

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 09.12.20

Naturfilm

(_film, _sjanger) Også kalt naturdokumentarfilm og på engelsk “wildlife film”. En undersjanger av dokumentarfilm. Ofte produsert som TV-serier.

Sjangeren har ført til mange milepæler knyttet til tidspunktene når ulike tekniske løsninger begynner å bli anvendt: filming av fugler fra småfly, minikamera inne i et bjørnehi, osv., og milepæler for hva som blir filmet for første gang: snøleopard, sjimpanser som spiser kjøtt, løver som dreper en elefant, en gaupe med unger, osv.

I prinsippet er naturfilmer “balanced precariously on a tightrope between two poles: science and storytelling. Wildlife films often included accurate scientific information, but were nevertheless highly *cinematic* in their treatment of it, in their use of techniques of classical narrative cinema that did not so much illustrate facts as dramatize them. The tension was not only between realism and formalism, but also between information and drama, reason and emotion.” (Bousé 2000 s. 84)

Det suggereres ofte en tidløshet gjennom å vise minimalt med mennesker og tegn på sivilisasjon, slik at dyrene i prinsippet kunne ha levd for århundrer eller årtusener siden. Filmene tenderer til å ville vise det evige, det som varer. Det er en konvensjon i mange naturfilmer å “exclude telegraph poles and electricity pylons, cars, roads, and people. No such vestige of reality may impinge on the period-piece of the natural world we wish to purvey.” (Bousé 2000 s. 14)

Store naturfilmserier, f.eks. produsert av BBC og Disney, kjennetegnes ofte av “(1) *the depiction of mega-fauna* – big cats, bears, sharks, crocodiles, elephants, whales, and the like; (2) *visual splendor* – magnificent scenery as a background to the animals, suggesting a still-unspoiled, primeval wilderness; (3) *dramatic storyline* – a compelling narrative, perhaps centering on a single animal, with some sort of dramatic arc intended to capture and hold viewer attention (i.e., not a science lecture); (4) *absence of science* – while perhaps the weakest and most often broken of these “rules,” the discourse of science can entail its own narrative of research, with all its attendant technical jargon and seemingly arcane methodologies, which can shift the focus onto scientists and spoil the “period-piece fantasy of pristine nature; (5) *absence of politics* – little or no reference to controversial issues, which are often seen as “doom and gloom” themes, and no overt Griersonian-style propaganda on behalf of wildlife conservation issues, their causes, or possible

solutions, although a brief statement may be included at the film's conclusion; (6) *absence of historical reference points* – “There has to be a sense of timelessness,” producer Dione Gilmour has said, suggesting that not only must nature itself appear timeless, but there should also be no clear references that would date the film or ground it in a specific time, and thus prevent future rerun sales; (7) *absence of people* – the presence of humans may also spoil the image of a timeless realm, untouched and uncorrupted by civilization, where predator and prey still interact just as they have for aeons.” (Bousé 2000 s. 14-15)

Filmfolkene må ta etiske/moralske avgjørelser, f.eks. når det gjelder å gripe inn for å redde dyr. Professor i idéhistorie Trond Berg Eriksen har blitt opprørt når han i naturfilmer har sett at “fotografene følger en flokk elefanter gjennom tørst og sult i undergangen – helt til skjelettene ligger der hvite og skinnende i ørkenen. Hvorfor i all verden kunne ikke fotografene sette ut noen tønner med vann i stedet for å rapportere om den pinefulle dødskampen dag for dag og time for time? Jeg synes det er noe opprørende i en dokumentasjon uten et snev av medfølelse med gjenstandene. Samtidig snylter fotografene på tilskuernes maktesløse medfølelse med dem som vakler mot undergangen.” (*Morgenbladet* 20.–26. september 2013 s. 55) Mange rovdyr begynner å spise på sitt bytte før det er dødt, og store byttedyr dør ikke alltid raskt. Seeren kan ønske at byttedyret skal dø straks, uten mye smerte, men oppleve å se det stikk motsatte.

Dyrenes oppførsel tolkes ofte inn i menneskelige kategorier. Dyr kan bli gitt individuelle navn for å individualisere/personliggjøre dem. De kan også bli tildelt helte- og skurkeroller (for å fremme seernes innlevelse). Dyr framstilles via menneskelige karakter-, emosjons- og handlingsmønstre (Lehmann og Wulff 2016 s. 9). Likevel skal det være som om naturen selv forteller sin historie. Filmtraileren til den franske regissøren Luc Jacquets *Pingvinenes marsj* (2005) lokker med denne formuleringen: “Naturen skriver de vakreste av alle historier” (siteret fra Krohn og Strank 2012 s. 227).

