

Film as a Tool of Ideology^(*)

**Under the Supervision of
Sahar Sobhi Abdel Hakim**

**Asmaa Ahmed Shehab
Faculty of Art - Cairo University**

Abstract:

Film is a powerful ideological instrument utilized by the ruling classes to disseminate the dominant system of thought and secure their interests. With its form, narrative and representation, film plays a major role in aligning the spectators, instilling certain values and encouraging the adoption of certain beliefs. In this sense, a film is more than just entertainment. Films are political. Many film theories lay bare the ways films affect viewers. They also explain how films help maintain the status quo. This main objective of this paper is to explain why film is a successful and powerful tool of ideology. The paper is divided into four parts. The first part provides a historical background, demonstrating how various regimes used film as a propaganda tool to cement their ideals and construct national memory and identity. The second part presents different film theories – the psychoanalytic and cognitive film theories – to demonstrate how films affect viewers' psyches and engage people's minds and emotions and explain how this makes ideological conditioning possible. The third part focuses on the link between genre, the "depiction of reality" and ideology. Different Hollywood films from various time periods are referred to in order to demonstrate how they supported and promoted the dominant ideology of the time. The final part of the paper examines counter-ideological film genres, particularly the dystopian genre, to demonstrate how they challenge the ideological domination of mainstream films.

Keywords:

Propaganda, psychoanalytic film theory, cognitive film theory, emotions and ideology, the dystopian genre

(*) Film as a Tool of Ideology, Vol.12, Issue No.1, January 2023, pp.31-63.

الملخص:

يعد الفيلم أداة أيديولوجية قوية في يد الطبقة الحاكمة تستخدمها لنشر ودعم المنظومة الفكرية المهيمنة، وللحفاظ على مصالحها. يلعب الفيلم دوراً رئيساً في توحيد المشاهدين وغرس قيم محددة وتشجيع تبني معتقدات معينة عن طريق الشكل والقصة وأسلوب التقديم. وبهذا المعنى فإن الفيلم أكثر من مجرد تسلية. فالأفلام ذات وظيفة سييسية في المقام الأول. تكشف عديد من نظريات السينما عن الطرق التي تؤثر بها الأفلام على مشاهديها، وتكشف أيضاً عن الكيفية التي تعمل بها الأفلام للحفاظ على الوضع القائم. ويهدف هذا البحث لتوضيح ما يجعل الفيلم أداة للأيديولوجيا. ينقسم البحث إلى أربعة أجزاء رئيسية. يعرض الجزء الأول خلفية تاريخية، ويوضح كيف قامت أنظمة سياسية مختلفة باستخدام الفيلم وسيلة للبروباجندا. أما الجزء الثاني فيعرض نظريات الفيلم المختلفة التي توضح كيف تقوم الأفلام بالتأثير على المشاهد على المستوى النفسي والعقلي أو المعرفي. وتفحص هذه الدراسة الأساليب المختلفة التي يتم بها استخدام الأفلام لغرس الأيديولوجيا في عقل المشاهد. ويركز الجزء الثالث على العلاقة بين التوصيف الدقيق للواقع والأيديولوجيا، ويقوم الجزء بعرض أمثلة مختلفة من سينما هوليوود من حقبة زمنية مختلفة لتوضيح كيف قامت السينما بدعم الأيديولوجيا القائمة. أما الجزء الأخير فيقوم بفحص أشكال وأنواع الأفلام المناهضة للأيديولوجيا القائمة مثل أفلام الدستوبيا، للوقوف على شكل التحدي الذي تمثله هذه الأفلام للأشكال السينمائية التي تنتشر الأيديولوجيا.

الكلمات المفتاحية:

البروباجندا، النوع الديستوبي، نظرية الفيلم المعرفية، نظرية التحليل النفسي للفيلم، المشاعر والأيديولوجيا

Control and ideological programming, today, are dependent on the occupation of the audiovisual media industry. Film, with its power of representation, has the capacity to captivate people, reinforce and impose different value systems and is, therefore, considered a powerful tool to disseminate ideology. This power of film attracted theorists from different disciplines and they called for a serious study of film. This "filmologie" movement started in France in the late 1940s. The goal was to understand how films affect viewers on both a psychological and cognitive level. This paper demonstrates why and how film has been used by those in power to shape and control people in desirable ways. Then, it will present the different ways a film can affect and influence viewers. Finally, the paper will focus on the dystopian genre which rejects realism to subvert, expose and criticize the dominant ideology.

Film as a Tool of Propaganda

Historical Background: Soviet, Nazi and Hollywood's "Return to Vietnam" Films

The power of film has been recognized since its inception in the late nineteenth century (around 1895). Film emerged at a period when nationalism was one of the forces shaping history in Europe and America, and it was used by national powers to instill and disseminate national values. One of the earliest articles on the power of film as one of the principal methods of control is "Vodka, the Church, and the Cinema" (July 1923) by Russian politician Leon Trotsky (1879-1940). Trotsky understood the propagandist value of cinema that could be used to manipulate the people and influence public opinion.

According to Trotsky, the Bolshevik Revolution (1917) resulted in the eight-hour work day and the prohibition of vodka. Workers had more free time and Trotsky believed that it is the duty of those in control to provide the workers with satisfaction and entertainment. This pleasure must also serve as a tool for collective education. The cinema "satisfies these demands in a very direct, visual, picturesque, and vital way, requiring nothing from the audience; it does not even require them to be

literate". Trotsky finds film a suitable tool for "the application of our socialist educational energies". This is why cinema is an "instrument which we must secure at all costs!" (Trotsky, 1986, p.32)

This weapon (the cinema)... is the best instrument for propaganda... a propaganda which is accessible to everyone, which is attractive, which cuts into the memory and may be made a possible source of revenue.... The cinema competes not only with the tavern but also with the church.... The Orthodox Church ... never was successful in penetrating deeply into the consciousness of the masses... (Trotsky, 1986, p.33).

Here, Trotsky illustrated what distinguishes film from other available "weapons". He stresses its visual power that manipulates emotions and penetrates people's consciousness whether they are literate or not. It was a tool for educating the public about who they are, what to think and believe. Film was a vehicle for raising national consciousness; it gave "national identity" an image and a voice. On the screen, people watched stories about their history, traditions and national symbols. The background music reinforced the mood, while the language utilised in the *intertitles* – frames of text that were inserted in the silent films – reinforced the messages of the film. Vladimir Lenin (1870-1924) realized the power of film as a propaganda tool and witnessed its potential to unify and galvanize the workers. In 1922, he ordered that the first film production and distributing organization, *Goskino*, be established and said his famous statement, "of all the arts for us the most important is cinema" (Wayne, 2005, p.235). In this sense, film is more than entertainment. It has always been linked to politics, state control and is an effective way for the dissemination of ideas. The significance of film "as an organ of public opinion is not lessened by the fact that they are designed to entertain as well as inform" (Livingston, 2009, p.30).

