A Companion to the War Film
A Companion to the War Film

Edited by

Douglas A. Cunningham and John C. Nelson

WILEY Blackwell
This edition first published 2016
© 2016 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Registered Office
John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

Editorial Offices
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK
The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

The right of Douglas A. Cunningham and John C. Nelson to be identified as the authors of the editorial material in this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book.

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services and neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for damages arising herefrom. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Title: A companion to the war film / edited by Douglas A. Cunningham and John C. Nelson.
Subjects: LCSH: War films–History and criticism. | BISAC: PERFORMING ARTS / Film & Video / History & Criticism.
LC record available at http://lccn.loc.gov/2016003714

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Cover image: Courtesy of the Author

Set in 10/12.5pt Minion by SPi Global, Pondicherry, India
Contents

Contributors vii

Introduction 1

Douglas A. Cunningham

1 “Hearing” the Music in War Films
   Robert Eberwein 6

2 Antilochus’s Burden: The Crisis–Catharsis Rhetoric of Bereavement Messages
   David Ryan 20

3 War Films in an Age of War and Cinema
   John Garofolo 36

4 Exploring War Horror’s Narrative Punch in Spielberg’s
   Munich and Saving Private Ryan
   Sandra Singer 56

5 The Service Tragicomedy: From Woody Allen to Full Metal Jacket
   Matthew Sorrento 71

6 The Wartime American Woman on Film: Home-Front Soldier
   Jeanine Basinger 89

7 “Conspiracy of Silence”: The Containment of Military Women in
   World War II Newsreels and Short Films
   Anna Froula 106

8 Filming a Nuclear State: The USAF’s Lookout Mountain Laboratory
   Kevin Hamilton and Ned O’Gorman 129

9 The Gendered Remembrance of Japanese-American Internment:
   Come See the Paradise and Snow Falling on Cedars
   Yuki Obayashi 150

10 “The Angels of Bataan and Corregidor”: Representing Nurses in the Pacific Theater
    Debra White-Stanley 163
Contents

11 In the Exigency of a National Cause: Bollywood’s Responses to the Kargil War
   Kaustav Bakshi and Ramit Samaddar
   180

12 Transnational Algerian War Cinema Revisited: Comic Relief in Merzak’s
   Bab el-oued City and Bab el-Oued
   Christa C. Jones
   198

13 Fifty Years Hence: The Forgotten War Remembered in South Korean
   and American Cinema
   John Nelson
   214

14 Dresden (2006): Marketing the Bombing of Dresden in Germany, Great Britain,
   and the United States
   Linda Robertson
   234

15 How to Recognize a War Movie: The Contemporary Science-Fiction Blockbuster
   as Military Recruitment Film
   Tanine Allison
   253

16 Making Citizens out of Soldiers: Rearming the Individual in Paul May’s 08/15
   Mark Gagnon
   271

17 Those at Home Also Serve: Women’s Television and Embedded Military
   Realism in Army Wives (Lifetime, 2006–2014)
   Mary Elizabeth Haralovich
   289

18 “TiK ToK on the Clock, but the Party Don't Stop, No”: The Parodic Military
   Dance Video on YouTube
   Leah Shafer
   320

19 Generation Kill: The Invasion of Iraq As Seen on HBO
   Deborah L. Jaramillo
   305

20 Kuwaiting for Godot: The Absurd Theatre of War in Jarhead
   Cason Murphy
   338

21 The Meaning of the Soldier: In the Year of the Pig and Hearts and Minds
   Laura Browder
   356

22 Why We (Shouldn’t) Fight: The Double-Optic of the War Documentary
   Kris Fallon
   371

23 A War for Everyone: Strategic Ambiguity in the Home-Front War Drama
   Dan Hassoun
   385

24 Is There Such a Thing as an Antiwar Film?
   Agnieszka Soltysik Monnet
   404

25 Through a Soldier’s Eyes: Stereoscopic Gazing in Operation Homecoming:
   Writing the Wartime Experience
   Kelly Wilz
   422

Index
   445
Contributors

**Tanine Allison** is Assistant Professor of Film and Media Studies at Emory University, where she teaches courses on film, video games, and digital media. She has published essays on war video games, digital realism, and motion capture in the *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, *Critical Quarterly*, and *Literature/Film Quarterly*; her essays on contemporary visual effects and race in digital animation appear in two edited collections on special effects. She is currently completing a book on the aesthetics of combat in American films and video games set during World War II. Her website is www.tanineallison.com.

**Kaustav Bakshi** is Assistant Professor of English, Jadavpur University, Kolkata, India. A Charles Wallace fellow, he is currently pursuing his doctoral research on Sri Lankan expatriate fiction at the Department of English, Jadavpur University. He was awarded an M. Phil by the same department in 2008, and his thesis on Rohinton Mistry’s fiction was extended into a University Grants Commission sponsored Minor Research Project. He has published in both national and international journals, including *South Asian Review* (University of Pittsburgh, 2012), *New Cinemas: Journal of Contemporary Films* (Intellect Books: Bristol and Wilmington, NC, 2012–13) and *South Asian History and Culture* (Routledge/Taylor and Francis: London, 2015). His articles have been published in several anthologies, including *Muses India: Essays on English Language Writers from Mahomet to Rushdie* (MacFarland: Jefferson, NC, 2013) and *Gay Subcultures and Literatures: The Indian Projections* (IIAS: Shimla, 2012). He has co-edited two anthologies, *Anxieties, Influences and After: Critical Responses to Postcolonialism and Neocolonialism* (Worldview: New Delhi, 2009) and *Studies in Indian Poetry in English* (Bookaway: Kolkata, 2011). His forthcoming co-edited volume *Rituparno Ghosh: An Afterword* with Routledge/Francis and Taylor is in press currently. He blogs at kaustavsarden.blogspot.in.

**Jeanine Basinger** is the Corwin-Fuller Professor of Film Studies, founder and curator of the Wesleyan Cinema Archives, Founding Chair of the Film Studies Department at Wesleyan University, and a 1996 and 2013 recipient of Wesleyan’s Binswanger Prize for Excellence in Teaching. Her book *Silent Stars* won the National Board of Review’s William K. Everson
Prize, and her most recent book, *The Star Machine*, published by Knopf, 2007, won the Theatre Library Association Award. She is the author of numerous articles and book reviews as well as ten books on film. She is a trustee of the National Board of Review, a trustee of the American Film Institute, and a current member of Warner Brothers Theatre Advisory Committee at the Smithsonian Institute.

**Laura Browder** is the Tyler and Alice Haynes Professor of American Studies at the University of Richmond. Her most recent book is *When Janey Comes Marching Home: Portraits of Women Combat Veterans*, with photographs by Sascha Pflaeging, for which she interviewed 52 women from all branches of the military. She is also the executive producer of the PBS documentary *The Reconstruction of Asa Carter*, based on her book *Slippery Characters: Ethnic Impersonators and American Identities*. She is currently working on a documentary film called *Mothers at War* as well as a documentary about her grandfather, Communist Party leader Earl Browder.

**Douglas A. Cunningham** teaches film, literature, and humanities at Brigham Young University and Westminster College. He is a retired U.S. Air Force officer and taught literature and film at the U.S. Air Force Academy for five years of his 20-year military career. He is the editor of another essay collection, *The San Francisco of Alfred Hitchcock's Vertigo: Place, Pilgrimage, and Commemoration* (Scarecrow, 2011), and his other essays have appeared in *Screen*, *CineAction*, *The Moving Image*, *Critical Survey*, and as chapters in several anthologies. Many of these essays may be read under his name at www.academia.edu. Doug is currently at work on a monograph titled *Celluloid Airmen: World War II, Hollywood, and the Army Air Forces First Motion Picture Unit*. He earned a PhD in Film Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, in 2009.

**Robert Eberwein** is Distinguished Professor of English Emeritus, Oakland University. His many books include *The Hollywood War Film* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), *Armed Forces: Masculinity and Sexuality in the American War Film* (Rutgers, 2007), *The War Film* (Rutgers, 2004), and *Sex Ed: Film, Video, and the Framework of Desire* (Rutgers, 1999).