Dyr blir antropomorfisert, dvs. menneskeliggjort. Dette er et eksempel på “the human drive to conquer the alien and make it conform to a narrowly human understanding” (Lentricchia og McLaughlin 1990 s. 36). Det motsatte, når mennesker tillegges dyre-egenskaper, er zoomorfisering (Lehmann og Wulff 2016 s. 9-10).

I Disney-konsernets naturfilmer antropomorfiseres dyrene (Niney 2012 s. 224). Blant annet blir dyrene tilskrevet menneskelige egenskaper av kommentatorstemmen. Den franske biologen og regissøren Jean Painlevé ville derimot framstille dyrene i deres annerledeshet og fremmedhet (Niney 2012 s. 224). Likevel trekker han ofte paralleller til menneskelivet når dyrene omtales. Dette gjelder svært mange naturfilmer, f.eks. ved bruk av metaforer der dyr sammenlignes med mennesker.

Cynthia Chris' bok *Watching Wildlife* (2006) inneholder en "historisk gjennomgang av naturfilmgenren. Chris kaster blant annet lys over hvordan fremstillingen av dyr i naturfilm kan leses som en gjenspeiling av vår forståelse av mennesket: "In fact, we have become so accustomed to seeking in animals models to explain our own behavior that we describe ourselves through animals in popular culture [...]" (Chris 2006:208-209). Chris har imidlertid et relativt beskjedent fokus på naturdokumentarfilm hvor en økologisk naturforståelse kommer til uttrykk – de gangene dette blir drøftet, er det primært i en historisk kontekst. *Watching Wildlife* fokuserer heller på hvordan naturdokumentaren gjennom historien har vært en plass for å forstå menneskelige moralske egenskaper, familieverdier og kjønnsroller. Chris hevder naturfilmen har gått fra å benytte antropomorfisme til forstå dyr, til å benytte "a zoomorphic framework in which knowledge about animals is used to explain humans" (Ibid.:x)." (Jan Magnus Larsen i *Grønn dokumentarfilm i et historisk og retorisk perspektiv*, 2012; her sitert fra <http://bora.uib.no/bitstream/handle/1956/6342/100171075.pdf>; lesedato 19.01.17)

"Antropomorfisme light. [David] Attenborough utelukker heller ikke en tredje sesong av "Planet earth". Også da lover han å bestrebe seg på å holde antropomorfismen – altså tilbøyeligheten til å tillegge dyr menneskelige trekk og egenskaper – på et minimum. Iblant er han blitt kritisert for det, selv om han hevder å ha et svært bevisst forhold til fenomenet. - Det er et begrep folk liker å leke med. Personlig synes jeg det blir uakseptabelt først idet du tillegger følelser eller lidenskaper du ikke kan verifisere. Det er og blir en antropomorfistisk uttalelse å påstå at en elefant, når den stormer tutende mot deg med ørene ut og snabelen opp, er sint. Men uttalelsen er ok og innafor. Derimot skal du være veldig forsiktig med å erklære at elefanten er forelsket, eller at den minnes forfedrene sine hvis den roter i gamle bein. Da havner du fort på tynn is." (*Dagbladets Magasinet* 29. oktober 2016 s. 64 og 62)

BBCs serie *Frozen Planet* (2011) "tar for seg dyre- og naturlivet i polarområdene. Serien består av syv 50-minutt lange episoder. Den første episoden, *The ends of the earth*, er en generell introduksjon til seriens tematikk. De neste fire episodene tar suksessivt for seg årstidene i polarområdene, fra vår til vinter. Episode 6, *The last frontier*, tar for seg menneskets forhold til områdene. Den syvende og siste episoden, *On thin ice*, utforsker følgene den globale oppvarmingen har på polarområdene. David Attenborough har fortellerstemmen. [...] Å portrettere dyr som individer – med følelser, moral og motiver for sine handlinger – har forståelig nok blitt kritisert (Chris 2006:37), men dette er likevel retorisk virkningsfulle grep for å skape identifisering og appellere emosjonelt til publikum. I antropomorfismen ligger mye av grunnlaget til den implisitte henvendelsesformens økologiske budskap. *Frozen Planet* inneholder en god del slik antropomorfisme, noe samarbeidet mellom Attenborough og NHU [Natural History Unit] for øvrig gjennomgående gjør. I den andre episoden, *Spring*, introduseres vi for en koloni adelpingviner. 'Some penguins turn to a life of crime', forteller Attenborough muntert på lydsporet. I sekvensen jobber en pingvin iherdig med å hente småstein