Besides the Soviets, several countries sought to improve their film industries as a strategy of national affirmation. The most prominent example is the German Nazi cinema (1933-1945) which was

Hollywood's strongest competitor until the Second World War. In the early 1930s, one of the first missions of the Nazi Party was to establish a film department to disseminate and propagate their Nazi ideology. In *Mein Kampf* (1925), Hitler emphasized the powerful psychological effect of images.

The picture, in all its forms, including the film, has better prospects. In a much shorter time, at one stroke I might say, people will understand a pictorial presentation of something which it would take them a long and laborious effort of reading to understand (Hitler, 1939, p.434).

Nazi propagandist Hans Traub wrote in the essay "The Film as a Political Instrument" (1932) that film is an effective propaganda tool because it has "an unimaginable richness of rhythm for intensifying or dispelling emotions" (Brauchli, 2019, p.2). And, indeed, emotions are indispensable when it comes to ideology and propaganda. The Nazis sponsored film shows in large cinemas with huge crowds in order to maximize the propaganda effect, where the feeling of being part of the crowd was so overwhelming for the audience that critical evaluation of the film was not possible. Nazi films stirred the emotions of the people and made them feel proud to be Germans who belong to the Aryan Race. Others, however, were dehumanized and represented in the most derogative ways. *Der Untermensch* or *The Subhuman* was the term used to describe non-Aryans and in the Nazi films they were silenced and marginalized. Thus, Germany used cinema as a major propaganda tool for subjugating the people. In fact, Nazi propaganda films were so well made and varied in genres from documentaries to narratives that when the Italian-American director Frank Capra (1897-1991) watched Leni Riefenstahl's (1902-2003) film *The Triumph of the Will* (1935), he (Capra) said, "We're dead. We're gone. We can't win this war" (Harris, 2014, p.133).

In the same way, Hollywood produced films to instill American values in immigrants to integrate them in American society. Films were also used to construct social memory and foster a sense of patriotism and

nationalism through their discourses, resonant images, and narratives that serve at "mobilizing thought and behavior" (Kellner, 1996, p.107). Hollywood films played a key role during and after the Vietnam War (1955-1975). Instead of defeat, Hollywood films dealt with Vietnam and provided for many Americans an ideological presentation of the history of Vietnam War. The views of American Vietnam veterans are significant. Marita Sturken (1957) observes,

[s]urvivors of traumatic historical events often relate that as time goes by, they have difficulty distinguishing their personal memories from those of popular culture. For many World War II veterans, Hollywood's World War II movies have subsumed their individual memories into a general script (Grainge, 2013, p.104).

She adds "[s]ome Vietnam veterans say they have forgotten where some of their memories came from – their own experiences, documentary photographs, or Hollywood movies?" (Grainge, 2013, p.104). The pure or real experience is no longer available. Moreover, Vietnam veteran Michael Clark argues that Hollywood films worked to create a special memory of the war: "they had constituted our memory of the war all along... [They] healed over the wounds ... and transformed guilt and doubt into duty and pride" (Storey, 2009, p.178). This shows how films play a key role in constructing memories, experience and consciousness.

These "return to Vietnam" films are made in a way to circulate their "regime of truth" which does not have to be historically correct. This is achieved through what is intentionally not included in the films. Omissions and silences reveal an ideological agenda. The films focus on evil communists and ignore any U.S. brutality against the Vietnamese because "[h]egemony... works by exclusion and marginalization, as much as by affirming specific ideological positions" (Kellner, 1996, p.114).

Propaganda filmmakers manipulate the emotions of the spectators. They employ cinematic effects such as slow motion, close-ups, triumphant music, camera framing, and lighting to "overwhelm the

viewer's critical faculties, thus subliminally conveying the ideologies through images and spectacle" (Kellner, 1996, p.69). Moreover, propaganda films provide viewers with a closure. The "happy ending" is significant because it allows the spectator to experience defeating evil, with all its emotions, through the spectacle. Cumulatively, the return-to-Vietnam films exhibit a defensive and compensatory response to military defeat in Vietnam. Victory was achieved in the films and helped people cope with social anxieties and reduce the sense of humiliation connected with defeat.

These return-to-Vietnam propaganda films served the country in multiple ways. They promoted the anti-communist ideology of the time. The posters of *Rambo*, for example, were displayed outside recruitment bureaus by the US Army in order to attract enlistees. *Top Gun* (1986) is another film with a similar effect. It aesthetizes war and, thus, offers propaganda for the army even the credits at the end give "special thanks" to the pilots of the U.S. Navy who participated in the film. *Time* reported that: "Its glorified portrayal of Navy life spurred theater owners ... to ask the Navy to set up recruiting exhibits outside cinemas where *Top Gun* was playing to sign up the young moviegoers intoxicated by the Hollywood fantasy" (Lamar, 1986, p.1). The film led to a major jump in military academy applications. This shows how ideologies are action-oriented. However, this is not a realistic depiction of war. It is the "myth" of war that film is trying to create. In *Death of the liberal Class* (2010) Chris Hedges states:

If we really saw war, what war does to young minds and bodies, it would be impossible to embrace the myth of war. ... This is why war is carefully sanitized. The wounded, the crippled, and the dead are, in this great charade, swiftly carted offstage. (p.82)

Propaganda films whether Nazi German, Russian or American are ideological devices built to promote hegemonic political positions. They are made in a way to glorify the state and demonize the enemy. They resist oppositional readings as Douglas Kellner (1996) insists: "It is a

mistake... to exaggerate the power of audiences against media culture. The media are tremendously powerful forces and underestimating their power does not benefit critical projects of social transformation" (108).

Propaganda films are not the only films that serve the interests of people in power. On the contrary, mainstream films like action films, thrillers or romances are equally powerful. They do not openly or explicitly transmit their messages, but achieve this in a smooth and subliminal way. Mainstream films have a stronger, more lasting effect. Paisley Livingston emphasizes that mainstream films have always "shaped the consciousness and beliefs of individuals" (p.142). Even in cases when culture did not flatter power openly, it tended to "affirm, rather than negate, the existing social order" and accommodate the status quo (Basch, 2016, p.1).

Mainstream Film and Ideology

Many film critics agree that each film is a product of ideology, no matter how 'artistic' it may claim to be, it has political implications. "It is made in and diffuses an ideology" (Comolli, 2015, p.143). A film, Althusser states, "give(s) to us in the form of 'seeing,' 'perceiving' and 'feeling' the ideology from which it is born, in which it bathes, from which it detaches itself as art, and to which it alludes" (p.223). Film has a very strong, cumulative influence particularly on young people who consume ideological norms that are frequently transmitted not in the open messages but in the practices and events repeatedly described as "normal" and "ordinary." As Mark Fisher states, "[a]n ideological position can never be really successful until it is naturalized" (p.21). Film has the power to naturalize certain values because it is an attractive, audiovisual medium that reaches a large number of people. Films are, also, easy to digest. They manipulate different senses and emotions and, therefore, they penetrate the minds of the viewers who accept their messages with no resistance because they are entertaining and pleasurable. Pleasure teaches people what to love and what to keep away from because "pleasure ... is neither natural nor innocent. Pleasure is ... intimately bound up with power and knowledge" (Kellner, 1996, p.39).