**Kris Fallon** is an Assistant Professor in Digital Cultures at the University of California, Davis, where he teaches courses on the history and theory of media in the Program in Cinema & Technoculture. Before coming to Davis, he played an active role in the early stages of both the Berkeley Center for New Media and the CITRIS Data & Democracy Initiative at UC Berkeley, where he received his PhD. His research focuses on documentary practices across photography, film, and digital media, and places established modes of representation alongside emergent media such as data visualization and virtual environments. His essays on digital technology and documentary have recently appeared in *Film Quarterly* and *Screen* and are forthcoming in several edited anthologies in *Contemporary Documentary* from Routledge. He is currently working on a book entitled *Where Truth Lies: Digital Culture and Documentary Film after 9/11*.

**Anna Froula** is Associate Professor of Film Studies at East Carolina University in Greenville, North Carolina. She has published on war, satire, trauma, zombies, and gender in *Changing

Mark Gagnon is an Academy Professor in the Department of Foreign Languages at the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York. He earned a PhD in Germanic Languages and Literatures from Harvard University.

John Garofolo is the author of Dickey Chapelle Under Fire: Photographs by the First American Female War Correspondent Killed in Action (Wisconsin Historical Society Press, 2015). A former entertainment industry executive, John is a veteran of Operation Iraqi Freedom and was on the Humanities faculty at the US Coast Guard Academy and an adjunct at Yale. He is the recipient of a grant from the Brico Fund and the Milwaukee Press Club endowment to write a play about the life of Dickey Chapelle. He holds a PhD from the University of Southern California School of Cinematic Arts.

Kevin Hamilton is Associate Professor at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, where he holds appointments in the School of Art and Design and the program in Media and Cinema Studies, and serves as Dean’s Fellow for Research in the College of Fine and Applied Arts. Working in collaborative and cross-disciplinary modes, Kevin produces artworks, archives, and scholarship on such subjects as race and space, public memory, history of technology, and state violence. His articles with Ned O’Gorman on Air Force film production have appeared in Rhetoric & Public Affairs, Visual Culture, and Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies. Their book-in-progress and accompanying digital archive trace the history of the Air Force’s most famous film unit, Lookout Mountain Laboratory, from 1948 through 1969. At Illinois Kevin also codirects the Center for People and Infrastructures, an effort currently focused on the ethics and civics of algorithmic culture through research, design, and outreach. Kevin’s artworks in digital form have appeared in Rhizome, Turbulence, Neural, and the ASPECT DVD series. Recent commissioned artworks have included a printed mural on the history of cybernetics, and a graphic novel on race, geology, and university politics in Urbana, Illinois. More of his work can be found at complexfields.org.

Mary Elizabeth Haralovich teaches television and film history in the School of Theatre, Film & Television at the University of Arizona in Tucson. Among her studies of television are popular appeal of Magnum, P.I., geopolitics of civil rights in I Spy, and third-wave feminism in Mad Men. Her social history of the 1950s suburban family domestic comedy has been reprinted several times. Studies of the film promotion of “scandalous females” include flirting with the viewer in A Free Soul (1931), housewife/adventurer Marlene Dietrich as Blonde Venus (1932), film noir mother Mildred Pierce (1945) and the proletarian women’s film, Marked Woman (1937). Co-editor of Television, History, and American Culture: Feminist Critical Essays (Duke University Press, 1999), Haralovich is a founder and Board Member of the International Conference on Television, Video, New Media, Audio and Feminism: Console-ing Passions.
Dan Hassoun is a Ph.D student in cinema and media studies at Indiana University, Bloomington. His work on audiences, new media practices, and mediated attention is published or forthcoming in Continuum, Television & New Media, Journal of Graphic Novels and Comics, New Media & Society, and Cinema Journal.

Deborah L. Jaramillo is Assistant Professor of Film and Television at Boston University. She is the author of Ugly War Pretty Package: How CNN and Fox News Made the Invasion of Iraq High Concept (Indiana University Press, 2009). Her articles on both early and contemporary television have appeared in the Journal of Communication Inquiry, Television and New Media, Ethnic and Racial Studies, and Communication, Culture and Critique. A board member of the Texas Archive of the Moving Image and a research associate for the Radio Preservation Task Force, Deborah's current book project examines the roles of the National Association of Broadcasters, the Federal Communications Commission, the United States Congress, and television viewers in the years leading up to the adoption of the Television Code in 1952.

Christa C. Jones is an Associate Professor of French at Utah State University, where she teaches classes such as Business French, France Today, French Culture and Civilization, and Conversation, as well as French and Francophone literature, music and fairy tales. Her publications on North African Francophone postcolonial literature, film, and music have appeared in Al-Raida, Contemporary French and Francophone Studies, Dalhousie French Studies, Expressions Maghrébines, Francofonia, French Review, Jeunesse: Young People, Texts, Cultures, Nouvelles Etudes Francophones, Women's Studies Quarterly, and elsewhere. She is the author of Cave Culture in Maghrebi Literature: Imagining Self and Nation (Lexington, 2012), co-editor of Femmes du Maghreb (Dalhousie French Studies, volume 103, in press) and she is currently co-editing a teaching volume titled New Approaches to Teaching Folk and Fairy Tales (University Press of Colorado, forthcoming in 2016).

Agnieszka Soltysik Monnet is Professor of American Literature at the University of Lausanne, Switzerland. Her publications range over topics such as national identity, feminism and queer theory, political melodrama, war gothic, the combat film, Civil Religion, race on film, night vision in the horror film, Batman, and writers such as Edgar Allan Poe, Ambrose Bierce, Louisa May Alcott, and Maxine Hong Kingston. She has published a monograph on nineteenth-century American literature, The Poetics and the Politics of the American Gothic (Ashgate, 2010), and co-edited several volumes, including The Gothic in Contemporary Literature and Popular Culture (Routledge, 2012), and Emotion, Affect, Sentiment: The Language and Aesthetics of Feeling (Narr Verlag, 2014), and a special issue of Gothic Studies on post-9/11 horror (Manchester University Press, 2015).

Cason Murphy is an MFA candidate at Baylor University in Waco, Texas, with a focus on directing for the stage. He previously earned his bachelor’s degree from UCLA’s School of Theatre, Film, and Television. Cason has professionally produced, directed, and acted in shows in Arizona, Texas, California, and New York, while his work as a researcher has previously been published in Theatre Topics and Texas Theatre Journal.
John Nelson is an Academy Professor in the Department of English and Philosophy at the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York. He earned a doctorate in comparative literature from the University of Washington. Among other works, he has published book chapters on Nobel laureate Derek Walcott and his play *Pantomime*, and contemporary military memoirs and their use of landscape. He teaches courses on literature, film, and cultural criticism at West Point.

Ned O’Gorman is an Associate Professor and Conrad Humanities Scholar in the Department of Communication at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. He is the author of *The Iconoclastic Imagination: Image, Catastrophe, and Economy in America since the Kennedy Assassination* (University of Chicago Press, 2015), *Spirits of the Cold War: Contesting Worldviews in the Classical Age of American Security Strategy* (Michigan State University Press, 2011), and, with Kevin Hamilton, the forthcoming *Lookout America! The Secret Hollywood Film Studio at the Heart of the Cold War State* about Lookout Mountain Laboratory.

Yuki Obayashi is a PhD candidate in Literature at University of California, Santa Cruz. Her most recent article, “Interpreting the Vietnam War from a Vietnamese American Perspective,” was published in *The Adaptation of History: Essays on Ways of Telling the Past* (eds. Laurence Raw and Defne Ersin Tutan, McFarland, 2013). She has also published articles in Japan, including “Paternal Projections of 1.5 Generation Vietnamese-American Writers,” by The Japanese Association for Migration Studies. Obayashi involves with community services in Diasporic Vietnamese Artists Network (DVAN) and The Japanese American National Library.