til redet sitt. Hver gang den forlater redet for å hente en ny stein, kommer pingvinen fra naboredet og stjeler en stein. Over munter musikk på lydsporet gjentar dette seg flere ganger. ‘The thief’s nest is coming along nicely, probably because he keeps a particularly sharp lookout for robbers’, sier Attenborough. I den samme episoden tar *Frozen Planet* for seg en gruppe sjøelefanter. Alfahannen i gruppen regjerer over et harem. Når en annen hann nærmer seg, forteller Attenborough: ‘This could be the beach master’s first serious test of his spring campaign’ – som om alfahannen er en kampsportutøver i sin vårsesong. *Frozen Planet* er mettet med lignende eksempler: i den andre episoden må en isbjørnunge i “skammekroken” for sin oppførsel, i den tredje episoden får to isbjørnunger “their first swimming lesson”. I den tredje episoden har et gjørmehull blitt til et pingvin-spa, der “you can indulge yourself with the full treatment”, mens en flokk petreller i episode fire omtales som “butchers”, der de spiser av et selkadaver. Et finnhvalkadaver blir i samme episode til et 18-meter langt “dining table”.” (Jan Magnus Larsen i <http://bora.uib.no/bitstream/handle/1956/6342/100171075.pdf>; lesedato 18.01.17)

“I *Frozen Planet* blir dyr gjennomgående presentert som enten *gode* eller *onde*. Mørk, nesten skummel musikk benyttes til stadighet når de onde kommer inn i en sekvens og truer de gode – vanligvis en art vi har blitt kjent med over flere minutter av en episode. I den første episoden presenteres vi for eksempel for en koloni bøylepingviner. Lystig musikk introduserer pingvinene, som svømmer inn mot land i saktefilm. ‘They can’t fly’, sier Attenborough; ‘but they don’t need to – there are no polar bears here’. En behagelig, konfliktfri tone er satt, og for å forsterke det *gode* bildet av pingvinene, får vi vite at begge foreldrene passer på at ungen får nok mat. Pingvinene tilegnes dermed familieverdier, den typen menneskelig egenskap som kanskje oftest tillegges dyr i naturfilmer (Bousé 2000). ‘Both parents have to go fishing’, sier Attenborough, før han plutselig blir mer dystert i stemmen; ‘and fishing can be dangerous’. En gruppe pingviner står i strandkanten, og ute i vannet ser vi skyggen av et stort dyr i en bølge – som umiddelbart presenteres med skummel musikk. Det er en søramerikansk sjøløve. I ekstrem saktefilm ser vi den bli med en bølge inn mot land. Haisommer-minner vekkes til live av en tone på lydsporet, og det er nå åpenbart at sjøløven representerer det *onde*.” (Jan Magnus Larsen i <http://bora.uib.no/bitstream/handle/1956/6342/100171075.pdf>; lesedato 18.01.17)

Kommentatoren kommer med “affektive dommer”, f.eks. om storke-par som holder sammen hele livet (Lehmann og Wulff 2016 s. 9). Og akkurat som i menneskelivet får barn/unger umiddelbart mer sympati enn voksne eksemplarer av arten, som om en løveunge skulle være mer “uskyldig” enn en voksen hannløve som dreper andre løvers unger.