This power of film intrigued many theorists from different countries and disciplines. They regarded film as a tool of ideology with the power to influence and shape the beliefs of the masses. To explain this power, some theorists employed psychoanalysis to explain what distinguishes film and makes it such a popular medium.

Psychoanalytic Film Theory and Ideology

Psychoanalysis has occupied a significant position in film studies and became the leading paradigm during the 1970s and 1980s. It has been used to determine the hypnotic influence of film and attempted to explain how a film captivates the viewer. Psychoanalysis was also used to identify the different processes that link the human psyche to the film text, particularly the unconscious and how this could influence the beliefs and ideologies of the viewers.

Hugo Münsterberg (1863-1916) was the first philosopher to write about film. In *The Film: A Psychological Study* (1916), he focused on aesthetic distinctiveness of film which replicates the mind in a way that was more compelling than other typical narrative forms of storytelling. Other film theorists used the theories of Jacques Lacan (1901-1981) – mainly his idea of the mirror stage – to describe the identification processes that take place in the viewing context. According to Lacan, the mirror stage is an early phase in the establishment of a child's identity. The stage starts when the child is six months. Lacan writes: "It suffices to understand the mirror stage ... as an identification ... namely the transformation that takes place in the subject when he assumes an image" (76). This theory marks the incipience of psychoanalytic film theory, which used the analogy between Lacan's child and the film spectator.

Jean-Louis Baudry (1930-2015) argued that the "screen-spectator relationship activates a return to the Lacanian Imaginary ... when the child experiences its first sense of a unified self during the mirror stage" (Hill, 2000, p.78). The film screen, like a mirror, provides pictures in which viewers may see themselves. The viewer identifies with the "camera-eye" or the film apparatus and what it shows. Also, just as the

child identifies with idealized images of himself during the mirror phase, the film audience identifies with idealized characters on the screen. This character identification "sutures" the viewer into the film. The concept of "suturing" was developed by Jacques-Alain Miller who used the ideas of Lacan to describe the processes "of binding... that pertain to subject formation" or describe how a film works with the psyches of the viewers to position them as subjects within the film. This identification process is extremely important because "it amounts to an ideological effect" and makes ideological conditioning possible (Elsaesser, p. 152).

Psychoanalytic film theory also explains cinematic pleasure which constantly causes audiences to return to film-viewing. Film is primarily used to mobilize and maintain wish-fulfillment. Parker Tyler states: "A thousand small wishes are symbolically satisfied by the humblest and worst Hollywood movie" (p.238). In *Psychoanalysis and Cinema: The Imaginary Signifier* (1975), Christian Metz (1931-1993) argued the film image compensates for what people lack in real life. That is why Metz dubs cinema "The Imaginary Signifier," it provides pictures that suggest completeness, but it is just imaginary. This compensation offers "an imaginary unity to smooth over the fragmentation at the heart of subjectivity" (Hill, 2000, p.80). This compensation, also, extinguishes possible revolutionary impulses and provides an escape from everyday reality.

Films cause the audience to surrender. Hortense Powdermaker (1900-1970) called Hollywood the "dream factory" because "Hollywood provides ready-made fantasies or day-dreams" (p.13) that appeal to and captivate millions of people. In general, there is a long history in the comparison of film and dream. Metz describes the "filmic state" of theatrical movie going to "a kind of sleep in miniature, a waking sleep" (p.116). The spectator, under the influence of the film, becomes immobile and hypnotized by visuals and emotions supplied by the film which cause him to temporarily lose his concern with the outside. This response to film as a form of psychological regression is in line with Freud's dreaming theory, in which the audience returns to a more

primitive form of mental functioning. In this passive state, the viewers will not resist the ideological messages delivered by the film.

Cognitive Film Theory and Ideology

Cognitive film theory emerged in the late 1980s to expand on psychoanalytic theory. Its founder Noel Carroll focuses on "look[ing] for alternative answers to many of the questions addressed by or raised by psychoanalytic film theories ... in terms of cognitive and rational processes rather than unconscious or irrational ones" (p.385). Cognitive film theorists seek to understand "how films engage our minds" (Allen, 174). Gregory Currie explained that the cognitive theory emphasizes "the ways in which our experiences of cinematic narrative resemble our experiences of seeing and comprehending events and processes in reality" (p.106). Cognitive scholars use a multidisciplinary approach that draws from a variety of fields such as psychology, neuroscience and philosophy to understand how film affects viewers' thoughts, emotions and behaviour.

Film theorists explained how films engage minds. For example, close-ups present "in visual form a correlate to the mental act of paying attention to something" (Wartenberg, 2015, p.3) and flashback "developed as a means of mimetic representation of memory, dreams, or confession" (Turim, 1989, p.6). Such instruments are all objectifications of mental processes that visualize and present the consciousness of screen characters and directly interact with the viewers' consciousness. A film can present events "just as they are brought together in our own consciousness" (Langdale, 2002, p.96). Viewers instinctively identify these objectified mental functions.

A film not only mimics human perception but it can also augment and transform it. Sergei Eisenstein (1898-1948), a Russian film theorist and director, was interested in understanding how films worked and how they moved audiences. According to Eisenstein, montage – "the process of selecting, assembling, and arranging motion picture shots and corresponding sound tracks in coherent sequence and flowing continuity"

(Katz, 1994, p.405) – was the best technique to stir and touch the spectator on several levels. Montage is control. Eisenstein magnified the impact of pallid scenes to galvanize the senses and stimulate the emotions, feelings and thoughts of the viewers to inculcate political messages. Emotions are extremely significant in film. Filmmakers know how to manipulate different emotions to fulfill different objectives.

Emotions, Affect and Ideology

The excess production and transmission of affect poses a constant threat of manipulation because emotions are tightly bound up with cognitions. Aristotle maintains that affect is "that which leads one's condition to become so transformed that his judgment is affected". Affect "influences the mind," (Shepard, 2015, p.3) and for this reason "emotions as experienced in films... contribute to a film's ideological effects" (Livingston, 2009, p.86). In this case, affect is connected to consciousness.

Film is sensual in a way that reading literature is not. Films derive their power in part from the physiological responses they are able to invoke in the spectator. In "Film Bodies: Gender, Genre, and Excess" (1991), Linda Williams discusses how emotions trigger bodily changes. The viewer's corporeality is stimulated by certain genres such as horror or melodrama. People react with laughter, tears and experience changes of moods, arousal and, in extreme cases, people had heart attacks because they watched a film. In fact, there is extensive research done by scientists to know more about how films cause the secretion of certain chemicals and hormones and how this will affect the audience in the short run (while watching the film) and long run (in real life).