Linda Robertson is on the faculty of the Media and Society Program at Hobart and William Smith Colleges in Geneva, New York. She initiated the program in 1996 and served as its director until 2007. Her areas of scholarly interest are the history of documentaries, war propaganda, and war films. She has published a book-length study of the influence of propaganda on the development of American military aviation, *The Dream of Civilized Warfare* (2005), and is currently at work on a feature-length documentary about Sarah Bradford, Harriet Tubman’s biographer.

David Ryan is an Assistant Professor of Rhetoric and Language at the University of San Francisco. He teaches courses in film criticism, strategic communication, and rhetoric studies. His essays have appeared in *Rhetoric Review* and many anthologies. He is the co-author of *The Speaking-Writing Connection* (Fountainhead Press).

Ramit Samaddar is Assistant Professor of English at Jadavpur University, Kolkata, India. He received his BA (Honours), MA, and MPhil. degrees in English from the same university. He has been awarded the Charles Wallace India Trust Research Grant for his doctoral thesis on Anthony Trollope. His areas of interest are eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literature and culture, travel writing, postcolonial studies, and film criticism. He is a member of the Centre for Victorian Studies at Jadavpur University.

Leah Shafer is an Assistant Professor in the Media and Society Program at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, where she teaches courses in media studies, with an emphasis on
television and new media. Her scholarship focuses on the marketing and branding of entertainment media, activist new media art, and media literacy. She has been published in *Women & Performance, Cinema Journal,* and *Afterimage.* Her essay on cat videos is forthcoming in *Film Criticism,* and she is currently completing a textbook that teaches US History using television commercials.

**Sandra Singer** (PhD, Cambridge) is an Associate Professor in the School of English and Theatre Studies, University of Guelph, Canada. She is co-editor of *Doris Lessing Studies.* Recently she published a co-edited collection of essays entitled *Doris Lessing: Interrogating the Times* (Ohio State University Press, 2010); an entry on Ethnographic Memoir in *Sage Encyclopedia of Case Study Research* (2010); and an article entitled “Acting Out Justice in J.J. Steinfeld’s ‘Courtroom Dramas’” in *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 41.1 and 2. Her manuscript, *Intersections of Terror, Trauma, and Terrorism,* is currently under review.

**Matthew Sorrento** teaches film and media studies at Rutgers University in Camden, New Jersey, and is the author of *The New American Crime Film* (McFarland, 2012). The former editor of *Film Threat,* he has edited the film section of *Identity Theory* and is currently Interview Editor of the journal *Film International* (filmint.nu), where he is a regular contributor. Sorrento directs the Reel East Film Festival (reeleastfilm.org).

**Debra White-Stanley** serves as an Associate Professor of Film Studies at Keene State College and earned her PhD from the University of Arizona. Her fields of research and teaching interests include gender and war media, media adaptation, and the study of sound in media. She has published in *Velvet Light Trap,* the anthologies *Heroism and Gender in War Films* (2014), *Lowering the Boom: Critical Studies in Film Sound* (2009), and *War Isn't Hell, It's Entertainment: Essays on Visual Media and the Representation of Conflict* (2009).

**Kelly Wilz** is currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Communication and Theatre Arts at UW-Marshfield/Wood County. Professor Wilz received her PhD in Communication and Culture with a minor in Religious Studies from Indiana University, Bloomington. Professor Wilz’s research focuses on rhetorical constructions of gender, violence, and dissent within the context of US war culture, and how dehumanizing and demonizing rhetoric extend beyond war to issues of social violence based on discourses of race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and other identity markers. Her most recent article focuses on the mainstreaming and brutality of depictions of rape and assault within popular television shows. In addition to her research, Professor Wilz has worked with groups such as Equality Now in efforts to petition the Secretary of Defense and the House and Senate Armed Services Committee Chairs to reform the military justice system so that professional military prosecutors—not the perpetrator’s command—are responsible for investigating and prosecuting cases of sexual assault. She is the author of “Richard’s Story: The Present Referent in *In the Valley of Elah,*” *Global Media Journal* (2009) and “Rehumanization through Reflective Oscillation in *Jarhead,*” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* (2010).
Introduction
Douglas A. Cunningham

In the blistering Colorado summer of 1989, I was immersed in the belly of “Beast,” which is to say “BCT” (Basic Cadet Training) at the US Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs. The program worked to prepare new trainees to become officer candidates, most of whom would complete Beast, go on to four years of subsequent college education and military training, and—at the end of it all—accept commissions as second lieutenants in the US Air Force. In Beast, however, the days felt long; we “Basics” were awakened at 5:00 am each morning by loud poundings on our dorm-room doors by upperclassmen trained to give us hell. We were then run through obstacle courses, assault courses, drills and ceremonies, and high-pressure situations designed to test our memorization of military history facts, quotations by famous generals, aircraft technical details and silhouette identifications, and all four verses of the National Anthem. If any one of us slipped on any given task, we could expect a cadre of male and female upperclassmen to surround that person, pelting the unfortunate soul with verbal assaults and commands for push-ups. Day in and day out, over the course of that grueling 1989 summer, the struggle continued.

One day, however, we were diverted from the routine of drill, exercise, and rote memorization, and we were funneled into Arnold Hall, the large auditorium of the main campus (known as the Cadet Area, or “the Hill”), its stage flanked by blue-gray curtains. We’d been here before, of course, usually for lectures on Air Force history or pep talks from cadet leadership. This time, however, the house lights dimmed as an immense screen lowered from above the auditorium stage. Silence and anticipation followed until, curiously, another stage—one not unlike our own in Arnold Hall—appeared on the screen, its curtains open to reveal an immense American flag. Somewhere, an authoritative voice called the troops to attention. But wait—that wasn’t a voice in Arnold Hall—it wasn’t a voice meant for us. No, the voice came from the image on screen, and before long, we understood its purpose. A highly decorated and magisterial figure gradually took his place before the flag, returning a salute for the duration of a bugler’s tribute. General George S. Patton manifested before us in the person of an equally commanding figure: George C. Scott.
Not one of us cheered in the darkness—not because we felt fearful of repercussions from upperclassmen, nor because this moment generated no excitement in us. Rather, the whole spectacle inspired in us such a feeling of awe, even reverence, that to interrupt it—even with whoops of elation—seemed unthinkable, sacrilegious. It was a very “meta” moment. We were being prompted to take patriotic and masculine cues from a fictional rendering of an actual man who, in his own sense of legend-creating theatricality, sought to emulate in a modern form the great conquerors of ancient Rome. Military leadership, then, could be defined, at least in part, as a series of multi-generational signifiers, each building on perceptions—and its power has remained with me for a quarter century. For in that moment, I first began to contemplate, in some form at least, the following question: What does experiencing a war film mean?

Context plays an undeniably large role in answering such a question, of course. Watching *Patton* with 1500 military recruits in a service academy theater in 1989 will necessarily differ from the experience of viewing the same film in a crowded California drive-in on a Friday night in 1969. And yet, something about a powerful war film resonates beyond the time and place of its own historical and/or historicized release. The war film is always relevant and always imbued with meaning because war itself, unfortunately, never leaves us, and its impact echoes across generations. In fact, historically, when have we, as a species, ever been separated from war by more than a single generation? No instance comes to mind, at least not when thinking on a global scale. Perhaps this fact is why no one ever speaks of a war film as being “dated.” The war film is always already modern in the popular imagination because the very causes of war—greed, enmity, fear, revenge, and the lust for power and resources—remain forever hardwired into our collective unconscious.

The past 15 years, in fact, have given rise to some of the most shocking and violent conflicts in recent memory, including the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon; the Global War on Terror, particularly in Afghanistan and Iraq; the Second Chechen War; the genocide in Sudan’s Darfur; the ongoing conflict between the Columbian government and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia (also known as the FARC); the intensities of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict; the Mexican government’s war against ultra-violent drug cartels; the killings of Saddam Hussein and Osama Bin-Laden; the suppression of the Green Revolution in Iran; the revolutionary upheavals of the Arab Spring and their unfortunate aftermath; and the massive, violent unrest in places such as Libya, Syria, and Ukraine, to name just a very few. Given the changing nature of warfare—and the ways in which both traditional and new media tell its myriad stories—now is the perfect time to revisit and re-evaluate the genre of the war film. Indeed, John Nelson and I have designed *A Companion to the War Film* to be one of the most comprehensive volumes on this popular and important genre to date, aimed at examining war films not just from the US, but from many other countries around the world as well.

