audience as crazy as it does Benjamin Martin. With this scene the negative image of the enemy is clarified and strengthened in the eyes of the audience. Moreover, these cruel and merciless images are emphasized more in the ongoing scenes and the American Revolution war is justified. British soldiers are shown not only as violent, pitiless creatures, but also as egoistic and immoral aristocrats.

Gabriel's enthusiasm to fight for his country fascinates the audience deeply. Although his brother dies because of him and his family is in danger, he decides to join the army again after he gets well. When his father refuses to let him join the armed forces, as his place is near his family now, he says "I am a soldier. It is my duty." and he leaves. His patriotism infuses the audience with the feelings of

nationalism. The determination he shows makes Benjamin join the army just to protect Gabriel from the possible dangers. His motivation is not to fight for liberty, but to keep his family away from danger.

Just like in all nationalistic Hollywood movies, the flag is an important element in this movie, too. Gabriel Martin gets a shredded American flag from the mud while a wounded soldier watches him. The veteran desperately tells him that it is a lost cause, but Martin puts the cloth flag in his bag. He mends the flag and always carries it in his bag. It shows his loyalty to the American nation. After he dies, when Martin decides to give up fighting and go back home, he sees the mended American flag in Gabriel's bag. He changes his mind and catches up the army waving his son's flag. When the American soldiers see Benjamin with the flag in his hand, they feel a great happiness and joy. Their happiness and joy drag the audience as well. Moreover, the American flag is always in the foreground during the final battle. There is always someone carrying a flag in the army during the whole battle. Benjamin also gathers his militiamen who begin to retreat during the final battle back by waving an American flag on the top the hill. Just as the militiamen are running back to escape, they see Benjamin waving the American flag and running towards the enemy with enthusiasm, so they turn back and win the battle.

After Gabriel and Benjamin join the army, Colonel Burwell asked Benjamin gather a militia from the volunteers and commands them. Gabriel goes to a village and finds all people in the church praying for the souls of the men who were hung. He announces that the South Carolina Militia is being called up and he is there to enlist every willing man. However, no man is willing to fight against the British army, because they believe they will not be successful. A young woman in the

church, Anne, who is Gabriel's future wife, makes an impressive speech, and says that every man in that church always talks about freedom and patriotism and now it is time to take an action. She asks everyone to act upon the beliefs which they have so strongly spoken and in which they so strongly believe. Only then are most of the men eager to join the Militia. A young woman is more courageous than all the men there and she convinces others, even the minister, they have to do it for the sake their nation. Her impressive speech persuades not only the people in the movie but also the audience of the necessity and importance of fighting for a nation when it is necessary.

Another interesting scene is the one in which Benjamin Martin gathers volunteers to join the South Carolina Militia. He gets the people who are willing to sign their names. There are a lot of volunteers who want to fight for independence. Even a five- year- old child and a black slave also volunteer to join the Militia although Benjamin tells the slave that he does not have to do it if he is not willing. Gabriel tells the black slave when they win the war, a lot of things will change. He argues that the British call America the new world, but in fact it is not. If they win the war, they will have the chance to build a new world where all men are equal. Later, it is announced that by order of General George Washington and the Continental Congress, the slaves who serve at least one year to the Continental Army will be granted freedom and paid a bounty of five shillings for each month of service. Occam, the black slave, gets happy as he has only six more months to be free. However, in the final battle, at the end of the movie, although he has been serving for more than a year, he does not leave the army and goes on fighting in the American Militia.

Colonel Tavington learns the names of the militiamen and finds and kills their families. When Tavington kills the wife and son of one of Benjamin's men, the man kills himself. Benjamin tells his men to attend their families and gives them one week furlough. He tells them that if any of them does not want to return, they will not be regarded as a coward or uncommitted. Every one goes and checks if their families are safe, but although they have the chance not to come back and stay with their families, they all come back and go on with their duties for their nation.

The cruel and heartless image of the enemy is strengthened when Colonel Tavington gathers all the people of a village, including Anne and her family, in the church and burns them alive. He shows no single sign of mercy or humanity. He feels the pleasure of what he is ordering his men to do. When Gabriel and others learn this, Gabriel chases Tavington and he fights with him. In the end, brutal Tavington kills Gabriel, Benjamin's second son.

After Benjamin loses his second son for this war, he loses his motivation too. He decides to give up the war although Colonel Burwell insists him to go with them and justify their sacrifice. Benjamin has already made up his mind, and he wants to go home after burying his son. The others leave for the final battle with the British army and Benjamin buries his son alone. After the burial, he sees the American flag in Gabriel's bag and he catches up with his friends, waving the flag with great enthusiasm and patriotism.

Unity is another important element in the movie. In the final battle, American soldiers have a strong unity and fraternity among themselves. For example, Occam, the black slave, does not leave the war, although he has the right to do as he has been serving for the American army for more than one year. When one of his friends asks

Occam why he is still there in the war, he says he is there now for his own accord. Even though his friend has been humiliating Occam since he joined the militia as he is a black slave, his friend replies that he is honored to have Occam with them.

In the end, the American army wins the battle. General Cornwallis retreats his army and moves north. We learn that America wins the war with the help of French who finally comes to block the British off. Benjamin Martin kills Colonel Tavington who murdered his two sons. Every man in the American army starts a new life in an independent country formed by the American nation.

Although the motivation of Benjamin Martin to fight against the British is completely personal, he turns out to be a hero of the American army at the end of the movie. With the several nationalistic and patriotic images it contains, this movie tries to show American people how their ancestors gained their independence and formed the American nation. It aims to remind people of the difficulties and sorrows they had, and the sacrifices that the people made in the past as a nation. There is the message that the American nation gained their independence with great difficulties; therefore, people should try hard to keep this independence.

2.2 Black Hawk Down

Black Hawk Down (2001) is a Hollywood war film produced by Jerry Bruckheimer and directed by Ridley Scott. The movie is an adaptation of Mark Bowden's book with the same title and based on the story of the Battle of Mogadishu that started with the raid of the United States soldiers to capture Somali warlord Mohammed Farrah Aidid.

The movie is based on a real event. James I. Matray summarizes the historical event in his review of the movie. He writes, the Bush government

... sent U.S. troops to Somali in December 1992 to assist the United Nations in providing relief assistance to the Somali people. Six months later, the Clinton administration ordered redeployed U.S. forces to capture a warlord named Mohamed Farrah Aidid. On October 3, 1993, Task Force Ranger launched a mission to capture two of Aidid's top advisers that ignited a battle with Aidid's militia and escalated into an incredible bloodbath after a Somali shot down the first of two Black Hawk helicopters. The Rangers, who refused to leave any comrade behind, fought for survival in the streets of the city until just after dawn the following day. Eighteen Americans died and over 70 were wounded. At least 500 Somalis were killed and over 1,000 wounded, most of them civilians (Matray, 2002: 1176).

The movie was shot in 2001, and was supposed to be released in March, 2002. However, it appeared on December 28, 2001. Melani McAlister claims that the date of the first release was changed in order to “cash in on the more militaristic mood of a country that had just routed the Taliban from Afghanistan.” (McAlister, 2002: 453) On the other hand, the chair of Paramount explained the reason why the movie appeared sooner than expected: “It is about the sacrifice that soldiers make so the rest of us can be safe.” (qtd. in Young, 2003: 258)

The movie is full of nationalist and patriotic images. The American soldiers who fight in the battle are depicted as brave and fearless patriots who risk their lives to do their duties. Therefore, it is supposed to be a nationalist and propaganda movie rather than a historical one although it is based on a real historical event. McAlister argues that the Pentagon completely assisted the filmmakers; they provided helicopters, technical support, and even soldiers to serve as extras (McAlister, 2002: 453). The director himself acknowledges that the movie doesn't intend to present the political issues of the time, but it is about the “valor of those who, in the face of

danger, found courage and performed their duty” (McAlister, 2002: 453). Moreover, Rick Lyman asserts that this movie “came within inches of being the first major Hollywood film to directly address the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks” (Lyman, 2001: 1). Mark Bowden, the writer of the book on which the movie is based, also acknowledges; “this movie says that we have the capability of doing this kind of thing. It’s ugly and it’s terrible, but we have these very brave young men who do this, and we need to use them now and then” (qtd. in Young, 2003: 258).

Black Hawk Down (2001) opens with the scene in which we see a corpse wrapped in a white cloth and a man who is probably preparing the corpse for burial. Then we see another corpse who is also wrapped in a white cloth and tied to a chair. We hear a piece of African music which gives the feelings of sorrow and pain. No one speaks in these early scenes. A text comes out and gives information about the time and setting of the movie. We learn that the movie takes place in Somalia, East Africa, in 1992. Then, the text explains us the political and social conditions in the region.

Years of warfare among rival clans cause famine on a biblical scale. 300.000 civilians die of starvation. Mohammed Farrah Aidid, the most powerful of the warlords, rules the capital Mogadishu. He seizes international food shipments at the ports. Hunger is his weapon. The world responds. Behind a force of 20.000 US Marines, food is delivered and order is restored. Aidid waits until the Marines withdraw, and then declares war on the remaining UN peacekeepers. In June, Aidid’s militia ambush and slaughter 24 Pakistani soldiers, and begin targeting American personnel. In late August America’s elite soldiers, Delta Force, Army Rangers, and the 160th SOAR are sent to Mogadishu to remove Aidid and restore order. The mission was to take three weeks, but six weeks later Washington was growing impatient (*Black Hawk Down*, 2001).

Along with the text the camera shows us other scenes of death and disorder. We deduct that people have died of hunger and famine. We see extremely skinny people who look fatally ill and desperate. The dramatic African music strengthens the feeling of desperation.