“Naturfilm är inte enbart uppbyggd kring en dikotomisering av natur och kultur utan också mellan könen – “manligt” och “kvinnligt”, “hane” och “hona”. Många djur (men inte alla) tillhör det ena eller andra biologiska könet, men genus, eller kulturellt kön, är något som människorna skapar i de berättelser som handlar om

natur. [...] Medan gränser mellan natur och kultur främst blir synliga i det visuella så är genus och sexualitet något som främst skapas i speakertexten, voiceovern. Språket strukturerar vår upplevelse av verkligheten. En högst naiv men utbredd syn på språkets funktioner är att det exakt kan reflektera den så kallade verkligheten. I ett sociokulturellt perspektiv reflekterar inte orden det som kallas verkligheten utan hur olika företeelser *uppfattas* i en kultur. [...] Att språket fungerar som ett kulturellt raster blir också tydligt i användningen av begreppet "familj" i naturfilmer. En älgko med två kalvar kallas familj, då den liknar den mänskliga, västerländska, konventionella kärnfamiljen. Däremot benämns den grupp på upp till ett dussin besläktade lejonhonor med ungar och ett fåtal "ingifta" hannar – den sociala konstellation som lejon vanligtvis lever i – inte familj, utan "flock", trots att formationen utgör lejonens familjebildning. På ett ytligt plan kan denna skillnad i terminologin ses som ett undvikande av en antropomorfering, men på ett djupare plan innebär åtskiljandet mellan familj och flock ändå en överföring av mänskliga normer och ideal på djur. I det här exemplet skulle man ju egentligen lika gärna kunnat kalla lejonflocken för lejonfamilj, men den mänskliga och västerländska normen för hur en familj ska se ut – mamma-pappa-barn – förhindrar det. [...] Biologen Marlene Zuk (2002) menar att rön om djurs beteende har stereotypiserats och missbrukats, både inom och utom vetenskapen. Djurs beteende kan dock visst användas för att förstå människor, hävdar hon, men då måste biologin bli den vetenskap den egentligen är, nämligen en disciplin som inte drar gränser mellan könen, utan upphäver och utmanar dem. Detta krav går också att ställa på naturfilm: för att verkligen motsvara denna genres anspråk på att vara en objektiv, faktasprängd och dokumentär genre borde den också spegla den enorma variation som finns i naturen vad gäller kön, sexualitet och sociala formationer och därmed bidra till att utmana gränser snarare än reproducera dem." (Hillevi Ganetz i http://www.nordicom.gu.se/sites/default/files/kapitel-pdf/25_003-016.pdf; lesedato 26.06.15)

"Making wild animals beautiful and appealing [...] is one of the subtle goals of many wildlife filmmakers. Attenborough has argued that among his primal tasks is "to persuade the public that animals are interesting and beautiful," because it is widely thought that this is a way of making viewers more concerned with wildlife protection, and thus more susceptible to explicit preservation messages elsewhere. [...] "It is our job," cameraman David Parer has said, "to make the audience emphathize with the animal." [...] "One of the most beautiful scenes in *The Living Planet*" involves just such a shot of polar bear: "Suddenly, the beast turns toward the camera and bares its teeth ferociously: this happened when cameraman Hugh Miles happened to unscrew the cap on a flask of soup; at 30 yards, the bear could smell it. The cap was replaced, and the bear shambled away." (Bousé 2000 s. 30-31)

Filmfolkene må ha mange egenskaper. "The wildlife film-maker is in many ways the modern equivalent of the big game hunter. He shoots film instead of bullets, but has to call on many of the same qualities – great physical toughness, an instinctive

understanding of how animals think and above all monumental patience.” (Langley 1985 s. 112) “Next to courage comes adaptability. Interspersed with the moments of high drama and danger can be long periods of patient immobility, when the cameraman has to sit silent and still in a hide waiting for perhaps a few seconds of action.” (Langley 1985 s. 99)

“Over the course of a few years, a viewer might see more of some animals on television – pandas, tigers, or gorillas, for example – than actually exist in the wild. It seems feasible to speculate that this appearance of plenty could have a reassuring effect, perhaps over time blunting concern among viewers over species extinction. Regardless of explicit statements about extinction inserted into a film’s narration, the overall illusion of plenty is nevertheless reinforced visually and given more screen time.” (Bousé 2000 s. 16) I en film om regnskogen “people seeing the film are likely to imagine that the forest is pullulating with creatures, whereas in fact they are extremely difficult to find.” (David Attenborough sitert fra Bousé 2000 s. 16)