The extant publishing on the topic of the war film is, of course, legion. On World War II alone, for example, one can choose among several titles. Lawrence H. Suid’s *Guts and Glory: The Making of the American Military Image in Film* (University Press of Kentucky, 2002) explores the longstanding relationship between the US military and Hollywood. Similarly, Thomas Doherty’s *Projections of War: Hollywood, American Culture, and World War II* (Columbia University Press, 1993) traces the way in which Hollywood worked to generate public support of the military during that oft-portrayed war. Clayton R. Koppes and Gregory D. Black’s *Hollywood Goes to War: How Politics, Profits, and Propaganda Shaped*
World War II Movies (University of California Press, 1990) studies in great detail the workings of the Office of War Information's Bureau of Motion Pictures and the way in which that agency partnered with Hollywood and its War Activities Committee to shape public perception of the war. One of this collection's notable contributors, Jeanine Basinger's The World War II Combat Film: Anatomy of a Genre (Wesleyan University Press, 2003) remains the staple text for understanding the generic formulations of this era's war film. More generally, Armed Forces: Masculinity and Sexuality in the American War Film (Rutgers University Press, 2007), by Robert Eberwein, another of our esteemed contributors, tackles the gender implications inherent to the war film from World War I to the present. The same author's anthology, The War Film (Rutgers University Press, 2005), features essays discussing the subject from the perspectives of genre, race, gender, and history, while his most recent monograph The Hollywood War Film (Wiley- Blackwell, 2009), traces patterns and themes in blockbuster American war films from the early days of Hollywood to the present.

J. David Slocum's Hollywood and War: The Film Reader (Routledge, 2006) assembles some of the best historical writings on the war film into a single collection. Paul Virilio's War and Cinema: The Logistics of Perception (Verso, 2009) explores its subject from unique theoretical angles that combine considerations of visuality and military history. Finally, Ed Halter's From Sun Tzu to X-Box: War and Video Games (Thunder's Mouth Press, 2006) examines the intricate relationship between video games and the recruiting practices of the US military. These stand as only a few of the dozens of books dedicated to the study of the war film and its profound impact on the way in which we conceptualize armed conflict.

While each of the aforementioned books is excellent in its own right, the scholarship on the war film genre at large needs to catch up with events of recent history and technologies: the ways in which new media now expands and also complicates our understanding and experience of war; the global nature of local, regional, national, international, and ethnic conflicts; and the myriad forms that stories about war can take when we allow the boundaries of the genre to expand, for example. Also, the scholarly conception of the war film in the United States has remained largely mired in examinations of Hollywood films on World War II and the Vietnam War for the past generation. By this statement, I do not mean to suggest, of course, that these wars merit no further attention; rather, our examinations of these well-trodden territories need to deepen, such that we approach them from new angles and perspectives.

Similarly, our definitions of the genre as a whole need to broaden. We must include in our analyses films from a wide variety of conflicts, nations, and time periods, and we also need to apply fresh theoretical approaches and archival resources to our study of these films. A Companion to the War Film seeks to fill these gaps in the genre's scholarship while, at the same time, acting as an essential and multi-faceted classroom text for the hundreds of undergraduate and graduate courses on the war film taught throughout the world. While the book is aimed primarily at an academic audience (both students and military/film scholars and historians), we have commissioned essays easily accessible to general readers who share an enthusiastic interest in cinematic representations of war.

Although we have avoided assigning our chapters to strict "sections," we nevertheless feel that A Companion to the War Film's 25 essays might be said to fall roughly into one of five areas of interest: the war film and history; the historiography of the war film as a genre; race and gender issues in the war film; the war film outside the Anglophonic imagination; and
the war film as experienced through alternative media and/or genres (e.g., television, cable, YouTube, straight-to-video projects, etc.).

Those chapters concentrating on history, for instance, deal primarily with how war films attempt to contextualize real-world conflicts and how such films, set as they are within certain periods, necessarily comment—either directly or indirectly—on other conflicts contemporaneous to the periods of production. Robert Eberwein considers the long-ignored traditions of music in the war film, while Ned O’Gorman and Kevin Hamilton delve deeply into the hitherto unknown history of the Lookout Mount Laboratory, Los Angeles, home of the many experts who filmed US nuclear tests for nearly 30 years. David Ryan notes the ways in which films such as Saving Private Ryan (1998) and The Messenger (2009) depict the complexities of the ancient tradition of the wartime bereavement message.

John Garofolo briefly tracks trends and developments in the American war film from 1898 to the present. Sandra Singer also contextualizes her study of Saving Private Ryan and Munich (2005), noting Spielberg’s signature touch on both films, and Matthew Sorrento works to explain the dynamics of the “service tragicomedy” in films such as Bananas (1971) and Full Metal Jacket (1987). Chapters interested in historiography and genre examine the history and malleability of the war film itself—its development across the globe; its modes of production; its circumstances of exhibition and reception; and its influences and legacies. These chapters also consider questions of genre requirements, their variations, their changing natures, and how we might expand the standard definition of the genre—or create more subgenres—to account for new and innovative entries that don’t always meet the traditional genre expectations. If war films exist as an unquestioned genre, contributors such as Dan Hassoun and Agnieszka Soltysik Monnet ask, should they be formally and ethically distinguished from anti-war films? Similarly, Tanine Allison, in her chapter, ponders connections between science-fiction action films and the military recruitment advertisements that often precede them in movie theater screenings. In a different vein, Cason Murphy contemplates the relationship between Sam Mendes’s Jarhead (2005) and Samuel Beckett’s Waiting for Godot. In separate essays, both Kris Fallon and Laura Browder think deeply about wartime documentaries and their relationships to the larger war film genre, and Kelly Wilz reveals how the lines between documentary and film blur in her study of Operation Homecoming: Writing the Wartime Experience (2007). Issues of race and gender dominate (either overtly or in a subversive way) the subject matter of certain war films, and our book features several chapters that probe these topics. Yuki Obayashi, for example, tackles the harsh realities of the Japanese internment in her comparisons of Come See the Paradise (1990) and Snow Falling on Cedars (1999). The female soldier’s experience on the war front is addressed by both Debra White-Stanley’s study of wartime nurses and Anna Froula’s accounts of postwar Army training films that encouraged traditional femininity for female soldiers. Also, Jeanine Basinger takes an in-depth look at what she calls “home-front soldiers” in films such as Tender Comrade (1943), Since You Went Away (1944), and The War against Mrs. Hadley (1942). Chapters dealing with war films outside the Anglophonic experience consider many unique questions: Does the nature of the war film differ by language, region, and/or nation? What conflicts are considered of great importance to filmmakers from nations other the United States and the United Kingdom, and how do filmmakers from non-Anglophonic nations differ in their approaches to this thoroughly elastic genre? How do filmmakers from different countries, with both domestic and global markets in mind,
portray the same conflict on the screen? Co-editor John Nelson addresses these questions in his study of two Korean War films produced in South Korea, just as Linda R. Robertson and Mark Gagnon look at German works for their respective chapters. Christa Jones discusses representations of the Algerian War in her chapter, and Kaustav Bakshi and Ramit Samaddar look closely at two films depicting the Kargil War between India and Pakistan. Finally, A Companion to the War Film considers how other forms of media—television, cable programming, YouTube, and videos posted to social-networking sites—affect our conceptualizations of the war film as a genre while, at the same time, they draw from (and then expand) the genre's longstanding tropes. Deborah Jaramillo, for example, looks at the Iraq War as depicted by HBO's Generation Kill (2008). Also sticking closely to issues of televisuality is Mary-Beth Haralovich's study of the television series Army Wives (2007–2013) and the phenomenon of reality programming during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