In the next scene we see a lot of people struggling and savagely fighting with each other to get some food in Red Cross food distribution center. An American military helicopter is flying above the area. We meet our protagonist Staff Sergeant Matt Eversman (Josh Harnett) for the first time in this helicopter. Then, we see some armed Somali militiamen in a jeep approaching to the Red Cross center. When they come to the center, they start to shoot some people there and declare that the food is the property of Mohammed Farrah Aidid. Our brave and devoted American soldiers want to intervene and help the miserable Somali people, but as it is U.N.'s jurisdiction, they can not intervene. We see the disappointment and desperation in the eyes of Sergeant Matt, since he is unable to help them.

This short scene gives us a clear understanding of the enemy. First of all, the image of the enemy is depicted as cruel and savage. The Somali militiamen do not have pity on their own people and they can kill them without hesitation and without a reason. Two groups of Somali people are portrayed in the movie. The first group is "the skinnies" most of whom starve and die because of different illnesses. They also suffer from the oppression of a Somali warlord. The other group consists of the militiamen of Mohammed Farrah Aidid who shoot and kill people without any reason. The existence of US soldiers in Somali is justified by this merciless picture of the second group and miserable picture of the first group. American soldiers are there to protect "the skinnies" from those cruel militiamen of a crueller warlord and to

provide them with the necessary requirements to survive. As identity is something dynamic and constructed, they are trying to construct American national identity by dehumanizing the enemy. In the movie, the enemy is dehumanized with all these negative images.

Sergeant Matt, our protagonist, is also introduced to the audience as a brave and devoted American soldier in the very beginning of the movie. He wants to establish order in this country. We see him in a Black Hawk helicopter with other American soldiers in another scene. While other soldiers are having fun and joking with each other, he is there to observe and study the neighborhood. He watches carefully and tries to analyze the surrounding. As one of his friends says about him that he is 'an idealist' and he believes in 'his mission down to his bones.' In another scene when his friends ask him if he really likes the Somali people, he replies "it is not that I like them or I don't like them. I respect them." He also feels sorry from them, because those people have no jobs, no food, no education, and no future. He figures that they have two things they can do. They can help or they can sit back and watch the country destroy itself on CNN. When another soldier says he was trained to fight, he replies "I was trained to make a difference." He is young, but he looks talented. He is in Africa to help the miserable people. When one of his friends gets sick, he gets in charge of a troop.

In the first thirty minutes of the movie, before the attack starts, we get the chance to know the private worlds of the American soldiers whom we are supposed sympathize with. For example, Todd Blackburn has just arrived to Mogadishu to join the American troops there. He is only eighteen years old, and he is very enthusiastic about fighting with the enemy. Another soldier who registers Todd to the army feels

discouraged as his typing skill precludes him from doing missions. Another one, Yikes, draws a picture of her daughter's favorite cartoon character. As we get to know the characters better, we witness how they are eager to fight for their nation and how much they sacrifice to be there.

While they are preparing for the operation, some soldiers are very relaxed believing that they will be back in a short time. However, some others are nervous and worried. One of them writes a letter to his family and gives it to his friend in case he doesn't come back. Another one calls his wife and leaves a touching message for her. Their apprehension catches the audience and takes them into the movie.

The raid which was supposed to last only thirty minutes turns out to go on whole night. The rest of the movie shows this raid and its instant consequences. The Delta Force and Rangers land in the Bakara Market in order to arrest two colleagues of Mohammed Farrah Aidid. Two sets of helicopters and a column of Humvees on the ground as the extraction force takes part in the attack.

When the US soldiers land the Bakara Market, an area of the city where there are a lot of people who are friendly to Aidid, some militiamen start to shoot at them. In the very early beginning of the attack, the inexperienced soldier, Todd Blackburn falls from the helicopter as the pilot tries to avoid from a RPG (Rocket Propelled Grenade), and he gets fatally injured. The US soldiers start the raid just as they planned. They get in the building and they arrest the people there. They believe that everything goes as they have planned. However, all of a sudden, a lot of armed Somali appeared everywhere around them. They are on the top of the buildings, in the buildings, on the streets, shooting and attacking the US soldiers.

The rest of the movie shows how American soldiers try to survive from the attack and we see very bloody scenes. We see some US soldiers suffer and die in great misery; however, we do not see how the Somali people die. The movie conveys the message that the death of the Africans is not very important, because they are the ones who are guilty and who deserve this brutality. However, it claims the US soldiers as the courageous heroes who fight to death to rescue their comrades.

We witness the comradeship and fraternity among the US soldiers. They refuse to leave the wounded and even dead soldiers, so they risk their own lives in order to take the bodies of the dead and the wounded soldiers to the military base. They get even the ruptured hand of a dead soldier. When the Africans shoot the first of two Black Hawks down, the US soldiers struggle hard to find the wreckage of the helicopter to check if there is anyone alive and to get the bodies of the dead. On the other hand, the ones who stay at the military base feel desperation for not being able to help their friends. They all gather around the transmitter to follow what is going on downtown. When the second Black Hawk is shot down, a group of soldiers from the base set out to help the crew. As one of them asks if there is anyone alive in the crew, another one replies that it doesn't matter because no one will be left behind.

Another thing we see among the US soldiers is their courage and desire to fight with their friends. Although they are aware of the danger that is waiting for them downtown, they are very brave and enthusiastic for fighting and helping their comrades. They think that even if no one is alive there, it is worth to go and get the bodies of their friends. They risk their own lives in order to support their friends. For example, Sizemore, one of the US soldiers, volunteers to go with the team although he has a cast on his arm. When his friends tell him that he cannot go with that cast,

he tries to take it off with a knife. Another one who has chronic asthma gets his ammunition with him and joins the team after he takes his medicine.

When it gets dark, the US soldiers take shelter in an abandoned building. There are also some wounded soldiers one of whom has a serious injury. They wait for help, but the base doesn't want to send a helicopter because they don't want to risk another Black Hawk. Their friendship and fraternity touch the hearts of the audience in this scene. They try to treat their fatally injured friends. They are in a really desperate situation. Their friend, Jamie Smith, is dying right in front of their eyes, but they cannot help him. Jamie asks Sergeant Matt Eversman to tell his parents that he has fought very well there, and then dies. Matt thinks about his responsibilities and he blames himself. He feels sorrow for his friend. It is the first time he commands a troop and some of his men are killed. He is discouraged and disappointed. In the morning of that night, some Humvees come to get the wounded soldiers. The others reach the UN region on foot. They treat the wounded soldiers there.

When they reach the safe place, they are proud of themselves and no one of them regrets participating in that war. For example, Lorenzo was shot during the raid. The bullet went in and out, and the medic says he will be ok in a couple of days. He asks whether they are going after the Somali militiamen and says decisively if they are going after them, they shouldn't go without taking him and he can still do his job. He is still thinking about fighting although he is seriously injured. Furthermore, Hoot tells Eversman when he goes home people will ask him why they do it and if they are some kind of war junkie. He says he won't answer them because they will not understand they do it for the man next to them and it is the only reason

in fact. In the final scene Eversman is talking to himself next to the corpse of Jamie Smith and he says that everything has changed. He knows he has changed. He tells that one of his friends asked him before he went to Somali why they were going to fight someone else's war and if they thought they were heroes. He didn't say anything then, but if he asks again he knows what to say this time. He will say no one asks to be a hero; it just sometimes turns out that way. They give the message that none of the American soldiers in Somali asked to be heroes. They just did what they were ordered to do. They fought someone else's war because the people there needed their help and they were very brave during the attack that they were all heroes. They are all portrayed as reluctant heroes.

At the end of the movie, we hear a soldier reading a letter that he wrote to his wife. We can also hear a dramatic piece of music in the background which makes the letter more touching. At the same time we are informed that during the raid over one thousand Somalis died and nineteen American soldiers lost their lives. We learn the names and ranks of all the soldiers who died during the attack. However, there is no single information about the Somali who died. They are treated as soulless masses that do not have an individual identity. They are dehumanized throughout the movie and at this very last scene, the deaths of the Somali people are shown as worthless.

As Ridley Scott argues this movie is about the heroism of the soldiers who, in the face of danger, showed courage and carried out their duty (McAlister, 2002: 453). It aims to dignify the American soldiers. Moreover, it tries to arouse the feelings of nationalism and patriotism among the American people especially just after the September 11 events. It gives the message that American soldiers are brave and heroic enough to fight against every enemy when they have to. The movie also

emphasizes the fraternity and comradeship among the American soldiers and suggests that American people should also accompany with each other especially at the times of national traumas. However, while showing American soldiers as super humans, the movie dehumanizes the Africans. They are depicted as soulless and worthless masses who are supposed to be saved by the Americans. As James I. Matray argues “viewers have no choice but to conclude that Somalis are not only lousy marksmen but crazed "Skinnies" and "Sammies" without any regard for human life.” (Matray, 2002: 1177) The movie is full of glorification of American soldiers and negative stereotypes of the Africans. The Somalis are introduced to the audience as inferior creatures to the Americans. The movie is a good example of Hollywood nationalist movies which try to arouse nationalistic feelings and union among their people.

2.3 We Were Soldiers

We Were Soldiers (2002) is a Hollywood war movie directed by Randall Wallace. The story of the film is based on the Battle of Ia Drang, the first serious battle between the American soldiers and the Vietnamese in Vietnam War in November 1965. The movie is an adaptation of the book *We Were Soldiers Once ... and Young* which was written by Lieutenant General Hal Moore and reporter Joseph Galloway who were both at the battle.

We Were Soldiers, like all other Hollywood war movies, serves an aim. Marilyn Young argues that after World War I, Hollywood released some movies to wipe out the previous negative effects of the war. One of these movies is *Sergeant York*, who fights a better World War I. After World War II, it was the same again,

and Hollywood released some movies which claim that it was necessary for the US government to attend the war.

In 1941, in an effort to take the bad taste out of World War I and the powerful antiwar movies that dominated the interwar years, Hollywood released *Sergeant York* (dir. Howard Hawks, 1941), a moving tale of a pacifist turned war hero. We can sit in the theater and see [York] go fight a better World War I for us... Films like *Sergeant York* ... wipe out earlier images and replace them with new ones, appropriate for the times. To create a “new mythos” for World War II ... Hollywood had to recast the Great War as a reasonable national enterprise, not as the crazy slaughterhouse depicted in literature and film for the previous twenty years. . . . Outright obliteration was a prerequisite (Young, 2003: 259).