Some cognitive film theorists often hold the belief that when watching film, our cognitive and perceptual experience is similar to our cognitive and perceptual experience of ordinary life events. In other words, emotions evoked on watching films are in many respects similar to emotions aroused in real life. They are "witness emotions" as if the viewer were a "side participant" in actual events (Tan, 1996, p.82). We react with real emotions to film because "the human mind/brain is

modular.... Fictions engage parts of the brain that generate automatic affective and emotional responses, while eliciting high-order cognitive processing that precludes viewers from responding as though the fictions were actual events" (Livingston, 2009, p.89). In a sense, film can be viewed as a replacement for experience because what people watch in film form becomes acceptable to them subconsciously. When people experience a similar situation in real life, they are already familiar with it because they have already lived it in film form.

Filmmakers are able to amplify and exaggerate certain emotions in order to influence the audience and accomplish certain objectives. Film strategies such as music and colour are employed to engage the subconscious of the viewer into the film. Also, character empathy plays a key role in the production of emotions.

Music stimulates the formation of certain brain chemicals and selecting specific kinds of music can affect the mood of the viewers. Philip Merikle describes subliminal experience as something that happens when "stimuli presented below the threshold or limen for awareness are found to influence thoughts, feelings, or actions" (p.123). Film music is perceived by film viewers, for the most part, without awareness, and directly influences their perceptions and thoughts about the events depicted on screen. Music plays directly on the viewer's emotions because a film's music is similar "to a hypnotist's voice that lures us into unconscious obeisance to a film text's ideological demands" (Smith, 2009, p.191).

Colour is another significant tool utilized by filmmakers to assist them in delivering their ideological messages. Colour "affects both the functions of our body as well as our mind and emotions". Viewers react both physiologically and psychologically to colour (Ertem, 2017, p.1). In 2018, the University of Melbourne published a study that shows the "power" of colour and how it plays a key role in influencing the way we "think, feel, behave and how our brains... respond to them unconsciously". Every colour has a different energy, frequency and wavelength. By using the right combination of colours, filmmakers can

achieve the desired effects. They can "influence your decisions or your judgment and affect your mood" (Gazibegovic, 2018, p.2). Thus, the aural and visual stimuli converge in the mind of the film spectator and form what may be described as a "complex gestalt" (Biancorosso, 2009, p.260). Moreover, films synchronize the brains of the spectators. Psychologist Uri Hasson explained that "when people watch a movie together their brain activity is, to a remarkable degree, synchronized. ... It's also a testament to the captivating power of cinema" (Miller, 2014, p.2). This shows how film affects viewers on a large scale.

Another way of engaging the spectator's emotional response to film is achieved by narrative and character because "[f]ilm's narration constructs a preferred or intended trajectory of emotional responses" (Livingston, 2009, p.92). Filmmakers, also, use the apparatus to engage the audience with their characters. They want viewers to empathize with their characters and sometimes they want more. They want their viewers to experience the same feelings and emotions of their characters. In theatre, Konstantin Stanislavsky (1863- 1938) developed the Stanislavsky method which intended to create rich characters by allowing the actors to completely comprehend and internalise their characters' inner emotions and motives. He urged the actors to use their personal experiences and memories to convey genuine, authentic emotions and build empathy. Building empathy is also crucial for filmmakers.

In "How Movies Trick Your Brain Into Empathizing With Characters", Greg Miller explains how *science could support filmmakers in their art*. An interesting example is the film *Black Swan* whose director, Darren Aronofsky, is always keen on putting his audience in the mindset of his characters. Some neuroscientists studied the brain activity of the audience who watched the last scene of the film when the dancer, Nina, begins to hallucinate that black feathers are poking through her skin. Interestingly, when people watch this scene, their brain activity bears some resemblance to a pattern that has been observed in people with schizophrenia. Later, Aronofsky was asked if he was concerned about giving his audience a taste of psychosis, yet he

responded, "I'd be thrilled" (Miller, 2014, p.1).

Aronofsky states that when he plans scenes, he thinks a lot about how to manipulate the audience's emotions. He said, "[w]e're always thinking about how to get into an emotional state... and how to bring as much of the audience along with us". To achieve this end, he uses everything at his disposal from character to music and colour. "There's always a theory of where the camera is and why it's there," Aronofsky said (Miller, 2014, p.1). Therefore, emotions are an integral part of film. They are related to cognition and are one of the key mechanisms that control and direct attention, confirm or modify beliefs, desires and ideologies.

The Depiction of Reality and Ideology

Most film theorists and critics agree that the ideological functioning of film is achieved by means of the cinema machinery that assumes the role of producing reality for its audience – in image and story. In his essay "The Myth of Total Cinema" (1967), Andre Bazin (1918-1958) describes the cinematic frame as "a torn fragment from the 'seamless fabric of reality'" (p.235). The cinema was lauded for showing the world objectively. It was considered a mechanical reflection of the world. Adorno and Horkheimer, also, stress that films strictly "reproduce the world". This way a "film denies its audience any dimension in which they might roam freely in imagination... thus it trains those exposed to it to identify film directly with reality" (Horkheimer, 2006, p.45).

In "Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus" (1970), Baudry explains that cinema supports dominant ideology by covering the way it creates an illusion of reality. "Realism's disguising of the constructed as 'the natural' is a direct parallel to the function of ideology" (Turner, 1988, p.180). The viewer sees an image produced by a camera but believes it to be true and accurate, as if the events were actually happening before his eyes, without intervention, as if it is an unmediated perception of the world. This is not the case, though. More than it shows, the screen may hide. It inscribes a "dissemblance" within

"resemblance", and this is why it constitutes a lure (Comolli 2015, p.80). This is how films are conservative; this "depiction of reality" turns film into an instrument of ideology because it replicates the world and creates a world that can be recognized by the audiences. This is why, in most cases, realist films do not criticize or oppose dominant or mainstream values or beliefs because "it cannot question itself without losing authenticity" (MacCabe, 2004, p.53).

Jean-Louis Comolli (1941) emphasizes that the impression of reality serves to produce films which are "thoroughly bathed in ideology, which express it, carry it forward without any gaps or distortions" (Comolli, 2015, p.254) to the extent that the films "give no indication that their makers were even aware of the fact" (Comolli 2015, p.46). Nothing in these films causes a break with conformity. The films expose the unconscious of their filmmakers which is usually reflected in the representations of gender and race.

To illustrate, Hollywood films that were produced up until the 1980s "remained almost exclusively the cultural property of a white male consciousness, the centre from which any difference regarding race, gender and sexuality was defined and marginalised.... [W]omen and visible minorities assumed subsidiary and stereotyped roles" (Grant 2007, 80). Laura Mulvey explained that the classical Hollywood film reinforces myths about women and fosters and perpetuates a "patriarchal unconscious" (p.348) where women are reduced to an object or the Other, against which male subjectivity is created. The women in the films did not represent real women, but rather how men perceived women to be.