This collection thus examines all aspects of the genre, from the traditional war film to the new global nature of armed conflict, to the diverse formats war stories assume in today's digital culture, which continues to expand with the global propagation of social media. The contributors discuss the traditional “combat film” but then move beyond those limited confines to cover homefront films, international and foreign language films, and the use of alternative media—including Internet videos, military recruitment advertisements, government-produced films, and television programs—across a range of conflicts, nations, and time periods. Thus, A Companion to the War Film contributes to the ongoing conversation about the profound and enduring role that war film has played and continues to play in our collective understanding of armed conflict and its impact on society. Our contributors have provided exciting and nuanced analyses of a variety of new and old war films, and, in doing so, they challenge the traditional approaches by which scholars have studied this longstanding genre.
“Hearing” the Music in War Films

Robert Eberwein

My interest here lies in presenting a limited and preliminary exploration of various issues related to the reception of music by two distinct populations of audiences for American war films. First, I consider those in the late nineteenth century who attended Love and War (1899; James H. White), a film about the Spanish–American War, and those who saw “Break the News to Mother” (1897/1899; Charles K. Harris), an illustrated song slide show about the Civil War. Then I discuss modern audiences’ experience listening to the music in Clint Eastwood’s Flags of our Fathers (2006), a film about the battle for Iwo Jima. There is no way of determining if anyone in 1899 saw both the film and the slide slow. It is possible that a viewer of Eastwood’s film might have seen one of the earlier works. In a way it does not really matter, because what is important is realizing what occurs as a viewer/auditor “hears” certain music in war films. My speculative and provisional hypothesis is that the way music was used in the earliest war films establishes a kind of paradigmatic model, making music into a text, a site onto which various examples of cultural and political history are inscribed. Audiences hearing music in the works from the nineteenth century and in Eastwood’s from our own twenty-first can both be understood as experiencing the musical, auditory equivalent of a palimpsest. That is, like the mystic writing pad that retains traces of what was “written,” some music in war films continues to show impressions of the wars in which it figured and in some cases films in which it appeared, thus generating dynamic interaction between audiences and history.¹

As I have indicated elsewhere, the war film genre can be said to have begun in 1898 during the Spanish–American War, which was the subject of three kinds of film. First, “actualities,” such as Burial of the Maine Victims (1898), were essentially newsreel accounts of events. In at least one venue, New York City’s Proctor’s Theater, this film was accompanied by an orchestra and the playing of “Taps” on a trumpet. According to one report, this produced a powerful reaction in the audience:

In these days of excitement it takes a good deal to stir a big theater audience to any great display of feeling unless applause is drawn from it by patriotic songs and a liberal waving of flags, but the people last night showed that they appreciated the service the [New York] Journal has done
for humanity by giving to the simple black and white depiction of the Wargraph [Thomas Edison's name for the projecting device] the same outburst of applause that greeted the National anthem … The orchestra hushed and a bugler behind the scenes began to play that last, sad call, ‘Taps,’ as a company of blue jackets swung around the corner of the pictured scene.2

Second, “reenactments” were films in which staged battles recreated specific encounters, such as US Infantry Supported by Rough Riders at El Caney (1899). Finally there were narratives, such as Love and War. This work can certainly be claimed not only as the first narrative war film, but, as far as I can tell, the first narrative film of any sort to use the word “war” in its title.3

This three-minute film, as it exists now in the Library of Congress print, has six scenes, each presented in a continuous shot from a stationary camera: (1) a youth leaves his anxious family to go to war; his brother holds the departing soldier's rifle; (2) his mother, sitting next to the brother, reads the newspaper for accounts of him; (3) his father and another man come in with news that the soldier has been killed or wounded, producing anguish for all; (4) the brave soldier engages in battle, is wounded, and is rescued by his courageous comrade who dies saving him; (5) he is taken to a field hospital where a nurse prays over him; (6) he returns home and reunites with his family and girlfriend.

Exactly what audiences in November in 1899 saw during the presentation of this film is difficult to determine since the film available to us now differs from the one described both in the Edison Catalogue and in the advertisement for the film published in The New York Clipper, a well-known trade publication, seven days after the film was copyrighted.4 According to the Catalogue, Love and War is

[a]n illustrated song telling the story of a hero who leaves for the war as a private, is promoted to the rank of captain for bravery in service, meets the girl of his choice, who is a Red Cross nurse on the field, and finally returns home triumphantly as an officer to the father and mother to whom he bade good-bye as a private. The film presents this beautiful song picture in six scenes, each of which has a separate song, making the entire series a complete and effective novelty.

PARTING. – “Our hero boy to the war has gone.” Words and music.
FIGHTING. – The battle prayer. “Father, on Thee I Call.” Words and music.
SORROWING. – The mother’s lament. “Come back, my dear boy, to me.” Words and music.

The above scene can be illustrated either by a soloist, quartette or with an orchestra, and with or without stereopticon slides. This series of animated pictures, when properly illustrated or announced by stereopticon reading matter, should make a great success.5

The advertisement in the New York Clipper, a trade journal at the time, uses some of the language of the Edison Catalogue and adds two sentences:

LOVE AND WAR … A wonderful song picture. We have at last succeeded in perfectly synchronizing Music and Moving Pictures [my italics]. The above is an illustrated song, telling the story of a hero who leaves for the war as a private, is promoted to the rank of captain for bravery in service, meets the girl of his choice, who is a Red Cross nurse on the field, and finally returns home triumphantly as an officer to the father and mother to whom he bade goodbye as a private. The scenes are carefully chosen to fit the words and songs, which have been especially
Robert Eberwein composed for these pictures [my italics]. LENGTH 200 ft., complete with words of song and music, $45.00. (The New York Clipper, 18 November 1899, p. 801)

The disparity between the film we have and the printed descriptions in the Edison Catalogue and the New York Clipper is made even more problematic by the explanation offered by the Library of Congress: “Only four of the scenes described in the Edison Catalogue were submitted for copyright under the title *Love and War* and thus survive in the Library’s paper print copy; two other scenes were likely produced and, perhaps, copyrighted as separate films but then added to the Love and War picture sing and sold to fill out the description.” The advertisement does not mention the language from the Edison Catalogue about using soloists or presenting stereopticon slides. But both the Catalogue and Clipper describe the film as an “illustrated song” and “song picture.” According to Rick Altman, “illustrated songs” had begun to appear as early as 1863 when the producer “Tony Pastor bought lantern slide portraits of Civil War generals … to illustrate his song ‘Heroes of the War.’” He explains their history:

By the end of the century, illustrated songs were a vaudeville feature. In this period, sixteen to twenty slides would be used to illustrate each song. Photographed in black and white with live models staged to represent the words of the songs, the slides would then be hand-colored and projected while a singer belted out the lyrics. Audiences would usually be invited to join in the chorus, reading the words off the screen.7 (Altman, 2004, p. 107)

Since the illustrated song was focused on only one work, it is not clear why the Edison Catalogue gives this label to *Love and War* even as it identifies six illustrated songs within the film. In addition, the advertisement makes a claim that cannot be supported historically in regard to having “at last succeeded in synchronizing music and moving pictures.” Edison himself had already done this in the 1894 or 1895 short, *The Dickson Experimental Sound Test*, in which two men dance with each other. Shown originally on the kinetophone, the music was supplied by a wax cylindrical tube.8