Therefore, Young argues, “to erase Vietnam, Hollywood would have to go back to Vietnam, where the unraveling of the war story began.” (Young, 2003: 259) *We Were Soldiers* is a film of this kind. It had an important goal, and in order to achieve this goal, just like *Black Hawk Down*, *We Were Soldiers* was also released before the planned schedule.

The movie opens with the scene in which we hear someone telling the story. He tells us “these are the true events of November, 1965, the Ia Drang Valley of Vietnam. This story is the testament to the young Americans who died in the Valley of Death and a tribute to the young men of the People's Army of Vietnam who died by our hand in that place.” And he says to tell this story, he has to start at the beginning, but he can not remember where it begins. Then he starts telling what happened in June of 1954. As he is telling the story, we see some French soldiers wandering around the forests of Vietnam. In 1954 French Group Mobile 100 moved into the Central Highlands of Vietnam where Americans go 11 years later. They were suddenly attacked by the Vietnamese units and all of them were killed because

the commander of the Vietnamese unit thought that if they killed all of them, they would stop coming.

Eleven years later, some American soldiers are chosen to be sent to Vietnam. Lieutenant Colonel Hal Moore, who is a very brave and dedicated American soldier, and who is also a good husband and father, is in charge of the soldiers who are sent to Vietnam. We see him training his soldiers in the best possible way. He is a good commander, but at the same time he sets good relationships with his soldiers. He studies the conditions in Vietnam and he tries to find out the reasons why the French had a great defeat in Vietnam eleven years ago in order not to make the same mistakes.

After they arrive in Vietnam, Moore learns that an American base has been attacked; therefore he is ordered to attack the Vietnamese soldiers with his 395 soldiers. They land the “Valley of Death” with helicopters and 395 American soldiers fight against 4000 well equipped enemy soldiers. The order is simple for American soldiers; find the enemy and kill them. However, in the end, most of the American soldiers are killed in Vietnam, but Lieutenant Moore takes every soldier, alive or dead, back to home.

The movie is full of American nationalism and patriotism as well as fraternity and unity during the times of chaos. Moore believes that “the film shows four essential themes: the battle's intensity, how soldiers fight for each other, respect for the enemy, and grief at home.” (Coatney, 2003: 313) Joseph Galloway, the reporter who wrote the book *We Were Soldiers Once ... and Young* with Lieutenant Colonel Hal Moore, is satisfied with the film and he explains;

... audiences would be drawn to the story because it is not defeatist about what eventually became the misadventure of Vietnam. ... This is about what we did, what we saw, what we suffered in a thirty-four-day campaign in the Ia Drang Valley of the Central Highlands of South Vietnam in November 1965, when we were young and confident and patriotic. It was a love story about men proud of the opportunity to serve [the] country. It was also a story about the far more transcendent love that comes to men unbidden on the battlefields. . . . We killed for each other, we died for each other, and we wept for each other. And in time, we came to love each other as brothers. In battle our world shrank to the man on our left and the man on our right and the enemy all around. The film version makes it also a story about family values, a manly reporter ready to pick up a gun, and worthy enemies (qtd. in Young, 2003: 260).

As mentioned in the previous chapters, the image of the enemy is important in war movies because while constructing national identity, the image of the enemy plays a crucial role. In this movie, we are introduced to the enemy in the first scene in which Vietnamese soldiers kill the French savagely. The fact that they do not take prisoners and ‘slaughter’ all of them in order to prevent them from coming shows the enemy pitiless and brutal. Later, when two American commanders are talking about the Vietnamese, they call them as “cavemen in black pajamas.” There is a humiliation of the enemy.

Before we meet our protagonist, we hear about him that he is a very brave soldier who leads a combat company in Korea. We first see him in his car singing with his five children and wife. He looks very sympathetic and he gives the impression that he is a good father and husband. The next day he meets his soldiers and humane side of his characteristic is again emphasized. He values his soldiers and he sets a good relationship with them. Moreover, he is very hardworking. He makes his soldiers train hard. He tries to teach them the qualities of a good leader and motivate them for a real war. He tells them to look after each other well, because at the time of war they will need the friendship and protection of each other. We always

see in the movie that Moore cares for his soldiers. For example, when one of his soldiers has a new baby, he finds him in the church, shares his happiness and prays with him. The night before they depart for Vietnam, he can not sleep because he worries about his soldiers as they are very young, and he tells his wife that when he looks at their youth, he thinks about their sons, so he feels anxious for them.

Furthermore, he is a real nationalist and patriot. He is always very eager to fight for his nation. Before they leave for Vietnam, Moore makes a motivating speech to his soldiers and he tries to construct a national identity and unity among their soldiers. He stresses the existence of “American nation” and tells although there are differences among them, they should forget all those differences and concentrate on being from the same nation; American nation. He also tries to strengthen the fraternity and comradeship among his soldiers. He asks them to take care of each other, because they are going to a difficult war and they should be very careful. He wants them to trust him and each other and assures them that he will be the first one to set foot on the field, and the last to step off. He promises that he will leave no one back, alive or death, although he can not promise he will take them all back alive. The idea of not leaving any one in the fields of the enemy is same in the *Black Hawk Down*.

Look around you, in the 7th Cavalry, we got a Captain from the Ukraine, another from Puerto Rico, we got Japanese, Chinese, Blacks, Hispanics, Cherokee Indian, Jews and Gentiles, all American. Now here in the States some men in this unit may experience discrimination because of race or creed, but for you and me now, all that is gone. We're moving into the valley of the shadow of death, where you will watch the back of the man next to you, as he will watch yours, and you won't care what color he is or by what name he calls God. Let us understand the situation; we're going into battle against a tough and determined enemy. I can't promise you that I will bring you all home alive, but this I swear: when we go into battle, I will be the first one to

set foot on the field, and I will be the last to step off. And I will leave no one behind. Dead or alive, we will all come home together. So help me God.

We Were Soldiers is different from most of the other war movies in terms of the emphasis that it makes on the roles and difficulties of women characters. The movie “devoted a significant amount of time to showing the relationship between soldiers and their wives, home-front activities of military wives and the impact that the fear and the loss of life has on the women.” (Henry, 6) This difference makes the movie more touching. For example, first we see them at the farewell party dancing together with their husbands. They try to enjoy, but they are in fact worried and upset. Then, we see them seem of their husbands to war. They wait to get some news from their husbands anxiously and the audience shares their anxiety when the taxi which brings the letters about the deaths of the soldiers appears. The stories about the women and children make the audience feel more pity for the American soldiers. We share the mourning of the women when they get the telegrams informing the deaths of the soldiers.

The battle scenes are full of nationalistic images. For example, in the beginning of the attack, while one of the soldiers is dying, he tells his friends not to let the enemy get signal codes and says “I am glad I could die for my country.” He thinks about the welfare of his country even when he is about to die, and he says that he is happy because he is dying for his nation. Although they are in a bad condition, they are eager to fight and even to die. Just as Lieutenant Moore has told them to do, they take care of themselves and try to protect each other. When a helicopter comes to get the injured soldiers to the base, one of the soldiers gets off the helicopter to let

his friend go as his friend is hit worse than him. However, as soon as he gets off, he is shot by another bullet and dies. His sacrifice touches the audience.

Even the American reporter, Galloway, is as brave as to fight against the enemy in the time of need in spite of not being a soldier. When Moore asks him why he is there and if he wants to die, he says he is there because he knows those dead boys will be there. And he tells his own story. His father, grandfather, and great-grandfathers were soldiers. Each of his great- grandfathers lost their one leg in civil war. One of them lost his right leg, and the other lost his left leg. They met in a shoe store in Galveston, and every year after that, they would get together on the same date, in the same store and pick out a brand new pair of shoes for the two of them. One had a daughter; one had a son, his grandparents got married. This is an emotional story which depicts the history of the new American nation. There is the message that this nation has been constructed by a lot of difficulties and strong unity. His ancestors have been soldiers for generations, and served and sacrificed for the welfare of their country and nation. He is not a soldier himself; however, he has inherited the patriotic feelings from his ancestors. Therefore, he shows a great courage and determination by volunteering to attend a war as a reporter.

Just as Moore has promised, he leaves no one behind. While counting the soldiers, they find out that 40 soldiers were dead, and two of them were missing. They try to find those two soldiers among many corpses in the middle of the war at night. They find the dead body of Jack by recognizing him from the bracelet on which the name of his daughter is written.

Scott sometimes shows us the motivation and feelings of the Vietnamese soldiers as well. We see that they are also motivated to fight for their countries and

nations just like the Americans are. The colonel of the Vietnamese army prays for his nation's success like Colonel Moore prays for victory. Moreover, they find a notebook on one of the Vietnamese soldiers who wanted to kill Colonel Moore, and there is photo of his wife in the notebook. There is an emphasis that they also have families, and there is probably a mourning at their houses, too. In the final scene, we see the wife of Jack and the wife of the Vietnamese soldier crying after their husbands in two different parts of the world.

At the end of the movie, the Americans have broken through the Vietnamese lines, and they are thought to have gained a victory. American helicopters come and get the injured and the dead. One of the helicopters brings some reporters and journalists who want to celebrate the "victory" and learn the details about the war. First, they ask some questions to Joseph Galloway, but he can not answer any questions. Then, they find Colonel Moore and ask questions to him. However, he is not eager to answer any questions either. They ask him the key for victory, but Moore doesn't think that they have gained a victory. He says to Galloway that he will never forgive himself that his men died and he didn't. They have gained the war, but it is certainly not a victory, because they have lost a lot of soldiers. And he asks Joe to tell the American people what these men did there how his troopers died.