“One particular gruelling episode was the filming of David [Attenborough] with the mountain gorillas in Rwanda for the *Life on Earth* series. These creatures lived in very dense vegetation at an altitude of about 10 000 feet, and in order to get near them we had to obey their strict social laws. Because the undergrowth is so thick, they are alarmed at any unidentified rustling, and in order to prove that you are a friend (i.e. another gorilla) you have to grunt in a peaceful sort of way all the time, which reassures them. The other problem was that standing up is an aggressive gesture for a gorilla: they will only stand up to thump their chests and make a threatening display. So I couldn’t stand up. There I was scrambling around on these steep and thickly wooded slopes for nearly eight hours, grunting every so often and carrying a camera. I wasn’t helped by the thinness of the air up there, which sapped my energy very quickly. Still, I got the pictures, and that turned out to be one of the most memorable sequences in the whole series.” (en av *Life on Earth*-seriens filmfolk, sitert fra Langley 1985 s. 94)

Den amerikanske naturfilmeren Neil Rettig prøvde på 1980-tallet å filme Sumatraneshornet i Malaysia: “This had never been done before; in fact hardly anyone had ever seen the animal, as it was extremely shy and extremely rare, with only about 150 individuals left in the wild. We were told by the researchers that it was very afraid of any human disturbance, and that the only likely location for finding a specimen was at one of the mud ‘wallows’ where they liked to bathe occasionally. The rhino is so sensitive that if a human so much as walks near one of the wallows it will abandon the whole area for days, weeks and even months. They have well-developed senses of smell and hearing, but luckily for us their eyesight is very poor. So, in order to keep our scent from ground level, we built platforms about 20 feet up in the jungle trees, 60 feet or so from one of these wallows, so that we had a fairly clear camera angle.” (Langley 1985 s. 114) Et neshorn nærmet seg området, men Rettig og hans følge lyktes ikke i filme det før det oppdaget dem og forsvant.

“Neil Rettig er en naturalist og filmskaper som startet sin karriere midt på 70-tallet etter å ha gått på Chicago Academy of Fine Arts. I løpet av de siste tre tiår har Neil bidratt til produksjonen av hundrevis av filmer, inkludert IMAX-produksjoner, National Geographic-spesialutgaver og vitenskapelige dokumentarer. Neils kunnskap om rovdyr, især om sjeldne skogsøgler, og hans feltarbeid, har vært medvirkende til bevaring av sjeldne og truede dyrearter, til etablering av beskyttede økosystemer rundt omkring i verden og til avlsprosjekter for truede dyrearter. Neils nyskapende kamerarbeid i tropiske regnskoger, hans evne til å bevege kameraet fra skogbunn til himmelhvelving og til å filme umiddelbart, gjorde ham til en vesentlig del av teamet for Great Migrations. I tillegg til sin tekniske og naturhistoriske dyktighet er Neil anerkjent for sitt kreative blikk, artistiske komposisjon og sin lynraske evne til å fange inn øyeblikket.” (<http://natgeotv.com/no/great-migrations/biographies>; lesedato 08.04.13)

Å bruke mye film hjelper ikke alltid. “You can go on filming for hours and the right sequence never comes up. Already in your mind you can envisage ringing up the BBC and saying “We’ve used 20 rolls of film and we haven’t got anything yet!” ” (Langley 1985 s. 116). Ventetiden kan føles lang, og resultatet kan være kun noen få sekunder med film. “The actual rolling of the film takes up very little time indeed. [...] This sequence lasts about 30 seconds in the programme but it took us about five days to get it right.” (Langley 1985 s. 146-147)

Å filme insekter og andre smådyr har sine utfordringer, og spesielle effekter kan skapes gjennom forstørrelse: “There is a kind of Serengeti in miniature down there in the leaf litter. [...] the bacteria get to work on them. They are preyed on by much bigger animals called pseudo-scorpions which, when they are magnified by the camera lens, look like real science fiction monsters with two large claws and huge mouth parts.” (Langley 1985 s. 147)

Det er en ofte fortellerstemme (voice-over) for å forklare dyrene oppførsel, mer fortelling enn er vanlig i de fleste andre filmsjangrer. Briten David Attenborough er et eksempel på en synlig “fortellerfigur [...] som gir seg ut for å være ekspert, søker kontakt med tilskuerne og tilbyr en identifikasjonsmulighet” (Boden og Müller 2009 s. 49-50). Andre kjennetegn:

“*Camera placement* – many wildlife shots are routinely obtained through concealment that might be seen as unethical if dealing with human subjects.

Camera-to-subject distance – wild animals are often unapproachable, even at considerable distances.

Choice of lenses – wildlife filmmakers regularly use long telephoto lenses to get close-ups, often resulting in an illusion of close proximity to the subject.