An even more problematic assertion in the advertisement is the claim that “the words and songs … have been especially composed for this picture.” Obviously “The Star-Spangled Banner” preceded the creation of *Love and War*. It was first introduced during the War of 1812. “Father on Thee I Call” duplicates the first line of Friedrich Heinrich Himmel’s “A Battle Hymn,” which dates from the 1860s. “Weeping, Sad and Lonely” was an immensely popular Civil War song by Henry Tucker and Charles Sawyer used by both Union and Confederate armies. Each side made the lyrics specific to itself. The Union’s version had: “How proud you stood before me in your suit of blue, / When you vowed to me and country ever to be true.” The Confederate’s went: “How proud you stood before me in your suit of grey, / When you vowed to me and country nevermore to stray.” Given the fact that Americans’ uniforms during the Spanish–American War were blue, it is more than likely that the version used in the 1899 film relied on the Union version.9 One source claims over 1000000 sales in sheet music (Ebsen, 1999, p. 66). “Our Hero Boy to the War Has Gone” may well be a version of a Civil War Song by John Ross Dix, “My Northern Boy to the War Has Gone” (1864).10 I can find no Civil War song titled exactly “Come Back My Dear Boy to Me,” although some post-Civil War titles seem possibilities: “When Will My Boy Come Back to Me” (1875) and “Dear Robin Come Back to Me” (1888).
Our lack of specific information about what occurred in 1899 is frustrating. We do not know if the projector was stopped at various points for the presentation of the songs or if the soloists and singers were accompanied by a piano or orchestra. But if there were slides, one of the options mentioned in the Edison Catalogue, it is most likely that the audience would have sung along, especially if accompanied by printed lyrics, given the presentational practices for illustrated songs at this time. In any event, some of the songs were sufficiently popular, especially “The Star Spangled Banner” and “Weeping Sad and Lonely,” to allow one to speculate that some members of the audience would recognize them as parts of American history and culture. Even if, by chance, they did not, from our perspective we can see that the experience had a historical materiality for the audience, which was being given the opportunity to project the music being heard into the silent fictional world being observed. And in so doing, as they were hearing/singing a traditional patriotic song and a Civil War song while watching a film about the Spanish–American War, they were enveloped by and in history: the conflicts and the songs sung by soldiers and citizens during earlier wars.

The same year that Love and War appeared, McCallister and Co., which sold lantern slides, ran an advertisement for “Illustrations of Popular songs.” The copy claimed: “The ‘Songs of the People’ are much more attractive when accompanied by pictorial illustration ….” The songs listed are “all photographed from life-groups with appropriate accessories of furniture, etc., to give reality to the scene, and when enlarged and brilliantly projected on the screen by a fine Magic Lantern or Stereopticon, induce an audience to enter the more heartily into the sentiment of the song as rendered meanwhile by the vocalist.” One set in the form of eighteen slides was “Break the News to Mother,” available in “colored” or “uncolored” formats, for $16 and $8 respectively. (Altman, 2004, p. 107).

In 1897 Charles K. Harris, a successful publisher of sheet music and, more significantly, an immensely popular songwriter—most notably at the time for “After the Ball” published his “Break the News to Mother,” a song he had composed earlier about a doomed Confederate soldier. Under his direction, sometime between 1897 and 1899, the work became an illustrated slide song about a Union soldier. This was not the first of his songs to be put into song slides, having been preceded by “I Love Her Just the Same” (Harris, 1917, p. 1520). For the earlier number he asked members of a local vaudeville troop in Milwaukee to pose for the pictures suggested by the song. He recounts:

They were delighted to do so, and that was the birth, not only of the illustrated song slide but of the moving picture play scenario of the present day, as an article published ten years ago in the first issue of MOVING PICTURE WORLD will testify. By reading that article you will find that the same methods that we were using in making song slides are now being used by the greatest moving picture directors in making their scenarios. In making song slides for ‘I Love Her Just the Same’ I laid out the scene for each line …. I was compelled to look for locations, as well as the different types who were to appear in this song, and I was just as careful in selecting types and different locations as the most celebrated providers of picture plays at the present date. (Harris, 1917, p. 1520)

Harris was incorrect in saying that “I Love Her Just the Same” represented the birth of the song slide. That distinction seems to belong to the 1894 song “The Little Lost Child.” While it is not clear when “I Love Her Just the Same” was first shown, “Break the News to Mother” must have been created sometime between 1897, when Harris first published the
song, and 1899, when McCallister and Co. advertised it. Whether in 1897 or 1899, “Break the News to Mother” is the first visual work about war to provide a partially synchronized melding of song and image in color. To that extent, Harris has a partial claim to the work's significance as “the birth of the moving picture of the present day,” at least in regard to war narratives with music. His candid description of its appearance is worth noting:

As I could not get the war scenes for the song, I was in a quandary for a while, when suddenly the idea struck me of painting backgrounds of soldiers fighting, and to have them photographed. I never will forget the rendition of the song with these slides. They were simply awful. I was scared to death when the song was put on for the first time … but in spite of the crude pictures, it was a novelty and the audience took to it like a duck takes to water …. [T]he song slides were a sensation.

Assuming he followed the same pattern of creation for “Break the News to Mother” that he did in “I Love Her Just the Same,” he acted like someone making a film, finding actors and locations, and, in effect, storyboarding (Harris, 1917, p. 1520).

The song itself was enormously popular, according to M. Paul Holsinger, who calls it the most popular ballad during the Spanish–American War. … Inspired by the dying request of a young Confederate drummer in William Gillette’s Civil War melodrama Secret Service to ‘break the news to mother,’ Harris, one of the nation's most published songwriters, that same evening composed the words and music to the song. At first it got little attention. Harris's friends told him that Americans simply no longer cared about the Civil War, and, indeed, sales of the new number's sheet music seemed to bear out the truth of their assessment. The following spring, however, when the nation went to war with Spain, everything changed dramatically. Suddenly the possibility of death in battle seemed a certainty, and [the song] became an overnight smash success. During the summer of 1898, it was sung by the troops in Cuba and the Philippines and by citizens at home alike. (Holsinger, 1999, p. 181)

The initial slide, which indicates the title and manufacturer of the set, is followed by eighteen slides comprising the narrative that presents the story of a brave soldier who is fatally shot while trying to protect the Union flag. The blue color of the hero's and soldiers’ uniforms clearly identifies them as Union forces. Here are the lyrics and indications of the slides coordinated with each section or line, as created by DragonflyEnt:

*Slides nos. 1 and 2.* While shot and shell were screaming
Across the battlefield,
The boys in blue were fighting,
Their noble flag to shield.
Then a cry from their brave captain
Said, “Boys, the flag is down.
Who'll volunteer to save it from disgrace?”

*Slide no. 3.* “I will,” a young boy shouted,
“I'll save your flag or die!”
Then sprang into the thickest of the fray,
Saved the flag, but gave his young life,
All for his country's sake.
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Slide no. 4. They brought him back and heard him softly say,
She knows how dear I love her—
Slide no. 5. Chorus: “Just break the news to Mother—
For I’m not coming home.
Slide no. 7. Just say there is no other
Can take the place of Mother,
Slide no. 8. Then kiss her dear sweet lips for me,
And break the news to her.”
Slide no. 9. From afar, a noted general
Had witnessed this brave deed.
Slide no. 10. “Who saved our flag? Speak up, boys.
’Twas noble, brave indeed.”
“T’was: he lies sir,” said the captain,
“He’s sinking very fast,”
Slide no. 11. Then slowly turned away to hide a tear.
The general in a moment
Slide no. 12. Knelt down beside the boy,
And gave a cry that touched all hearts that day:
Slide no. 13. ’Tis my son, my brave young hero,
I thought you safe at home.”
Slide no. 14. “Forgive me father, for I ran away.”
Slide no. 15. “Just break the news to Mother—
She knows how dear I love her—
And tell her not to wait for me,
Slide no. 16. For I’m not coming home,
Just say there is no other
Slide no. 17. Can take the place of Mother,
Then kiss her dear sweet lips for me,
Slide no. 18. And break the news to her.”