Just as he has promised, Colonel Moore is the last one who steps his foot off the battle. He takes every soldier, dead or alive, back home and he leaves no one in the land of enemy. He is sorry for his men who have lost their lives in the war. When they get to the base, his superiors congratulated him for killing 1800 enemy soldiers and tell him to take his troop back to the "Valley of Death" again. Despite all their negative experiences and the losses they gave there, he goes to the valley back and

fighters for 235 more days with his soldiers. He symbolizes the protective, devoted, self-sacrificing, and patriotic American soldiers who can do everything for his nation and country.

This movie is a good example of nationalistic movies because it includes a lot of patriotic images. We witness how brave and devoted American soldiers are. There is a great fraternity and unity among them. They are eager to fight for their nations. Some of them leave their newborn babies back, some others leave a bigger family; however, some of them do not have anyone waiting for them. They go to war because their country orders them to do. At the end of the movie, Moore narrates about his soldiers;

Some had families waiting. For others, their only family would be the men they had bled beside. There were no bands, no flags, no honor guards to welcome them home. They went to war because their country ordered them to.

In the final scene we see the names of the soldiers who have died in the war. We learn that the names of the men of the 7th Cavalry who died in the Drang Valley are remembered on Panel 3 East of the Vietnam War Memorial. And to their left and right are the names of 58,000 of their brothers in arms. Just like in *Black Hawk Down*, we get the message that every American soldier is precious for the government and they try to immortalize the ones who die for their nation.

CHAPTER III

NATIONALISM IN TURKISH CINEMA

Cinema not only reflects the values of the society which it belongs, it also demonstrates the place of other societies from the eyes of the society in which the film is produced. Therefore, cinema is generally not objective; representation is dependent on the producers' choice of whom they will represent, how they will represent and what they will represent, and by means of this representation the other cultures might be devalued while the host culture is praised (Selçuk, 2006: 184). With all these characteristics cinema has the power of producing knowledge which makes this genre so popular and millions of dollars are spent on this sector to affect the masses with the message which the producers want to spread. Because of the importance of cinema many countries have invested in cinema and with legal arrangements they have encouraged the producers as we can see in the Hollywood example. On the other hand, in Turkey the governments lacked such kind of a cinema policy which slowed down the improvement of the Turkish cinema.

The introduction of cinema in Turkey started nearly a year after two young Frenchmen, the Lumière brothers, held their first film exhibition on December 22, 1895, in a cafe in Paris. The first showings in Turkey were private ones held at the Sultan's court, the Yıldız Palace in İstanbul. Although cinema came to Turkey as early as the late 1890s, the actual start of film-making started in 1914 with a documentary, "The Demolition of the Russian Monument at St. Stephen", made by reserve army officer Fuat Uzkınay at the beginning of World War I, and sponsored

by the Turkish Army. After this film a number of films were made by official or semi-official organizations. In 1922 when Muhsin Ertuğrul returned home from Germany where he had worked as an actor and director, a new era started in Turkish cinema. In this year, also the first Turkish private film company, "Kemal Film" was set up and the first movie to deal with the War of Independence, based on the novel of Halide Edip Adıvar, "The Ordeal" was made. This film was first screened in İstanbul which was still occupied by foreign armies, on April 23, 1923, the third anniversary of the founding of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, and only six months prior to the formation of the Turkish Republic.

Actually, M. K. Atatürk was aware of the importance of cinema and he demonstrated his interest in cinema. He supported it in every possible way as he says: "Cinema is such an invention that one day it will be seen that it is affective in changing the aspect of the world more than the invention of gunpowder, electricity and the continents...We should give cinema the importance it deserves" (qtd. in Çağlayan). He tried to support cinema; for example, he reduced the taxes in 1938, and in 1932 when he watched Fuat Uzkınay's *Zafer Yollarında*, he thought that it was not sufficient and he wanted the movie to be continued because he thought that it was very important to document the War of Independence and the foundation of Republic in order to create national consciousness for the next generations. When he learned that the movie could not be finished because of the lack of Atatürk's motion videos, he reacted as follows:

I'm alive...All the documents about the national struggle, my sword, and my boots are available, then have you invited me, and haven't I done my part? If I had been invited, I would have accepted this invitation willingly, I'd have played in the film like an actor and I'd have animated the memories. This is a national duty because it is only

possible with these movies to leave memories and to prove how this struggle was won to the Turkish youth (qtd. in Çağlayan).

These words demonstrate Atatürk's awareness of the role of cinema but especially after his death Turkish cinema was neglected. With enough concern on cinema those years would have been documented and national consciousness would have been increased as Atilla Dorsay explains, "In those years the important role of cinema with its distinctive power and influence was forgotten. Cinema was divested of the honor of contributing Atatürk's principles...This is a big loss for post-Republic, a loss which is irreplaceable" (qtd. in Çağlayan). This lack of national themes in cinema is also felt during the following decades and with the influence of globalization national themes are replaced by Hollywood themes.

Cinema is one of the most influential ways of carrying culture, and since it is open to cultural interaction cinema has the potential to erase national values with the influence of globalization. Culture is monopolized by the influence of globalization which brings along the danger of destroying the national culture and national identity. Especially after the WWII Hollywood's cultural expansion demonstrated this danger which affected the national cinemas including Turkey. In 1989, quotas were removed by the government and American distribution companies started to bring films without agents which increased the Hollywood's hegemony in Turkish theaters. Therefore, in 1989 only 12 Turkish films were released while there were 230 Hollywood films, and in 1999 there were 275 Hollywood movies while Turkish movies were only 12 again (Karakaya, 2004: 67). Turkish national cinema was seized by Hollywood which also brought the danger of erasing national values.

In order to protect national culture severe precautions were taken in cinema and it was grounded in a regime of severe censorship. Many regulations were introduced by the Interior Ministry in 1939 (which lasted until 1986) and the censorship was implemented through a commission whose members were drawn from state departments, including the police and the military (Robins and Aksoy, 2005: 199). The censorship commission was functioning as the guardian of the Turkish national identity: there was the ideal image of the state and nation, and they were taking precautions to protect this image; however, the atmosphere was not appropriate for producers to produce films reflecting national culture as Halit Refiğ puts it:

In order to continue as a nation we need to have a national consciousness. In order to...protect our society from external and internal dangers, to maintain its unity and protect it from disintegration, we need to have a national consciousness. In cinema, this consciousness will be possible only through the existence of a conscious National Cinema. In the present circumstances, the state provides no support in this area. On the contrary, the state has an institution called censorship. (qtd. In Robins and Aksoy, 2005: 201)

Although censorship was practiced in the name of protecting national culture, actually it was the biggest barrier preventing the development of the Turkish cinema.

Since 1950s Turkish directors have made many nationalistic movies with strong and brave Turkish patriots. Tarkan, the Sword of Mars (Başaran, 1969), Kara Murat against Kara Şövalye (Baytan, 1975), and Kurtlar Vadisi Iraq (Akar, 2001) are three of them. In this chapter I am going to analyze the nationalistic images in these movies. I have chosen these movies because the first two movies have been watched by many Turkish people since they were released and are still watched by many

people whenever they are shown on TV. The last one, moreover, is a movie version of a popular TV serial and had a huge box office success.

3.1 *Tarkan the Sword of Mars*

Tarkan, who is one of the most significant characters in Turkish strip cartoon history, is created by Sezgin Burak. Gaining Turkish readers' admiration as a strip cartoon character in the beginning, in 1969 Tarkan's adventures were scripted and made into a movie for the first time. The movie 'Tarkan The Sword of Mars' which has a scenario prepared by its writer Sezgin Burak was directed by Tunç Başaran at first. Cast of the film is as follows: Kartal Tibet (Tarkan) as the leading actor, comedian Morris (Kulke), Zuhâl Aktan, Sevgi Can, Oktar Durukan, Lale Belkıs, Kayhanyıldızođlu and Aynur Aydan.

The writing 'Tarkan' at the generics part of the opening section of the film appears out of the sword figure. Tarkan's name is identified with being a warrior even at the generics of the film. The writing 'Tarkan' is red in color and gives the image of blood.

The voiced-over tells the film's story as follows:

Our story takes place in very old ages when Great Hun Empire's leader being known as 'God's Whip' by the Europeans Atilla started to invade Europe gradually. Atilla who aims to rule all over the world after Europe, wants to have the sword of Mars-the God of War. Only a priest called Moro knows where the sword is. He wants to possess this sword since whoever has the sword would be the ruler of the world.

While Atilla is being introduced to the viewers by these words, the fact that Europeans are afraid of him and he aims to rule the entire world is emphasized.

Turkish viewer is proud of his ancestors because of their dominating the entire world in old ages. Outer voice goes on telling the story;

Mars has stabbed this powerful sword into a rock before leaving the earth. Mars' sword has been waiting for the human being that will take it out of the rock and will be the ruler of the world. The European kings who are terrified by the Hun Turks are in the pursuit of one thing, God of War Mars' sword. They believe that they can only resist Atilla's power if they gain it. On one side there is the cruel and courageous Vandal king Genseriko; on the other side is the sneaky, bloodthirsty, crazy Roman Emperor Valantinyus. Both are in the struggle of possessing Mars' sword in order to resist Atilla's invasion of Europe.

By this way, the enemies that Atilla is to fight with in order to have the sword are determined Vandals and Romans. As it is clear from the enemies that are identified in the film the main enemy is the Europeans. There is another striking point about enemy and anticipating danger in the film. Tarkan has to face with several challenges in the pursuit of Mars' sword. Apart from these, Tarkan immediately grips his sword even when there is a knock on his door at the inns he is staying in. This sensitivity indicates his perceiving everything outside as a potential danger.

In the following scenes Atilla praises his soldiers while introducing himself. 'I'm going to raze Europe to the ground with these heroes. I'll show them how a nation's descendants are the Turks.' By these words he makes use of a discourse that praises and sanctifies Turkish people. His sentence: 'Tell me the name of a nation that can resist Turks' also strengthens this claim.

When his soldiers mention the importance of their having the sword, Atilla says: 'We are a nation which mastered so many nations not with our sword but with our heart'. Atilla's statements give the message of Turks not ruling by cruelty, violence and savagery as other nations but building their rule by their heart, love.