Racial representations are, also, significant. The film *Gone With the Wind* (1939), which is now banned on different streaming services because of its racial politics and its negative representation of black people, depicts slave characters who seem contented with their slavery. The film was "a product of its time" and depicted "ethnic and racial prejudices" that "were wrong then and are wrong today" (HBO, 2020, P.1). The film was promoting the dominant ideology of its time and

people accepted it as normal because past filmmakers were not always aware of "the covert psychological and social ... subtext" of their films (Sobchack, 1980, p.245). The problem, however, is that these ideologies were accepted and internalized by women and black people. They saw themselves through the eyes of this dominant ideology. bell hooks (1952-2021) commented:

Opening a magazine or book, turning on the television set, watching a film ... we are most likely to see images of black people that reinforce and reinscribe white supremacy. Those images may be constructed by white people... or by people of color/black people who may see the world through the lens of white supremacy-internalized racism. (p.15)

Mulvey and hooks are both aware of the dangers of representations that maintain the power structures and reconcile audiences with the status quo. Mulvey advocates the "destruction of pleasure" synonymous with realistic classical Hollywood cinema because this realism conducts the work of ideology which convinces or teaches people to accept their subjection. Mulvey advocates for an avant-garde cinema which "challenges the basic assumptions of the mainstream film" (p.343) and eschews emotional engagement because this emotional engagement plays an essential role in making film an instrument of oppressive ideological values. hooks encourages filmmakers to be more mindful of "the myth-making accomplished by the genres of film" (Sobchack, 1980, p.245). She states: "To face these wounds... progressive black people ... must be willing to grant the effort to critically intervene and transform the world of image making" (hooks, p.19).

Hollywood Mainstream Genre Films and Ideology

Genres – categories that define films and have distinctive textual features including subject matter and themes (e.g. detective films), setting (e.g. the western), narrative form (e.g. the musical), characterization and filmic techniques – function as tools for predicting and regulating the reception of films. Ideological messages are repeated

and some visual patterns in genre films give viewers a clear indication of what to expect. In an article entitled "Genre Film and the Status Quo," (1974) Judith Hess Wright argued that genre films advance the interests of the dominant class through their repetitions and variations of a few simple plots. They are examples of modern mass-mediated myth because "[i]n mass-mediated society, we huddle around movie screens instead of campfires for our mythic tales" (Grant, 2007, p.29).

Also, through their repetition and variation, genres organize the framework of expectations and function as tools for predicting and regulating the reception of texts. "The standard genre film permits little audience mobility" (Andrew 1984, 121). John Hartley explains that the meaning-potential of a text is limited and constrained by genres which direct the viewers to certain conclusions and act as "agents of ideological closure" (O'Sullivan *et al.* 1994, p.128). This is because a "[g]enre *constrains* the possible ways in which a text is interpreted, guiding readers of a text towards a *preferred reading* (which is normally in accordance with the dominant ideology)" (Fiske, 1987, p.114).

In Hollywood, genre films perpetuate the American dream and prevailing American values. They provide models for collective behaviour and replicate and normalize the social relations of a capitalist society. For example, the political thriller is, as Douglas Kellner observes, a "conservative genre" that shows the triumph of Good (government officials) vs. Evil (enemies) (Kellner, 2010, p.165). These films, as well as crime films, inculcated the idea that crime does not pay and glorified the police and legal system by proving them to be able to contain violence and deal with criminals.

Also, Hollywood melodramatic films produced before the twenty-first century play a key role in affirming the roles of women in societies and place female viewers in the interests of patriarchy. Melodramatic films were about male domination, romance, marriage, family, and moral correctness as the right path to fulfillment and well-being. They demonstrated what would happen to disrespectful wicked women or men who did not adhere to gender norms. They were always punished. This is

how "culture... [became] a house of moral correction" (Horkheimer, 2002, p.123). Films praised hardworking, self-abnegating mothers who traded their own happiness and wellbeing for their children, thereby defining the right role for women, and implied that the greatest happiness of life came from marriage and family. Janice Radway (1949) explains that romantic fantasies are like pain killers, in them women find the kind of love and care that they lack in real life. This compensation ties a woman to her social position. In the end, "she must also turn back to her daily round of duties, emotionally reconstituted and replenished" to resume her social role (Radway, p.210). This is the ideological power of romances.

Genre films "build the desire and then represent the satisfaction of what they have triggered" (Andrew, 1984, p.110). A plot resolution or narrative closure is crucial because this leaves the audience with no unanswered questions about the future or destiny of the main characters or the consequences of their actions. Most of the movies that support the dominant ideology seek to "contain or smooth over points of contention" (Allen, 1992, p.134), they provide comforting resolutions to ensure that all issues could be solved within existing institutions. Mass culture, thus, reflects social tensions, concerns, and utopian aspirations and aims to provide ideological containment. Fredric Jameson asserts that:

[w]orks of mass culture cannot be ideological without at one and the same time being implicitly or explicitly Utopian as well: they cannot manipulate unless they offer some genuine shred of content as a fantasy bribe to the public about to be so manipulated. (p.29)

According to Jameson, in order to properly legitimise a system, works of mass culture must effectively manage and address societal fears and anxieties. To accomplish this, mass culture must first acknowledge and voice these worries and anxieties and give them expression before providing a resolution, because "anxiety and hope are two faces of the same collective consciousness" (p.29). Thus, since ideologies attempt to persuade and to convince, they must have an attractive core. They often

contain emancipatory promises or moments which project visions of a better life. Slavoj Žižek (1949) stresses that, "every ideology attaches itself to some kernel of *jouissance*, the regulation and organization of which is central to its functioning" (Raybone, 2015, p.4).

In a few cases realist films expose and criticize the system. For example, the film *Snowden* (2016) is a biographical thriller about Edward Snowden, a subcontractor in the CIA who copied and leaked classified information from the National Security Agency (NSA) in 2013. *Snowden* producer, Oliver Stone, spoke about the challenge to make the film in the United States.

It's a very strange thing to do [a story about] an American man, and not be able to finance this movie in America. And that's very disturbing, if you think about its implications on any subject that is not overtly pro-American. They say we have freedom of expression; but thought is financed, and thought is controlled, and the media is controlled. This country is very tight on that, and there's no criticism allowed at a certain level. (Jagernauth, 2016, p.1)

The film was made entirely outside of the United States due to the fear of intrusion by the NSA. This is how films are political. They endorse dominant ideologies, serve to reinforce the hegemony, or superiority of certain institutions and beliefs, and the removal of others.

Ideology and Subject-Formation

Most film theories consider the spectator as a passive, helpless target of a system designed to exercise hegemonic control of its subjects. The spectator submits to the world within the film, his mind and body react as though its events were real and unmediated. For this reason, Thomas Andrae writes in "Adorno on film and mass culture: The culture industry reconsidered" that "the spectator's response thus becomes semi-automatic, leaving no room for autonomous or critical reflection" (p.10). The viewer is seen as a product of ideology. The interaction between the viewer and the film "constitutes" the viewer as subject in the process to

serve the dominant ideology because "film-viewing and subject-formation [are] reciprocal processes" (Flitterman-Lewis, 1992, p.24). The likelihood of resistance to authoritarian discourse is limited and does not exist in most theories.