The slides show several sites: the battlefield (three scenes, nos. 1–3); the area in front of the hospital tent to which the fallen soldier is conveyed (nos. 4–7, 9–14), his Mother (no. 8), and his Mother’s home (nos. 15–18). Obviously, there is no motion in the slides since all the “shots” are necessarily static, as if taken with a still camera. But there are definite examples of subject repositioning within the frame that suggest the illusion of movement. First, after an iris-like photograph of Mother (no. 8), we see the wounded soldier lying outside the hospital tent; one soldier holds a flag near his head and two are near his feet as one soldier appears to kneel before his body. In the next slide, the men seem to be trying to make the fallen man more comfortable. Then we see him on a stretcher, which has been put on a bier. In a thirty-second sequence (assuming that the construction has some claim to approximating that number temporally), the father appears, kneels at the bier as one soldier turns away to hide his tears, throws up his hands in surprise, identifies the soldier, (“’It’s my son!”), and cradles his head in his arm (no.14). Then the general goes to break the news. In three shots comprising thirty seconds (nos. 15–17), again in line with DragonflyEnt’s construction, he appears at the boy’s home to break the news; comforts the Mother in an embrace; and sits with her on a divan. The last slide (no. 18) repeats the earlier iris view of Mother. Both the
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scenes in front of the hospital tent and those with the Captain and the Mother can be seen to approximate an early form of subject positioning, or reframing. This is akin to, but not exactly the same as, what Noël Burch describes in British magic-lantern shows: “In many of these slide sequences, the spectator follows a series of movements in a single setting rendered by pictures of different shot scale and sometimes even from different angles.”

Many copies of the 1897 sheet music can be seen on the web. Harris’ own company published it at least ten times. Most covers of the music include four black and white drawings. Three are in an oval frame: soldiers offering support to a comrade; a fallen soldier; an officer greeting his mother. The one without a frame has some color and shows the doomed soldier carrying the flag, a patch of red blood visible on his left side. There are also photographs of various performers of the song (several with a solo female, one solo male, two male duos, two male–female duos) and one with Harris’s photograph. The latter lacks any drawings. The sheer number of publications indicates the popular song’s success.

But one sheet music cover is radically different from those just mentioned. It shows a photograph of soldiers from the Great War, framed within the circle of a drum. This one was published in connection with the release of a film actually titled *Break the News to Mother* (1919). In his autobiography, Harris explains that he had been working on a story about the circus when he was asked to supply a story to a director: “This story going over so well, I fell back on my old song titles and wrote a scenario around my soldier song, ‘Break the News to Mother,’ and sold it” (Harris, 1926, p. 269).

The plot summary of the lost film *Break the News to Mother* (1919; directed by Julius Steger) does not suggest it had a great deal to do with the Great War. The hero, David Brey, is falsely accused of a crime in America and flees. Towards the end of the film, “Meanwhile Dave, a war hero in Europe, and sick with pneumonia,” survives and “After the armistice, Dave returns to his mother.” The reviewer in *Variety* recalled Harris’s song but could not see any connection between it and the movie (*Variety* 1919). Even so, information printed on the sheet music cover that appeared at the time makes a connection that demonstrates how important the song was to Americans. The caption mistakenly identifies the date of the Spanish–American War, but the wording indicates its significance:

> This song was originally published in 1897, during the Spanish American war [sic], when it was virtually taken up by the entire nation. The author … since the outbreak of the present war has been besieged by requests for copies of his one-time famous song, the human heart appeal of which has kept alive for these many years. In response to this appeal he has issued this new edition. The song remains unchanged with the exception of the title page. And will undoubtedly take its place as an immortal classic.

In effect, as Harris “fell back on his old titles” and “wrote a scenario around [his] soldier song,” he was using the song as a slate or pad onto which new writing was put. The music’s historic materiality suggests a palimpsest, defined as a “very old document on which the original writing has been erased and replaced with new writing” and “writing material used one or more times after the earlier writing has been replaced.” Sigmund Freud’s theoretical use of the palimpsest is worth considering in the context as an analogy. One writes on the celluloid cover of a palimpsest. When the cover is removed, the writing on it disappears but
the residual impressions on the slate under the celluloid retain traces of the writing. For Freud, this is akin to what happens with our perceptions and memory:

The surface of the Mystic Pad is clear of writing and once more capable of receiving impressions. But it is easy to discover that the permanent trace of what is written is retained on the wax slab itself and is legible in certain lights. Thus the Pad provides not only a receptive surface that can be used over and over again, like a slate, but also permanent traces of what has been written, like an ordinary paper pad; it solves the problem of combining the two functions by dividing them between two separate but interrelated component parts or systems. But this is precisely the way in which … our mental apparatus performs its perceptual function. (Freud, 1961, p. 230, italics in the original)

The concept of the palimpsest can be seen to relate to the idea of a kind of historical intertextuality. If we consider the older music, in this case appropriated from earlier wars, as being (or being on) the base slate, then the later use of it can be understood as being registered on the celluloid (literally and figuratively) that is overlaid on the original musical slate.

To summarize at this point: the creators of Love and War, a film about the Spanish–American War, appropriated and incorporated songs from earlier conflicts, the War of 1812 (“The Star Spangled Banner”) and the Civil War (“Weeping, Sad and Lonely”). Charles K. Harris recycled “Break the News to Mother,” his own song, originally about a doomed Confederate soldier, and constructed a slide show in which the hero is now a member of the Union Army. This song then became immensely popular during the Spanish–American War, sufficiently so to warrant recycling it during the Great War, the next major American conflict. Both film and slide show connect their viewers with music from earlier time periods and wars—an unusual kind of auditory palimpsest. The music in both the film and the original slide is akin to the writing pad on which narratives are written and then overwritten: Civil War, Spanish–American War, and the Great War. I would suggest that something like this phenomenon seems to be particular to music in the war film, because, more than is the case with other genres, some of the music we hear is often understood to be that which audiences at the time would have heard in the theaters and viewing spaces during an actual war. For the moment, we are connected experientially with people who were close to, if not actually immersed in, an actual war.

And what we hear is “real.” Kathryn Kalinak speaks of “music’s utility to silent film … derived from its physical presence in the theater” and cites an advertisement for the Barton Orchestral Organ: “Out of the misty depths of the silversheet, shaking the shadows from them, come the people of the screen stories. They come dancing-running-fighting or with soul-weary steps—and music, real music, should always be with them” (Kalinak, 1992, p. 44, italics in the original). She observes that “silent film accompaniment, after all, was produced by live musicians whose presence lent credibility to the images themselves. The sight of live performers actually producing music transferred to the silent images a sense of here and now, a quality that the Barton Musical Instrument Company described in its advertisements as ‘next to human,’ a visual assurance that images on the screen are ‘real’” (ibid.). The wording is similar to that found in another advertisement from a different source claiming that the Wurlitzer “One Man Orchestra” provides “The Music That Gives Realism to the Pictures.”20 To take Kalinak’s conclusion one step further: It is not just that the music gives realism to the
image; it is that our perception of the image and war gains a degree of realism precisely because the sound itself is experienced as a real sound. If we know that what we are hearing is a real sound, then we are linked to earlier audiences that also “heard” what we are hearing now, whether they were living through a war or observing a film about it.

Michel Chion has explored the complex issue of music’s relationship to “reality” from a different angle. Differentiating diegetic from non-diegetic, he identifies “screen music” for film, and “pit music” for other entertainments such as opera or the circus. In the cases of film, when “the scene changes,” something extraordinary happens vis-à-vis music:

The scene changes, meaning what was first a palace becomes magically a forest, a boudoir, or the parlor of a convent. What does not change its imaginary placement for the audience, however, is the music. From beginning to end … the music is emitted from the orchestra pit, the grandstand, from a place beyond all places, that contains all times and all spaces, and leads everywhere: to the past as well as the future, to the sea and the city, to depths as well as to the heavens, a place that has no here or there, neither once upon a time nor now. The place of music is both a pit, where the elementary principles of these mean streets called life muck around, and a balcony in the sky, from where we can view as detached observers—out of time, through instantaneous cuts—past, present, and future. (Chion, 2003, p. 412)

Music becomes the experiential base for narratives and envelopes us by virtue of its material reality beyond “here or there.”