When Atilla's soldiers insist on Mars' sword, the candidate to do it is searched. The soldiers shoot arrows to the target during the training. The arrow that shot the target just in the center is cut into two by an arrow coming from far away. Everyone is surprised at this shot requiring an extraordinary talent. Tarkan is the one to shoot and is standing on a rock in distance with his dog 'Kurt'. This shot shows that Tarkan is very talented and courageous warrior. Tarkan is the one to take hold of Mars' sword.

Tarkan is a manly, sexy, cool, self-confident and brave Turkish soldier throughout the film. He doesn't have other companion than his dog Kurt. Tarkan is lonely. He doesn't have a family. With these characteristics, he gives the image of mythological character.

The Roman Emperor Valantinyanus pits his soldiers in the arena. He's characterized as a feminine figure. He sits at the throne and has the queen and servants around him. Atilla is on the horse, among his soldiers as a commander.

Roman Emperor appoints Lisyus to get the sword. Lisyus genuflects before the Emperor and makes a promise. However, Tarkan has never genuflected before anyone.

The queen says: 'I admire strong man Lisyus.' She shows that she is impressed by Lisyus' power and ability. This sentence has a sexual connotation indicating that Roman women adore power and powerful man.

Roman soldiers chase daughter of a Turkish inn owner. On rescuing Bilge and his father, Tarkan introduces himself to Roman soldiers as 'One of the great nation to whose ancestors you have maligned'. Similar expressions are heard many times throughout the movie. The pride of being a Turk and the loyalty to being

Turkish is constantly emphasized. Tarkan uses the term 'Turkish slap' an important power symbol when he is beating Roman soldiers.

Atilla's - thereby Tarkan's- other enemy is the Vandal king who also tries hard to get the sword. He buries six priests into the sand up to their heads in order to learn the location of Priest Moro. The other enemies accept Tarkan's torture and perform violence.

Tarkan stops at a different inn on his way. The inn-keeper employs slaves. A friend of one of the slave attempts to free his friend in return for a pouch of gold. The inn-keeper breaks his promise after accepting it and getting the gold. Having witnessed the situation, Tarkan knocks the inn-keeper down. The inn-keeper asks 'Who are you? What is your nationality?' This question indicates that everyone knows the owner of this slap and power. Tarkan says: 'My nation is the biggest of all. I am Turk. I'm the warrior of our holy leader Atilla. My name is Tarkan'. The greatness of Turkish people is emphasized once more and at the same time, Tarkan shows that he is the protector of liberty and justice by rescuing the slave and his friend from the inn-keeper.

The inn-keeper's wife tries to be close to Tarkan. She goes to his room and they spend the night together. Tarkan doesn't give as much importance to respect to integrity as he gives to respect to justice, liberty, patriotism etc. He has sex with several women throughout the film.

Tarkan is entrapped and taken prisoner by Lisyus. When Valantinyanus comes to the prison all prisoners except Tarkan kneel down. Turk's not surrendering is proved again. Tarkan impresses the Queen and the Princess. They covet Tarkan.

At the combat that is organized for Tarkan, he fights with Roma's most powerful fighter Kombo. At the end of the fight, Kombo begs Tarkan not to kill him. Tarkan says: 'We Turks do not kill the one who begs for help.' Here he emphasizes Turk's conscience and obedience to war rules.

The queen rescues Tarkan and takes him into her room. Upon being discovered by Valantinyanus and his soldiers they escape together. The queen is killed by the archers because of helping Tarkan run away.

The Turkish inn-keeper's daughter Bilge and his assistant go after Tarkan but they are captured and taken prisoners by the Romans. The slave trader that tries to sell Bilge at the market describes her as 'Here is a Turkish beauty for you. Ferocious as a tiger, strong as a horse, flirtatious as a woman.' Everyone at the auction wants to have the Turkish girl by increasing the price. Tarkan frees all the slaves at the market and kills the slave trader. In this scene, some prominent features of Turkish woman are highlighted.

Tarkan beats two gladiators that attack him in another inn. Two half-naked women that are together with the soldiers offer him to have sex. When Tarkan turns their offer down, one of them says: 'No man has rejected me.' Although Tarkan sleeps with women from time to time, he controls his lower self and senses. As it is also clear by the woman's words that he can even reject a woman who has never been rejected.

Tarkan is captured by a large group of soldiers and brought into the presence of the daughter of the Vandal King. The Queen tells him: 'It is apparent from your sword, clothes and posture that you are Turk. I will host you as you deserve.' Tarkan

is put into dungeon and rescued by the help of Kurt. Kurt understands all Tarkan's words and fulfills all his requests.

Upon finding out that Tarkan is also looking for the sword of Mars, the Queen tells him that she would tell the location of the sword if he spent the night with her. The Vandal Queen also approves of the Turkish man's power. She tells: 'I haven't seen a man as strong as you. Take me with you. Let's be the ruler of the world together.' However, she is killed by her father just after telling the place of the sword.

Tarkan escapes from the King's men but he gets stuck in the mud. The mud pulls Tarkan into it. Kurt helps him once again. Kurt hands a piece of branch and pulls him out of the mud but Tarkan is wounded. He takes refuge in a Hun castle. Vandals capture Bilge, Kulke and lots of Turks and they attack the castle. Since the captives are in the very front, it is impossible for the Huns to start firing. Bilge, Kulke and the captives say all together 'Start firing, don't worry about us. Long live our supreme leader Atilla. Long live Turkish people'. They sacrifice themselves for their nation. One more time it is Tarkan to solve the problem. Despite being wounded, he manages to shoot the Vandal soldier's chest from very far who is hiding behind the Turkish captives. The captives are rescued during the turmoil.

Tarkan reaches the Rocks of the Hell which is the place where Mars' Sword is hidden. The guard of the sword notices the fall of the last piece of sand in the sand clock and putting of the fire that has been active for centuries and says;

'At last one human being came to take Mars's sword by going beyond the Rocks of Hell. A new era is opening in Europe's history. Hun Turks will conquer all Europe with Atilla's armies. The most powerful kings will kneel down at his sword.'

Tarkan is very close to the sword now but the Vandal King also reaches the Rocks of Hell. Tarkan who kills Genseriko takes the sword out of the rocks.

Tarkan completes his mission successfully and brings the sword to Atilla. He doesn't bring it himself but throws it down from the cliff on which he shoots arrows in the beginning of the film and he leaves. By this detail, Tarkan shows that he doesn't expect even thanks from anyone. He has done everything for Atilla and Turkish people. All through the film, both by dialogues and by deeds Turkish nationality is heavily emphasized. It is praised and Turkish people are depicted as superior to other nations.

3.2 Kara Murat against Kara Şovalye

Kara Murat is one of the most important figures of Turkish strip cartoon history. Kara Murat was written by Rahmi Turan, drawn by Abdullah Turan, and was characterized as Sultan Mehmet's defender. The guard of Fatih Kara Murat, no longer being only a strip cartoon hero, turned into a Turkish cinema legend in whose films Cüneyt Arkın is always the leading actor. Kara Murat who has long hair and dense, black moustache is famous for shooting the enemy in spite of the arrows in his body, showering arrows over the enemy on the horse, beating the enemy with only a sword stroke, beating a lot of enemy soldiers alone, and jumping down the ramparts. Kara Murat has a lot more power and talent than a soldier.

In the film, Byzantine Prince Carlos kidnaps Kara Murat's twin brother killing their father in front of Kara Murat's eyes. Kara Murat, who was very little then, grows up wishing to take his revenge. Carlos's aim is to bring up Mehmet as a Christian and to use him against the Ottomans. He names him Marc changing his

name which was Mehmet. When Marc grows up, he tortures Turkish people attacking their villages. Carlos and his knights get prepared for an attack to kill Karaca Pasha, the grand seigneur of Rumeli. After this attack, Karaca Pasha is enslaved by them. His daughter is saved by the Turks. Fatih gives the mission of saving Karaca Pasha to Kara Murat. When Kara Murat is carrying out his duty, he comes across Marc and he understands that he is his brother Mehmet. Kara Murat, who makes Marc inefficient, goes into Carlos's palace disguising himself as Marc. He saves the Turkish slaves in the palace getting help from Zerdus and his men. However, when Marc, who escapes from the Turks, comes to the palace and tells Carlos what happened, Kara Murat is caught. Marc attends the Ottomans disguising himself as Kara Murat. Marc's aim is to kill the Sultan. Meanwhile, Karaca Pasha has already been saved and the insurgents rescue Kara Murat from the Byzantines. Marc can not kill the Sultan and comes back. While Carlos and his men continue their tortures, they beat Kara Murat's mother, too. When Marc sees them, he instantly remembers his past. He tries to save his mother but she dies. After Kara Murat arrives, Marc, who was injured by Carlos's men, dies. Kara Murat, who loses his mother and brother that he has found after so many years, attacks the Palace with the flame of revenge. He kills Carlos and his men and takes his revenge.

The film starts with the national anthem of the Ottomans. This national anthem which increases the motivation of the Turkish soldiers infusing them with nationalistic feelings has the same effect on the Turkish nation, too.

Murat's father comes across with Carlos at the war against the Byzantine. The Ottoman raider who has cut Carlos's arm forgives him when he tells that he will not use his sword against the Turks again. After he is forgiven, Carlos says, "I will

kill all the Ottomans until there is no one of them on the world.” In this scene, the fact that Turkish soldiers do not attack people who pleads forgiveness and that Byzantine soldiers are not honest is stressed.

The raider who has come home after a long war hugs his sons Mehmet and Murat “My brave sons” after kissing his wife on her forehead. This scene gives information about the relationships in Turkish families. The man does not get very close with his wife in an open place although they have not seen each other for a long time whereas he hugs his sons passionately. That his children are boys and they will be the ones who will save his family and that they will fight against the enemies is also important.