Comolli, however, referred to a few films that attempt to be critical of dominant positions and seek to expose, subvert and "provide countercurrents to the mainstream flow of the dominant ideology" (Berg, 2002, p.7). This is why Comolli saw the possibility of resistance through the development of a progressive "countercinema that subverts the regressive pleasures of mainstream film" (Comolli, 1976, p.24). These films criticize social domination, expose patriarchy or the representation of Otherness. Also, Herbert Marcuse, a dialectician, believed that culture could, sometimes, negate, and incite toward revolution. One of the most important thinkers, however, was Walter Benjamin (1892-1940). He knew the potential of film to criticize and worked with Bertolt Brecht (1898–1956) (discussed below), who rejected realism which cannot provide overt criticism. Together, they believed that the invention of forms that are different from those that serve to repress consciousness is required. Such new or different forms should provoke thought and construct a critical spectator. To illustrate, one typically does not question what is familiar, accepted and taken for granted, but when one is faced with a new situation that is unfamiliar to the eye, s/he will have to reflect on it and consider its implications.

Walter Benjamin and Counter-Cinema

Walter Benjamin, a loosely affiliated member of the Frankfurt School, contested the opinions of Adorno that consider all mass culture as ideological. Benjamin states that there are subversive moments in the culture industries and that an active audience can create its own interpretations for products of the culture industries. Benjamin saw the potential of film to promote progressive political ends. He said: "We do not deny that in some cases today's films can also promote revolutionary criticism of social conditions" (Benjamin, 2006, p.27).

In the essay "The Artist as Producer" (1934), Benjamin argues that "cultural creators should 'refunction' the apparatus of cultural production,

turning theater and film ... into a forum of political enlightenment and discussion rather than a medium of 'culinary' audience pleasure" (Durham, 2006, p.4). This should create a critical audience that is able to judge, criticize and analyze the messages and ideologies of film.

Unlike Adorno and French author Georges Duhamel who consider films "a pastime for helots, a diversion for uneducated, wretched, worn-out creatures who are consumed by their worries" (Benjamin, 2006, p.32), Benjamin can see what they cannot see in film:

Duhamel, who detests the film and knows nothing of its significance... notes: "I can no longer think what I want to think. My thoughts have been replaced by moving images." The spectator's process of association in view of these images is indeed interrupted by their constant, sudden change. This constitutes the shock effect of the film, which, like all shocks, should be cushioned by heightened presence of mind (Benjamin, 2006, p.32).

Benjamin describes the "shock effect" which should encourage reflection. He explains that the "mechanical reproduction" of art destroys its "aura" which leads to "a tremendous shattering of tradition" (Benjamin, 2006, p.21). The 'aura' is the sense of 'authenticity', 'authority', 'autonomy' and 'distance' (Storey 2009, 69). The decay of the aura frees texts from the authority of tradition and opens them to a plurality of reinterpretation. Meaning is no longer seen as unique. Whereas Adorno "locates meaning in the mode of production (how a cultural text is produced determines its consumption and significance), Benjamin suggests that meaning is produced at the moment of consumption" (Storey, 2009, p.69). In other words, meaning and consumption became active and political, not passive and psychological.

Susan Willis (1991) describes Benjamin's essay saying: "This may well be the single most important essay in the development of Marxist popular culture criticism" (p.10). Unlike Adorno, Horkheimer and Althusser who saw no hope in challenging mass culture, Benjamin believed film could raise political consciousness because it represents external reality in a way that was not available to people before: "[F]ilm

is the prism in which the spaces of the immediate environment... are laid open before their eyes in a comprehensible, meaningful, and passionate way" (Benjamin, 2002, p.17).

Benjamin was aware that the film could have conservative effects and "create a new kind of ideological magic and aura ... via the technology of the cinema" (Durham, 2006, p.5). He also realized that films could spread "false consciousness" because once Capital takes control of their production and distribution, films lose their emancipatory features because "the capitalist exploitation of film obstructs the human being's legitimate claim to being reproduced" (Benjamin, 2002, p.114). However, Benjamin realized that some films have a strong potential to turn their audience from passive recipients surrendering to the pleasures of the movie to more active viewers.

Benjamin was a companion of the German artist Brecht, they worked together on films and sought to use it for the purpose of progressive social change. Brecht promoted aesthetic antirealism. Classic Hollywood films "absorb" or "immerse" the viewer in the narrative just like Aristotelian drama which puts the audience under "hypnosis" and in a "trance" (Brecht, 1964, p.71). Viewers assume that what they see on screen is real and, thus, alienation devices – techniques designed to prevent emotional involvement – are required to counteract the "narcotic" effects of narrative drama.

Unlike Stanislavsky, Brecht opposed the ideas of "empathy" or emotional engagement because they impact reason negatively. In his plays, he would create unusual stage effects as reminders of the artificiality of the performance so that "the spectator is prevented from feeling his way into the characters" (Brecht, 1961, p.130). Brecht wanted to encourage the audience to think. He said: "I aim at an extremely classical, cold, highly intellectual style of performance. I'm not writing for... [those] who want to have the cockles of their heart warmed" (Brecht 1964, 14). This is why Brecht's art was not tolerated by Hitler who only accepted the art that promoted Nazi ideology. Brecht's books were among the books burned in the book burning of May 10, 1933 in Germany and then he and his Jewish wife went into exile.

Thus, Benjamin, Brecht and Mulvey agreed that to counter or subvert the dominant, mainstream ideology, it is necessary to embrace different genres. Tony Thwaites explains that: "transformations in genre and texts can influence and reinforce social conditions" (Chandler, 2021, p.6). They all agreed on rejecting realism but the problem with Mulvey is that she rejected mainstream genre films altogether. She did not consider how some mainstream films can subvert rather than endorse systems of social power. Feminist theorists Lorraine Gamman and Margaret Marshment echoed Benjamin when they insisted that, "[i]t is not enough to dismiss popular culture as merely serving the complementary systems of capitalism and patriarchy, peddling 'false consciousness' to the duped masses. It can also be seen as a site where meanings are contested and where dominant ideologies can be disturbed" (Gamman, 1988, p.1). They emphasized the importance of inclusion: "we cannot afford to dismiss the popular by always positioning ourselves outside it" because this is where "most people in our society get their entertainment and their information. It is here that women (and men) are offered the culture's dominant definitions of themselves" (1).

One mainstream genre that rejects realism is the speculative genre. It includes a variety of sub-genres such as science fiction, fantasy, dystopia and sometimes even horror and comedy. Unlike the genres that depend on realistic events, characters and settings, the speculative genre presents an unfamiliar world, time and characters. The events can take place in the distant future or alternative present or history. The characters may be humans but could also be robots, aliens, superheroes, demons or mythological creatures. Juliet McKenna (2014) explains that "speculative fiction may not imitate real life but it uses its magic mirror to reflect on the world around us" (p.9). In other words, the speculative genre gives the viewers a chance to speculate or ponder on certain situations. The dystopian genre is one of the sub-genres of the speculative genre. Its events take place in a highly undesirable society and for this reason it is suitable for social criticism.