Let me expand on this point by considering “I’ll Walk Alone,” an immensely popular song by Jule Styne and Sammy Cahn from 1944 performed in Flags of our Fathers. It is heard twice, first in an incomplete version sung by Eastwood during the opening credit sequence. Robert Burgoyne, drawing on the logic of Michel Chion’s theory, describes it in this manner:

Shortly after the introductory logo… a faint voice emerges from the darkness of the screen, a voice that has an old-fashioned texture and grain, singing a song that sounds like a fragment of a half-heard radio broadcast. The lyrics, which are barely audible … set a mood of solitude, loss, and regret. The source of the song is ambiguous; it seems to float between the opening Dreamworks logo … and the beginning of the diegesis, to be in both places at once, “haunting the borderlands.” The song is neither on-screen nor clearly off-screen, neither part of the credits nor part of the fictional world. It suggests the ghostly off-screen voice that Michel Chion describes as the “acousmetre.” (Burgoyne, 2003, p. 157)

Eastwood’s rendition begins five seconds into the film and ends at 0:56. But he presents the song again, this time as the Marines hear it over the intercom. One of the most striking scenes in the film occurs on the night before the landing on Iwo Jima. Sitting around a table in the barracks, the young men playing cards can hear Artie Shaw’s band playing his popular 1941 swing composition “Summit Ridge Drive” (DVD Chapter 5). They ask Ira Hayes (Adam Beach) who has been looking at photographs, about his “squaw.” When he shows them one image, it is of a blindfolded prisoner about to be beheaded; another photograph is of a G.I.’s body on a beach. Their banter stops as he explains that it is what the Japanese do to prisoners. At that moment, we hear the voice of Tokyo Rose, who taunts the men by talking about their girls back home, suggesting their infidelity: “Who do you think they are with tonight? Will they comfort you at your funeral?” While she speaks, we begin to hear
Dinah Shore singing “I’ll Walk Alone”; her song actually enters momentarily into a bizarre kind of counterpoint to the voice of Tokyo Rose.\(^2\) The song was first introduced by Shore the year before in *Follow the Boys* (A. Edward Sutherland; 1944), a wartime drama-musical-review film in which she sings it before an audience. Here Shore's voice takes over, and we no longer hear Tokyo Rose as Eastwood pans around the faces of the anxious Marines. As she concludes, “Till you’re walking beside me / I’ll walk alone,” instead of the vicious baiting, we have one of the Marines accompanying Shore on his guitar.\(^2\) While not singing along with the song, an action that could occur with the showing of the earliest war films I mentioned above, the Marine's accompanying of this song is certainly related to the principle of engaging with the music you hear. Moreover, the guitar accompaniment puts into relief Eastwood's own singing as the film begins. He literally is singing the part of the song we will hear shortly.

Tokyo Rose's counterpart in the European theater of war was Axis Sally, who is heard in *The Story of G.I. Joe* (1945; William Wellman) presenting propagandistic arguments of a similar kind to the soldiers listening on a radio to “Summit Ridge Drive,” the same Artie Shaw number presented in Eastwood's film. One soldier is quite caught up and joins in with sound effects. After urging her listeners to give up and join with their German brothers, Axis Sally plays “Linda,” a love ballad that lasts several minutes. Composed by Ann Ronell, it addresses men's loneliness and longing, and Wellman cuts from the longing faces of one man after another. At its conclusion, one soldier plays the ballad on his guitar. The parallels are interesting, not only on account of these being two films in which soldiers playing guitars join in with love ballads. Even more striking is the dual use of Artie Shaw's quintessential swing classic, which has remained a staple of modern American music since the 1940s. It too functions as a kind of palimpsest in *Flags*, bearing the impression not just of *The Story of G.I. Joe*, but of an entire cultural and historical tradition.

Two more songs in *Flags of Our Fathers* deserve mention in this regard, both performed by the Andrews Sisters. The first is another 1944 song by Jule Styne and Sammy Cahn, “Doing the Victory Polka,” first featured in the film *Jam Session* (1944; Charles Barton), where it is sung by Ann Miller. In Eastwood's film, the Andrews Sisters sing it at the first of two bond rallies at which they appear. The next song, performed at the second function, is “Any Bonds Today,” the virtually ubiquitous number urging citizens to support the war effort with their dollars. Written by Irving Berlin and first introduced by Bugs Bunny in the Warner Bros. cartoon *Any Bonds Today* (1942: Leo Schlesinger [producer]), it was shown in countless theaters. The Internet Movie Database (IMDB) lists its running time at 3:00 minutes. One entry available on You Tube presents a 1:27 minute version of the song. It begins with a title frame on a red curtain: “Leon Schlesinger presents ’Bugs Bunny’ Produced in Cooperation with Warner Bros. and U.S. Treasury Dept. Defense Savings Staff.” It is complete in regard to the animation (including the Al Jolson chorus in which Bugs sings in blackface) and concludes with a one-page advertisement, “For Defense, Buy United States Savings Bonds and Stamps.”\(^2\) A longer version available on YouTube (2:54), is closer in length to the time listed in IMDB. After the songs, we see the advertisement (“For Defense ...”), and another frame follows indicating “At this Theatre,” and then another, “Ladies and Gentlemen Let Us All Sing Our National Anthem!” Then a series of eight images appears with the image of a musical staff and the lyrics of “The Star-Spangled Banner.” When the rockets’ red glare is mentioned, images of fireworks appear underneath the staff. The last
two images omit the staff, as the anthem concludes with two images of the waving American flag. This version certainly brings us back to what might have well occurred in the presentation of Love and War were the audience singing along with a slide.

The contemporary audience for Eastwood’s film is not singing along. Still, the performance by the Andrews Sisters acts in a similar manner to engage us in an experience by which a text, the song, has a double inscription. Heard as “real” sound, it bears the imprint of the historical directive that is at the narrative center of the film. We are brought into a fictional world enlivened (and animated, in terms of Bugs Bunny), heard as “real” sound.

The reference to Irving Berlin’s “Any Bonds Today” leads to a concluding reflection. Berlin has to be considered as the ultimate composer of popular songs in the war film, not just for “Any Bonds Today,” but even more for two songs whose first cinematic occurrence is in This Is the Army (1943: Michael Curtiz): “God Bless America” (the song many wish was indeed our national anthem) and “This Is the Army, Mr. Jones.” The first, sung by Kate Smith with a full orchestra and chorus, is followed by scenes understood to be of the attack on Pearl Harbor and the death of a young pilot. The second is heard first during the credits and appears again in a production number in which army personnel performing it during World War I march out of a theater as they prepare to go to France to fight. The song is reprised later in the film, now sung by World War II soldiers who are interrupted (comically) by a group of Navy sailors. Like “Any Bonds Today,” it is instantly recognizable as another quintessential World War II song, appearing as it did in the most successful war-themed film made during the conflict.

As far as I can tell, its next appearance in film occurs as the accompaniment to Howard Hawks’s comedy I Was A Male War Bride (1949). It is safe to assume that most of the audience seeing the film when it first appeared would have recognized the song. Interestingly, the song was used to accompany the trailer for the film shown in advance of its release. As the IMDB notes, no credit is given—particularly surprising since the studio producing it was not Warner Bros., which made the 1943 film, but Twentieth Century Fox. In the trailer and credits of Hawks’s comedy can be seen another kind of inscription on the musical pad, here reprising a song and film six years after both cheered audiences at the height of World War II and four years after its conclusion. Even though the lyrics are not sung, the music underscores the difference between 1943 and 1949 by asserting that World War II is indeed over. While the 1943 film has comic moments, especially in its use of drag during some of the musical numbers, its ultimate generic status could be defined as musical war drama. We see destruction and the indication of at least one death. The high point of I Was a Male War Bride is Cary Grant’s drag impersonation of a woman so that he can accompany his wife back to the United States. No one dies. The use of the song here adds a new layer on to the musical slate, not by figuring in a different war but by showing a world that can have the comic moments without death.

Notes
1. Obviously, my interest in what audiences “hear” will remind readers of the title of Claudia Gorbman’s important study Unheard Melodies: Narrative Film Music (Gorbman, 1987).
2. For a detailed account of this from the New York Journal and Advertiser, April 26, 1898, see Musser (1991, pp. 129–130).