Although Mehmet was 3-4 years old, he can use arrows and swords. He cries near the river as he has lost his arrow. Mehmet who is supposed to play with his friends and toys uses arrows. The children’s toys are war tools.

Carlos kidnaps Mehmet killing his father. Murat gets safe hiding behind the bushes. Murat, whose father has been killed and whose brother was kidnapped by the Byzantines, is raised by his mother who wants him to take revenge. His mother tells Murat, “You should never leave the revenge flame in your hands. When the day comes, you will get your father’s sword and set out to take revenge. Swear for it, my son.” Murat swears to take revenge. Then she gives the sword to Murat:

“Take this sword. From now on, it will be always in your hands. I will teach you how to fight. You should be strong to take the revenge of your father, stronger. Your father created a lot of legends along the borders. You should be a brave man like him. You should be a son who deserves his surname.”

While his mother brings up Murat as a son who is worthy of his father and nation, Carlos trains Mehmet against the Ottomans, “You should be stronger and faster than him to beat an Ottoman. You will be the revenge sword of the Christianity. You will kill a lot of Muslims.” These sentences refer to Byzantines’ hatred towards the Muslim identity. The goal is not only to beat the Ottomans but also to kill Muslims.

The scenes in which Murat prays with his mother and in which Mehmet is sanctified by the priest are given one after another. Mehmet’s name is changed to Marc. The war is not only between the governments it is also between the religions.

Murat is now a grown up and has become great fighter Kara Murat. Marc is also like him. Both present their talents in using arrows. To the audience, the message that Marc’s talent is coming from his family is given.

Kara Murat sets out taking his father’s sword. He answers his mother saying, “Do not worry, Mother. I will recompense this sword” when she says that “Day is the revenge day.” Marc says “I swear that I will fight until I have the last drop of blood in my body in the way that the Christ opened” in the church. In these scenes, the symbolic difference of Islam and Christianity becomes clear. When Kara Murat gives his word in front of his mother kissing her hand, Marc gives his word in the church kneeling in front of the priest.

In the scenes that the Ottoman army is being trained and that they come across with the Byzantine armies, the background music is the national anthem. In this way, nationalist feelings are moved. Also, in these scenes the Ottoman flag is closed up.

The two scenes coming one after another attract attention in terms of bringing forth the Ottoman and Byzantine armies’ features. Firstly, that the Byzantine armies

attack an Ottoman village is seen. The soldiers kill all civilians no matter whether they are women or children. In these scenes, Marc's cruelty is emphasized. Marc tortures the slaves that he has gathered from the villages. The Ottoman soldiers fight only with the Byzantine soldiers. In other words, while the Ottoman soldiers only fight with the enemy soldiers, the Byzantine soldiers kill innocent people.

The Byzantines kidnap Karaca Pasha from the palace with a "Byzantine Trick." The Pasha's daughter is saved by the Turkish soldiers. Fatih gets frustrated when Karaca Pasha is kidnapped from the palace, "What kind of arrogance is this? How dare this is? Who is this Carlos? How can he trust himself like this? How can he challenge us? Destroying his country and making his palace upside down is not a thing for us." Fatih assigns Kara Murat to save Karaca Pasha.

Marc's nickname is "Kara Şovalye." While Marc wears black, Kara Murat always wears white. Marc represents badness whereas Kara Murat represents goodness in Turkish culture.

Kara Murat encounters Kara Şovalye. When Marc's mask falls down, Kara Murat understands that Marc is his brother who was kidnapped years ago. Kara Murat takes Marc prisoner and goes into Byzantine palace disguising himself as Kara Şovalye. When Marc escapes and comes back to the palace, the truth is understood. In the scenes that Kara Murat fights alone against the Byzantine soldiers, his extraordinary features are shown. Kara Murat jumps from very high ramparts, passes the walls with only one jump, kills a lot of soldiers alone. The audiences see a mythological character instead of a soldier.

This time Marc goes into Fatih's palace disguising himself as Kara Murat. He is caught when he is about to kill Fatih. As he is disguised as Kara Murat, he is sentenced to death as a result of betrayal.

When his mother hears about the situation, she says, "If they say the seas dried, the world is going round in the reverse way, I will believe, but nobody can make me believe that my son betrayed the sultan." However, what she says in front of the Ottoman Sultan Fatih gives a lot of messages in terms of showing her devotion to her nation and country:

If he betrayed you, what will I do with such a son. I will surrender to fate. But a mother heart suffers; however, I am an Ottoman Mother. If he is executed, even a drop of tear will not come down from my eyes. I will put up with this agony.

An Ottoman woman does not forgive her son who has betrayed his country and nation as a mother. She thinks the eternity of her country and nation putting her feelings as a mother aside.

Carlos and his men torture Kara Murat's mother getting her out of the house while she was praying. When Marc and his mother, who has been injured seriously, meet, he remembers his past. Marc gets injured while trying to save his mother after he understands that he is Mehmet. Kara Murat arrives. Mehmet tells his brother Kara Murat, "Forgive me for my ancestors," and he tells that he wants to die as a Muslim taking the cross off his neck. Mehmet dies repeating the Muslim prayer in Kara Murat's arms. Mehmet who is a Turk and Muslim understands the truth in his last moments and dies approving the truths.

Kara Murat takes the revenge of the dead members of his family and his country killing Carlos and his soldiers. The film which starts with the national anthem ends with the national anthem.

3.3 Kurtlar Vadisi Iraq

Plot of the film *Kurtlar Vadisi Iraq* is based on a true event between Turkish and American soldiers in North Iraq. This event which has been recorded as “Sack Event” in the history was that on 4 July 2003 a field officer and eleven Turkish Army soldiers under his command whose deployment was North Iraq Suleymaniye were captured by soldiers in American 173 Air Brigade and were taken to be kept under watch for sixty hours.

The leading casting of the film whose director was Serdar Akar consisted of Necati Şaşmaz (Polat Alemdar), Billy Zane (Sam William Marshall) and Bergüzar Korel (Leyla). The other important characters in the film are Doctor (Gary Busey) and Abdurrahman Halis Kerkuki (Ghassan Massoud).

In the beginning of the film, eleven Turkish soldiers who are taken prisoners after their encampment is attacked by American soldiers are deported. The film fiction starts after this. Lieutenant Süleyman Aslan who is in command of the troop consisting of 11 soldiers cannot live because of his self-esteem after surrendering by being insulted by the American soldiers and commits suicide after leaving a letter for Polat Alemdar. Polat Alemdar is a Turkish intelligence officer trained distinctively. Polat Alemdar who lives for his mission goes to North Iraq with his men. Polat and his men who go to Iraq to take Turkish soldiers’ revenge find themselves in the tragedy that the Americans make Iraq people live in. There are many crimes against

humanity in Iraq; innocent people are killed, organ trade, setting the people against each other, declaring people terrorists and arresting them.....

The leading actor of these crimes of humanity is an American Special Forces commander called Sam William Marshall who also supervised the “Sack Event”. Sam W. Marshall attacks an Arab wedding ceremony where all people in the region get together. He kills tens of people all of whom are civilians. The bride Leyla loses her husband-to-be in the attack. Hence, the destiny of Leyla who is seeking for an opportunity to take her revenge intersects with Polat’s.

Lieutenant Süleyman Aslan wants to resist to American soldiers but on the phone supervising authority gives the command not to fight. The Lieutenant says that the action of the soldiers is against Turkish nation. He states that he and his soldiers are ready to die to save his nation’s honour saying, “These people’s action is against Turkish nation. I am ready for your orders with my ten soldiers.” In this scene, we see an important characteristics of Turkish soldiers; obedience. Although they want to fight, the supervising authority wants them not to resist persistently. Eventually, the Lieutenant tells the soldiers to surrender.

Sam who takes possession of the encampment wants to take the Turkish flag on the Lieutenant’s table. Lieutenant Süleyman immediately takes the flag and puts it in his shirt’s pocket. The respect, love towards the national flag and its meaning do not let a foreign soldier touch it. The Lieutenant puts this flag into the envelope with the letter that he has written to Polat. The flag is the item that shows the patriotism once more and reinforces what he has written in the letter. Lieutenant Süleyman finishes his letter to Polat saying:

Dear Brother, on 4 July 2003 men with whom we drank tea and fight together attacked our encampment and threatened us with weapons while we were serving for the security of the region with my ten soldiers. Dear Brother, each day in Iraq, I thought this: What are we doing here? But in due course I understood that all who ruled over these lands tyrannized over these people, only our ancestors did not and unfortunately we are not worthy of our ancestors that day. We could not die for justice, preventing the tyranny, our honour. Now, I want it from you. What a pity, isn't it? Your brother Süleyman.

As it is understood from the letter, the reason that Turkish soldiers are in Iraq is to establish justice and make people live in peace in an honorable way. Lieutenant wants Polat to die to be worth of their ancestors thinking that they could not. Lieutenant Süleyman commits suicide saying "May my country live forever." This event shows the audience that the commander cannot keep his self-esteem after being taken with sacks on their heads by American soldiers.

Polat Alemdar and his men set off for Iraq after receiving Lieutenant Süleyman's letter. Polat is stopped by the peshmergas at the entrance of the city and they want him to kneel down. However, Polat shows them that a Turkish man never kneels down in front of somebody and wards them off.

The wedding ceremony of Leyla and Ali make a lot of people in the region get together. The wedding ceremony reflects rich diversity in terms of manifesting the national and cultural values. The rituals shown in the wedding ceremony are the ones that the Turkish nation is familiar with such as the wedding meals, women's and girls' helping with the meals, women's and men's sitting in distinct places, the groom's getting shaved on a chair in the yard. Ali gives a dagger which is a souvenir from his ancestors. He says, "It is a souvenir from my ancestors, it is very valuable. From Selahaddin Eyyübi to today, men in my family have given it to their wives to

make them preserve our honor and blood. The dagger which has been passed from one generation to another is the protector of their blood and honor and at the same time a symbol that reminds the necessity to preserve them. Leyla takes the dagger saying “My son’s custody is with me.”