The Dystopian Genre

The previous parts demonstrated how the majority of films

produced by the industry focus on the depiction of reality which seeks to confirm society by reproducing on the screen the ideological world people encounter in everyday life. These films also depend on emotional or sensory pleasure because "the most prevalent avenue for a respite from, and in preparation for work is the realm of 'leisure effects'". These leisure effects breed "a passive 'receiver' where one prefers to be amused over being actively engaged (Eriksen, 1980, p.16). The dystopian genre, however, can criticize society because its fictional form frees the writer or filmmaker from any verisimilitude duty.

M. Keith Booker's *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature* describes that "defamiliarization" is central to dystopian works, explaining that "by focusing their critiques of society on spatially or temporally distant settings, dystopian fictions provide fresh perspectives on problematic social and political practices that might otherwise be taken for granted or considered natural and inevitable" (p.19). This offers a better understanding of the human condition by exaggerating its shortcomings and contemplating the implications of their being taken to an extreme.

For example, *The Hunger Games* (2012) criticizes American society which is addicted to entertainment, celebrities and reality shows and reveal how this entertainment functions as a kind of distraction from the exploitation and inequality of capitalist society. The film takes the idea of elimination which happens in reality shows to an extreme. The players in the Hunger Games are not eliminated but they are killed. This idea is disturbing and it shocks the viewers. This "shock effect" is "crucial in the dystopian genre because shock effects 'jolt the audience out of the more passive habitual response'" and encourages them to reflect and comment on current issues and concerns (Eriksen, 1980, p.16). This is one way that such critical orientation can be achieved. It is similar to Brecht's (Verfremdungseffekt) estrangement which breaks down "automatized" recognition and makes one "develop that detached eye." This way, the dystopian genre shifts the response of the viewer from a passive response to an active, critical one.

The dystopian genre becomes more popular in periods of political

and/or economic turmoil. The first major dystopia of the twentieth-century, *Brave New World* (1932), was published three years after the Great Depression. Dystopias also became increasingly popular during the Second World War and the Cold War, the most famous example is *1984* (1949). A new surge in dystopian novels and films were produced in the twenty-first century after 9/11, the Great Recession of 2008 and the revolutions of the Arab Spring.

One popular dystopian franchise is *The Purge* (2013-2022) which shows how Americans celebrate "The Purge," an annual national holiday on which all crimes are made legal for 12 hours. Ironically, it is not the poor who do the killing but the rich and powerful. They use the purge to eliminate the poor and coloured people because they consider them a burden on the economy. The films criticize the American dream and power structures, particularly the power of the rich over the poor and the power of whites over blacks. The films reveal how the system benefits the powerful. Shortly after the first film, Black Lives Matter movement started to protest acts of racial violence and brutality by the police against black people. The dystopian genre represents the fears of people and the social zeitgeist. Despite being set in the future, dystopias are concerned with the present. The dystopian genre captures "a negative cultural trend and imagine[s] a future or an alternative world in which that trend dominates every aspect of life" (McDonald, 2012, p.9). This exaggeration highlights current social and political issues that could have negative consequences for people if left unattended.

V for Vendetta (2005) is another film which suggests that mainstream mass art can be politically progressive and counter-hegemonic. It criticizes the George W. Bush administration following 9/11 and has become an allegory of oppression by governments. This film has inspired viewers in different countries to stand up for their lost liberties. The Guy Fawkes mask is now a symbol used by protesters around the world to express their contempt for whatever institution or law they are protesting. David Lloyd, illustrator of *V for Vendetta*, stated: "The Guy Fawkes mask has now become a common brand and a convenient placard to use in protest against tyranny – and I'm happy with people using it, it seems quite unique, an icon of popular culture being

used this way" (Khoury 1).

The film did more than entertain audiences; it has completely reshaped the face of protest and gave people a symbol under which to unite against tyranny. This shows the power of the affective dimensions in film and how it could mobilise people to action at a material level. Therefore, if most genre films perpetuate and legitimize ideological norms, certain genre films could also be used to contradict, challenge and denounce ideological norms to raise questions and provide a critique of society.

To conclude, today media has become ubiquitous and people consume media products more than ever before. Film is one of the most popular kinds of media and it is undoubtedly a powerful instrument of ideology that can directly interact with the human mind and also affect the viewers on a psychological level. Filmmakers can manipulate viewers' emotions to promote certain values and ideals that serve the interests of the powerful. Comolli emphasizes that the majority of films promote the dominant ideology through the depiction of reality, yet some progressive filmmakers seek to create what Comolli, Benjamin and Brecht call "counter-cinema". Those filmmakers use the speculative genre, which rejects realism, to challenge the dominant ideology, criticize society and encourage viewers to approach the film with a critical eye. In all cases, it is important to be conscious, active and develop the ability to critically watch a film and analyse its content. It is important to ask what messages the film is trying to deliver and why, what genre it is using, how representations are used, which characters the filmmaker wants the viewer to empathize or identify with. It is imperative to develop a kind of literacy to comprehend how a film can affect or manipulate people because films are more than just entertainment.

References

- Allen, R. (1992). *Channels of discourse, reassembled television and contemporary criticism*. 2nd ed. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina.
- _____. (2001). *Wittgenstein, theory, and the arts*. Routledge: London.
- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. Monthly Review Press.
- Andrae, T. (2015). Adorno on film and mass culture: The culture industry reconsidered. *Adorno on mass culture*. <http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/onlinessays/JC20folder/AdornoMassCult.html#24n>
- Andrew, D. (1984). *Concepts in film theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Basch, R. (2016). Cultural revolution. *n 1*, 28 Sept. 2016, nplusonemag.com/issue-16/the-intellectual-situation/cultural-revolution/.
- Bazin, A. (1967). "The myth of total cinema." *What is cinema? Volume I*, pp. 234–236., www2.southeastern.edu/Academics/Faculty/jbell/mythtotalcinema.pdf.
- Benjamin, W. (2002). *Selected writings*, vol. 3, 1935–8, ed. H. Eiland and M. W. Jennings; trans. E. Jephcott, H. Eiland *et al.* (various translators), Cambridge, MA and London: Belknap Press.
- _____. (2006). The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction In *Media and Cultural Studies: Keywords*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Berg, C. (2002). *Latino images in film: Stereotypes, subversion, resistance*. Austin, TX: U of Texas.
- Biancorosso, G. (2009). Sound In *The Routledge companion to philosophy and film*. Routledge.
- Booker, M. (1994). *The dystopian impulse in modern literature: Fiction as social criticism*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood.
- Brauchli. (2019). The violence of Fascist leaders, then and now. *Brewminate*, 22 Nov. 2019, brewminate.com/the-violence-of-fascist-leaders-then-and-now/.