That Sam W. Marshall and his soldiers attack the wedding house and declare everybody terrorist as there has been a fire in the wedding ceremony is a description of an example of the USA Government’s practices in the Middle East. The soldiers kill a lot of innocent people besides Ali in the wedding house. The wedding house turns into a mourning house. The most tragic event in this scene, which is in slow motion, is that the first bullet is fired against a child touching the soldier’s rifle with a stick. The message in this scene which is strengthened by slow motion is that the American soldiers commit infanticides. Another example of American soldiers’ savageness is that they carry people to hospitals by containers for organ trade. To make them be able to breathe one of the soldiers makes a so-called “breathing hole” by raking the container with a rifle. A lot of people are injured or killed. The organs of the survivors are sent to Israel, England or the USA by a Jewish doctor, in a close up scene. It aims at arousing hatred against Israel and England besides the USA.

Polat tells the hotel manager Fender to call Sam after laying down dynamites under the columns of Grand Harilton Hotel with his men. When Fender says, “Mr. Marshall has no relationship with our hotel,” Polat Alemdar asks, “Don’t you pay his salary? Is American capitalism not the boss of American soldiers?” This statement stresses that the power behind the American soldiers’ that audacious attitude is American capitalism. This fact is reinforced with the dialogues between Polat and Sam. To Polat, who says he will explode the hotel, Sam says, “You explode my

Kaaba and I will explode yours.” It is shown that for Sam Grand Harilton Hotel, which symbolizes capitalism, is equal to Kaaba, which is the holiest place for Muslims.

Polat’s goal is to take revenge for the American’s insulting Turkish soldiers not to explode the hotel. To Sam Marshall, he says:

There is nothing I want to take from you. But there is something that you can give me. I will put this sack over your head. I will do the same to your men. You will go out of the hotel with sacks over your heads all together! The journalists will take your photos. You can give that much to me, right? I will give you the Grand Harilton in exchange. And I will go.

If Sam and his men do what Polat Alemdar wants, it means that he has taken the revenge for the “Sack Event” and that it is announced to the world via media.

One of the fiercest dialogues fomenting Turkish nationalism is between Polat and Sam in Grand Harilton Hotel. What Sam says after Polat throws the sack towards Sam’s face touches on Turkish people’s nerves. To Polat Sam says:

OK. Look Turk. For fifteen years I have been in this region. I know Turks very well. You like boasting. You have your own rules, your own red lines. You have your own constant Iraq politics. You always say, “If we do not want nobody can do anything here.” Shall I tell you something? We have already erased your red lines. We ruined your Iraq politics. I do not understand you. You did not take it as an offence but you took two sacks over your heads as an offence. I will tell you what you have taken it as an offence. United States is paying you for fifty years. We send even the elastic bands of your underclothes. Why can you not produce anything? You want money, we send it. You said that you wanted gun, we sent it. You admitted to fight. But before sending your soldiers, you started bargaining and then again you wanted money. How can you forget begging to us to save you from the communists? I will tell you have taken it as an offence. It is because we do not need you any more.”

Polat's answer to Sam after these sentences relieves Turkish people a little bit. Polat throws the sack towards Sam saying, "As you have said, I am a Turk. And I will turn the world upside down on a man who is to put a sack over a Turk's head! Now, shut up and wear it." Polat is challenging the world's super power America with his sentences and attitude.

What saves Sam from Polat is a bus filled with children that Sam has brought to the hotel. When Polat sees children, he tells Sam, "You are already an infanticide!" According to Sam it is normal to kill anybody, whether children or adult, to reach the goal. When Polat leaves the hotel, Sam sings Beethoven's 9th symphony with the children. This song puts forward an ironic situation in terms of American politics in Iraq. The expressions, "All men become brothers under the sway of thy gentle wings, whoever has created an abiding friendship, or has won a true and loving wife, all who can call at least one soul theirs, join in our song of praise; but any who cannot must creep tearfully away from our circle." contradicts American soldiers practices.

Another indicator of American soldiers' tyranny in the region is what they do in the prisons. That Iraqi people in prison are undressed completely, are beaten being put over and over, are tortured with compressed water, are called "terrorists" "vile cannibals", are met by "Welcome to hell" sayings and that a man who was praying was taken out of the room can be seen as the examples of tortures.

After suicide bomber event in bazaar area, Sam's soldiers begin to pursue Polat and his men. Leyla saves Polat and his men by hiding them. Leyla and Polat's ways intersect by this event. A dialogue between Leyla and Polat reveals the Americans plans in the region. Leyla says that the soldiers have not completely

finished pursuing them and it will be better to wait a little more. As a response to it, Polat says, “If we wait for Americans to leave, we will get older, Leyla.” It is stressed that Americans do not think of leaving the region by Polat’s sentences.

Sheikh Kerkuki prays;

‘Regardless of the seemingly, of the winner and of the loser, you are the superior, the prevailing, you are the one who performs and who has everything performed! Oh God, you are the one to make Muhammed Mustafa experience the feeling of failure. You never persecute. Oh God, we have believed and approved that we are the ones to persecute. Because of being far apart by our egocentric ambitions instead of being one in your way, we have persecuted ourselves. Since we have persecuted ourselves, enemies are now persecuting us, too. We have turned to you from all persecutors and from you. We have been sinners, losers, prisoners. We didn’t awaken by the wisdom of Quran or sunnah; you awakened us by the attacks of enemies. Now vouchsafe us, grant us with the necessary power and energy to overcome these attacks. Grant us with conscious patience and perseverance. Oh God, for the sake of your holy prophet who brought us Islam, the religion of peace, don’t keep us away from his rule and moral which he strongly obeyed at times of war!’

While praying with these words, Sheikh Kerkuki sends messages to Turkish people at the same time. He lists the reasons of Muslims’ current condition, the necessary traits of Muslims and advises them to be one and together.

As they are talking on top of the roof, Leyla tells Polat that her only wish before was to give her last breath in Iraq but now she only dreams of sticking the dagger in her hand into Sam’s heart. Polat also wants to take revenge for Turkish soldiers and people by killing Sam.

Sheikh Abdurrahman Halis Kerkuki rescues an American journalist from Iraqi Muslims. By warning the soldiers that were about to cut the journalist’s head off with his following words: ‘How can you perform such a cruel activity?’, he reminds that Muslims should be different.

The piano that was sent Sam as a present arrives home. However, Polat and his men placed a bomb into the piano beforehand. The bomb explodes. Everyone thinks Sam is dead. Erhan comes home in happiness and says ‘Children are outside; they shout that Turkey is proud of you’.

With the thought that it would be safer; Polat wants to leave Sheikh’s home. Azan was being recited as Polat was talking to the old person who was performing ablution at the fountain in the courtyard. Sam’s men who attacked Sheikh’s home blow the minaret up by rocket launchers. The audience is agitated by the blowing up of a temple which is the sacred for him/her. Conflicts between the two sides restart. Polat and his three men kill Sam’s men. Sam is killed by Polat with Leyla’s dagger. And, Leyla dies in the arms of Polat.

If we are to summarize the reflections of Turkish nationalism in the movie ‘Kurtlar Vadisi Iraq’ in general terms; as I have indicated before, it is based on a real story of Turkish-American soldiers in Iraq. The reason why Polat and his men go to Iraq is known as the “sack event” all over the world. The producer, scenarist and director of the movie wanted to eliminate such a negative occasion from Turkish people’s mind by the help of cinema. While doing this, they included positive characteristics of Turkish people, too. Especially patriotism and being devoted to honor, friendship, love of humanity, peace, reverence, being bound to cultural values, the sensibility of Islam, respect to the sacred are mentioned throughout the film.

As indicating the characteristics of Turkish society in the film, comparison with other nations is also traced. The other nation that is subject to comparison is America which is symbolized by the American soldiers, especially Sam W. Marshall.

In the movie, Americans are depicted as people who think everything acceptable towards their aim, who are imperialist, cruel, torturer, infanticide, who don't have respect in other nations and religions, who announces imperialism as the center of their lives and who is involved in organ trade.

People living at the area are depicted as positive or negative in accordance with their relations to Sam thereby to America. Turcoman leader's words: 'They spared mountain to Kurds, desert to Arabs and petroleum to themselves. We even don't have a place to go!' gives the image of Turcoman being innocent at least because of not being in cooperation with Americans. In the beginning of the film, the Kurds in the appearance of peshmerga and the Kurdish leader in cooperation with Sam arouse negative feelings in the audience. However, the same Kurdish leader's preventing Sheikh Kerkuki's is being arrested for the reason that he was always helpful to them eliminates the possibility of a radical negative feeling in the audience.

CONCLUSION

The role of media in the spread of national and cultural values is important. Cinema is believed to be the most effective means of media as it includes every type of art form. Recently cinema has reached to such a technological level that it can address to every sense of human beings. Therefore, cinema has the ability to easily convey a message to the whole world directly or indirectly, even by manipulating the truths.

Hollywood, the most powerful centre of film industry, is used according to the benefit of the American government. Nationalism in Hollywood movies has been a vital means of propaganda since WWII. During WWII, American government asked Hollywood producers to use nationalistic instruments in their movies in order to form a unity among their people and to increase their morale. Since then, producers have played their role with a great success.

On the other hand, nationalistic images were used in Turkish Cinema especially after 1960s and 70s. The struggles between the originally strip cartoon characters, such as Tarkan and Kara Murat, and enemy were adapted into cinema. These movies tried to create national consciousness for the next generations by reminding Turkish people how patriotic and courageous their ancestors were. Turkish nationalistic movies started to be popular in the last ten years. From “Deli Yürek: Bumerang Cehennemini” (2001) to Nefes (2009), various films which contain nationalistic images have been made. These movies are harshly criticized by some people as they provoke people against other nations while they are deeply praised by others as they depict how brave Turkish people are.

Among nationalistic movies, the ones which are about wars have a distinctive place because in these movies, directors and producers approach to historical events caring about the benefits of their own nations. As analyzed in this thesis, the reflections of nationalism on Hollywood and Turkish cinema are clearly exposed.

This thesis has attempted to demonstrate that *The Patriot* (2000), *Black Hawk Down* (2001), and *We Were Soldiers* (2002) are three important Hollywood movies which include various nationalistic images which try to unite American people and arouse the feelings of fraternity and nationalism. Moreover, *Tarkan Marsın Kılıcı* (*Tarkan, the Sword of Mars*) (1969), *Kara Murat Kara Şovalye'ye Karşı* (*Kara Murat against Kara Şovalye*) (1975), and *Kurtlar Vadisi Irak* (2006) are three important Turkish movies which serve to show people how brave Turkish people have been since the beginning of time and infuse people with the feelings of nationalism and patriotism in different periods.

Most of these movies are war movies. When we look at the events through the eyes of Turkish and American society, we can see that the concept of enemy is important. In Hollywood movies, enemies are the English, the Africans, and the Vietnamese while in Turkish movies the Byzantine, the Vandals, the Romans, and the American. There are also some ethnic cultures which the protagonists fight against.

In all movies, both the Hollywood and Turkish, the protagonists have super human characteristics as warriors. They at most get injured while fighting against hundreds of enemies and their injuries do not prevent them from fighting. Especially in the early Turkish movies, our protagonists turn into some kind of mythological characters.

While cultural values of Turkish and American societies come into prominence, this is more evident in Turkish cinema. Turkish people are portrayed in a way that they are proud, patriotic and ready to die for their nations, they prioritize their nation, they are just and sensitive, they give importance to their families and they have religious sensitivity. These characteristics of Turkish people are conveyed to the audience by both the roles and dialogues of the characters. On the other hand, in Hollywood movies social values are depicted in the course of events. Therefore, we can say that Hollywood films are more natural than the Turkish movies.

The reflections of nationalism on Hollywood Cinema give the impression that these images in the movies are created under the control of the government. For example, just like in every Hollywood movie about the Vietnam War, *We Were Soldiers* also depicts the events different from the historical reality. Their failure in Vietnam is manipulated into a story of heroes for the benefit of the American government.

In Hollywood movies patriotism also includes the individual rights and freedom. Patriotism is important, but the survival and happiness of an individual is also important. For example, in *Patriot*, our protagonist Benjamin Martin refuses to attend the war in order to protect his family although he attended a war and fought very bravely in the past. In Turkish movies; however, our heroes are ready to die under every circumstance.

Moreover, flag is an important symbol that is used in every nationalistic Hollywood movie. American flag is in every part of human life in Hollywood movies; for example it is used as the case for a pillow. However, in Turkish movies it is used only in war and official places.

The concept of family as the indicator of nationalism is treated in a different way in Hollywood and Turkish cinema. In Hollywood movies, while the protagonists have families and children, in Turkish movies the protagonists have no families. Although family has a sacred place in Turkish society, heroes are not married in order not to prevent them from dying for their nation.

Although there are some differences resulting from different social, cultural, and religious values, both in Hollywood and Turkish Cinema, there are many movies which are rich in depicting nationalistic and patriotic images. These movies are made in order to serve some goals, such as arousing nationalistic feelings, infusing people with patriotism and motivating them to fight for their countries when it is necessary. There are various reactions against these movies. Some people believe that they provoke people against other nations while others praise these movies as they remind the new generation their history and nationalistic feelings. In spite of these different reactions, nationalistic movies attract the attention of a lot of audience with the feelings they have as well as with the technology they use.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Benedict (1991), *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.

Anderson, Benedict (1996), "Introduction" in Gopal Balakrishnan *Mapping the Nation*, London and New York: Verso, 1-16

Baycroft, Timothy (1998), *Nationalism in Europe 1789- 1945*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Breuilly, Kohn (1996), "Approaches to Nationalism", in Gopal Balakrishnan *Mapping the Nation*, London and New York: Verso, 146-174

Cheung Ruby, and Fleming, D. H. (2009) *Cinemas, Identities and Beyond*, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Çağlayan, Tahir Alper. "Türkiye'de Sinema Politikası." <http://www.kameraarkasi.org/sinema/makaleler/sinemapolitikasi.html>

Dieckhoff, Alain and Jaffrelot, Christophe (eds) (2005), *Revisiting Nationalism: Theories and Processes*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Gellner, Ernest (1983), *Nations and Nationalism*, Oxford: Blackwell

Genesis. <http://www.missionarlington.org/d/OT-2YR-5-Babel.pdf>

Guibernau, Montserrat (1996), *Nationalisms: The Nation State and Nationalism in the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Higson, Andrew (2005), "The Limiting Imagination of National Cinema" in (eds) Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie *Cinema and Nation*, London: Routledge, 57-69.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. (1990), *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hobsbawm, Eric J. (1996), "Ethnicity and Nationalism in Europe Today", in Gopal Balakrishnan *Mapping the Nation*, London and New York: Verso, 255- 266

Karakaya, Serdar. (2004) "Küreselleşme, Kültürel Yayılmacılık ve Ulusal Sinemalar." *SBE* 12: 63-70.

<http://www.kuranikerim.com/telmalili/hucurat.htm>

<http://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary>

Huntington, Samuel P. (2004) *Who are we? The Challenges to America's National Identity*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

Hutchinson, John and Smith, Anthony D. (eds) (2000), "General Introduction" in *Nationalism: Critical Concepts in Political Science*, London and New York: Routledge

Jones, Dorothy B. (1957), "Hollywood's International Relations." *The Quarterly of Film Radio and Television* 11: 362-374.

Kellner, Douglas, "Cultural Studies, Multiculturalism, and Media Culture" (<http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/>)

Kohn, Hans (2000), "The Idea of Nationalism" in John Hutchinson and Anthony Smith *Nationalism Critical Concepts in Politics Science*, Volume I, London and New York: Routledge 64-69

Kramer, Lloyd (1997), "Historical Narratives and the Meaning of Nationalism." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 58, No. 3: 525-545.

Limerick, Patricia N. (1988), "Review: the Truth About Hollywood", *Reviews in American History*, 16: 472-477.

Lyman, Rick (Dec. 26, 2001) "An Action Film Hits Close, but How Close? Second Thoughts Prevail against a Political Message", *New York Times*

Matray, James I. (2001) "Review" *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 89, No. 3: 1176-1177

McAlister, Melani (September, 2002) "A Cultural History of the War without End" *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 89, No. 2, History and September 11: A Special Issue: 439-455

Miller, David (1995), *On National Identity*, Malden MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Miller, David (2000), *Citizenship and National Identity*. Malden MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Motyl, Alexander J. (2001), *Encyclopedia of Nationalism*, Volume 2, London: Academic Press

Özkırımlı, Umut (2000), *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, London: Macmillan Press

Özkırımlı, Umut (2005), *Contemporary Debates on Nationalism: A Critical Engagement*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Pease, Donald E. (2000), "The Patriot Acts" *Boundary 2*, Volume 29, Number 2: 29-43 <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/b2/summary/v029/29.2pease.html>

Puri, Jyuti (2004), *Encountering Nationalism*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

Renan, Ernest (2003), "What is a Nation?" in Homi K Bhabha (ed), *Nation and Narration*, New York: Routledge

Robins, Kevin and Asu Aksoy (2005) "Deep Nation: The National Question and Turkish Cinema Culture" in *Cinema and Nation*. Eds. Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie. London: Routledge: 191-208.

Ross, William (2000), "Review" *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 87, No. 3: 1146-1148

Selçuk, Ayhan (2006), "Kurtlar Vadisi Irak Filminde Kültürel Ögeler ve Kimlik Sunumları Üzerine Bir İnceleme." *İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi* 22: 183-210.

Shephard, Anthony W. (2001), "An Exotic Enemy: Anti-Japanese Musical Propaganda in World War II Hollywood", *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 54, 2: 303-357.

Smith, Anthony D. (1991), *National Identity*, London: Penguin Books

Smith, Anthony D. (1995), *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Smith, Anthony D. (1998), *Nationalism and Modernism*, New York: Routledge

Smith, Anthony D. (2009), *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism A Cultural Approach*, New York: Routledge

Spencer, Philip and Wollman, Howard (2002), *Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, London: Sage

Springer, Claudia (1986) "Military Propaganda: Defense Department Films from World War II and Vietnam", *Cultural Critique*, No. 3, American Representations of Vietnam, Spring: 151-167

Tamir, Yael (1995), "Review: The Enigma of Nationalism." *World Politics*, 47, No. 3: 418-440. Jstor

Verdery, Katherine (1996), "Whither 'Nation' and 'Nationalism'?" in Gopal Balakrishnan *Mapping the Nation*, London and New York: Verso, 226-235

Wetta, Frank J., ve Martin A. Novelli (2003) "Now a Major Motion Picture: War Films and Hollywood's New Patriotism", *The Journal of Military History*, 67: 861-882.

Young, Marilyn B. (2003), "In the Combat Zone", *Radical History Review*, 85: 253-264.

Zawadzki, Paul (2005), "Nationalism, Democracy and Religion" in Alain Dieckhoff and Christophe Jaffrelot (eds.) *Revisiting Nationalism Theories and Processes*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan 165-190

Zernatto, Guido (2000) "Nation: the History of a Word" in J. Hutchinson and A. D. Smith (eds), *Nationalism: Critical Concepts in Political Science*, London and New York: Routledge, 13- 25

FILMS CITED

Black Hawk Down. Dir. Ridley Scott. DVD. Revolution Studios, 2001.

Kara Murat against Kara Şovalye. Dir. Natuk Baytan, 1975.

Kurtlar Vadisi Iraq. Dir. Serdar Akar. DVD. Pana Film, 2006.

Tarkan, the Sword of Mars. Dir. Tunç Başaran, 1969

The Patriot. Dir Roland Emmerich. DVD. Columbia Pictures Corporation, 2000.

We Were Soldiers. Dir. Randall Wallace. Icon entertainment International, 2002.