- Brecht, B. (1961). On Chinese acting. *Tulane Drama Review*, 6 (1), 130–136.
- _____. (1964). *Brecht on theatre*. London: Methuen.
- Campbell, J. (2010). The order and the other: Power and subjectivity in young adult literature. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Illinois State University, Normal, IL.
- Carroll, N. (2018). *Engaging the moving image*. Yale University Press.
- Chandler, D. (2021). An introduction to genre theory. *Introduction to Genre Theory*. <http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/intgenre/intgenre1.html>.
- Comolli, J., & Narboni, J. (1976). Cinema/Ideology/Criticism In *Movies and Methods*, vol. 1, Berkeley: University of California Press, 22–30.
- Comolli, J., & Fairfax, D. (2015). *Cinema against Spectacle: Technique and Ideology Revisited*. Amsterdam U.P.
- Currie, G. (1999). "Cognitivism" In *A Companion to Film Theory*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell: 105-22
- Durham, M., & Kellner, D. (2006). *Media and cultural studies: Keywords*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Elsaesser, T. (2015). *Film theory: An introduction through the senses*. Routledge.
- Eriksen, N. (1980). *Popular culture and revolutionary theory: Understanding punk rock*. Theoretical Review No. 18. <https://www.marxists.org/history/erol/ncm-6/punk.htm#bk20>.
- Ertem, A. (2017). Psychology and color. *The effect of color / Psychology and color*. renketkisi.com/en/psychology-and-color.html.
- Fisher, M. (2009). *Capitalist realism: Is there no alternative?* Zero Books.
- Fiske, J. (1987). *Television culture*, London: Routledge.
- Flitterman-Lewis, S. (1992). Part IV: Psychoanalysis. In *New vocabularies in film semiotics: structuralism, post-Structuralism and beyond*. New York: Routledge. 123-83.

- Frye, N. (2000). *Anatomy of criticism: Four essays*. Princeton University Press.
- Gamman, L. (1988). 'Introduction', in *The Female Gaze, Women as Viewers of Popular Culture*, edited by Lorraine Gamman and Margaret Marshment, London: The Women's Press.
- Gazibegovic, P. (2018). Scientific scribbles. *Scientific Scribbles*. <https://blogs.unimelb.edu.au/sciencecommunication/2018/10/09/how-do-different-colours-affect-your-mood-judgement-and-physiology/>
- Grainge, P. (2013). *Memory and popular film*. Manchester University Press.
- Grant, B. (2007). *Film genre: From iconography to ideology*. London: Wallflower.
- Harris, M. (2014). *Five came back: A story of Hollywood and the Second World War*. The Penguin Press.
- HBO. (2020). "Gone with the Wind Removed from HBO Max." *BBC News*, BBC, 10 June 2020, <https://www.bbc.com/news/entertainment-arts-52990714>.
- Hedges, C. (2010). *Death of the Liberal Class*. Nation Books.
- Hess, W. (1995). Genre film and the status quo In *Film genre reader II*. Austin: University of Texas Press 41-9.
- Hill, J.(2000). *Film studies: Critical approaches*. Oxford Univ. Press.
- Hitler, A. (1939). *Mein Kampf*. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Horkheimer, M ,& Adorno, T. (2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment*. Stanford University Press.
- _____, . (2006). The culture industry: Enlightenment as mass deception. In *Media and cultural studies: Keywords*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- hooks, b. (2015). *Black looks race and representation*. Routledge.
- Jagernauth, K. (2016). 'No studio would support it': Oliver Stone talks making 'Snowden'. *IndieWire*. www.indiewire.com/2016/03/no-studio-would-support-it-oliver-stone-talks-making-snowden-263689/.

- Jameson, F. (2013). *Signatures of the visible*. Routledge.
- Katz, E. (1994). *The film encyclopedia*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Kellner, D. (1996). *Media culture: Cultural studies, identity and politics between the modern and the post-modern*. Routledge Taylor and Francis.
- _____. (2010). *Cinema wars: Hollywood film and politics in the Bush-Cheney era*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Khoury, A. (2011). "'V for Vendetta' Creators Alan Moore and David Lloyd talk Guy Fawkes protest masks." *Comics Alliance*. <<http://comicsalliance.com/alan-moore-david-lloyd-v-for-vendetta-guy-fawkes-mask/>>.
- Lacan, J. (2006). *Ecrits*. Trans. Bruce Fink. New York: Norton.
- Lamar, J. (1986). The Pentagon goes Hollywood filmmakers and the military enjoy a profitable partnership. *Time*, Monday 24 Nov. 1986, content.time.com/time/subscriber/article/0,33009,962933,00.html.
- Langdale, A. (2002). *Hugo Munsterberg on film the photoplay: A psychological study and other writings*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Livingston, P, & Plantinga, R. (2009). *The Routledge companion to philosophy and film*. Routledge.
- MacCabe, C. (2004). "Realism and the Cinema: Notes on Some Brechtian Theses." *Film Theory: Critical Concepts in Media and Cultural Studies*. Vol. 4. London: Routledge. 51-71.
- McDonald, B. (2012). The final word on entertainment: Mimetic and monstrous art in *The Hunger Games*. In *The Hunger Games and philosophy: A critique of pure treason* (pp. 8-25). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- McKenna, J. (2014). The genre debate: Science fiction travels farther than literary fiction. *The Guardian*. <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/apr/18/genre-debate-sciencefiction-speculative-literary>

- Merikle, P. (2001). Perception without Awareness: Perspectives from Cognitive Psychology In *Cognition* 79: 115–34.
- Metz, C. (1982). *The imaginary signifier: Psychoanalysis and cinema*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Miller, G. (2014). How movies trick your brain into empathizing with characters. *Wired*. www.wired.com/2014/09/cinema-science-empathizing-with-characters/.
- Mulvey, L. (2006). "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema", in *Media and Cultural Studies: Keywords*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2006.
- O'Sullivan, T. (1994). *Key concepts in communication and cultural studies*. London: Routledge
- Powdermaker, H. (1950). *Hollywood the Dream Factory*, London: Secker and Warburg.
- Raybone, S. (2015). Notes towards practicing Žižekian ideology critique as an art historical methodology. In *International Journal of Zizek Studies*. Volume Nine, Number Two.
- Shepard, B. (2015). Affect. *The Chicago School of Media Theory RSS*. <https://lucian.uchicago.edu/blogs/mediatheory/keywords/affect/>.
- Smith, J. (2009). Music In *The Routledge companion to philosophy and film*. Routledge.
- Sobchack, T., & Vivian, C. (1980). *An introduction to film*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Co
- Storey, J. (2009). *Cultural theory and popular culture: A reader*. 5th ed. Athens: U of Georgia.
- Tan, E. (1996). *Emotion and the structure of narrative film*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Trotsky, L. (1986). *Problems of everyday life*. Monad Press.
- Turim, M. (1989). *Flashbacks in film: Memory and history*. Routledge.
- Turner, G. (1988). *Film as social practice*. 3rd ed. Routledge.
- Tyler, P. (1944). *The Hollywood hallucination*. Garland.

- Wartenberg, T. (2015). Philosophy of film. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2015 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.). <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2015/entries/film/>.
- Wayne, M. (2005). *Understanding film: Marxist perspectives*. Pluto Press.
- Willis, S. (1991). *A primer for daily life*. London: Routledge.