Artificial lighting – thought by many to provoke unnatural behavior in night shooting.

Sync-sound – in part because of the distance at which many wildlife scenes are filmed, most wildlife footage is shot silent with their wild or studio sound added later.” (Bousé 2000 s. 24)

“Adrian Warren wanted to film some moths in slow motion which made it necessary to use a special camera which ran at 2000 frames a second.” (Langley 1985 s. 171)

Det brukes ofte “time-lapse”-fotografering for raskt å visualisere noe som egentlig er en langsom prosess, f.eks. overganger mellom årstider og veksten fra frø til stor plante. En rask sekvens som viser en blomst som vokser, åpner seg, lukker seg og dør, kan gi seeren assosiasjoner til menneskelige følelser som glede og lidelse (Diederichs 2004 s. 238). Lang-linser gir nærbilder på kilometers avstand, og skaper ofte en illusjon om fysisk nærhet. Det har også blitt ganske vanlig å bruke droner med kamera i stedet for helikopter, for å forstyrre dyrene mindre. En såkalt kamerafelle er et lite, fastmontert og kamuflert kamera (f.eks. plassert midt inne i en jungel) som kun filmer når en bevegelsessensor blir aktivert (f.eks. når en leopard beveger seg foran kameraet og utløser en usynlig, infrarød sensor).

“The opening of the weird rafflesia flower in a tropical rainforest was filmed on location in Indonesia by freelance film-makers Jim Frazier and Densley Clyne. The shooting had to take place continuously over a number of days, so a permanent lighting rig had to be set up to give a constant and uniform light, even at night. [...] Stephen Bolwell tackled another important time-lapse sequence – the growth of a fungus from amid the debris on a forest floor: [...] if I had put all light on one side, they would have grown towards that light and gone crooked. Then of course I could never be sure exactly when the fungus was going to start growing. You are supposed to be able to predict this by spotting the moment when the top has bulged to a certain size: things can start moving quite fast after that. Alternatively, it might be a false alarm, and I will have had the camera running for five hours, exposing one frame every ten seconds, with nothing to show for it. The shooting of this sequence actually took me more than a month, and it was murder.” (Langley 1985 s. 148)

Det er “not uncommon for a cameraman to shoot 25 times the amount of film needed for a particular sequence in order to obtain complete coverage of an unpredictable situation. The film editor’s job is to create continuity of action from what can sometimes be chaos. [...] It also calls for a good visual memory to recall whether, for example, the wide-angle shot of a male rhea moving right-to-left seven rolls previously will match the close-up I’ve just found. Was the background similar? Was the sun shining as brightly? Was the grass roughly the same length? Were those females as close? Only by careful and experienced judgement at this early stage can the next one – the editing of the shots into a smoothly flowing sequence – be achieved successfully. [...] There are usually problems, for few sequences go together perfectly. A vital couple of shots may be missing from a

piece of animal behaviour, and I may have to get over this by cutting away to a shot of something else or intercutting two sequences or – as a last resort – dissolving between shots which won't cut together acceptably.” (naturfilm-ekspert David Barrett, som inngikk i BBCs *Life on Earth*-team; sitert fra Langley 1985 s. 175-176)

“[L]eatherback turtles are very easily disturbed. They emerge on the beach in the middle of the night, and if you start dazzling them with light and noise before they start laying their eggs they will simply turn round and disappear into the sea again. Once they are laying they are much happier and will accept the sudden brightness, so the switching on of the equipment has to be timed very accurately.” (Langley 1985 s. 86)

“Plenty of people know that leopards wander the streets of Mumbai, but few people ever see them. The elusive cats hunt at night, shrouded by darkness and the din of the city. That made Gordon Buchanan's job tricky. The BBC sent Buchanan to Mumbai to film those cats for *Planet Earth II* [2016] [...] Filming wildlife isn't like shooting a movie; the stars ignore your schedule and rarely appear when or where you want them to. You make your best guess about what might happen, set up your gear, and wait – sometimes for days. Buchanan did just that, erecting infrared “camera traps” throughout the leopard's territory and checking them daily to discern its routine. Once he had a sense of the animal's habits, Buchanan spent night after night hidden in a blind, panning the horizon with his camera, hoping to glimpse his quarry. Buchanan favored a thermal rig designed for shooting in darkness. On a good night, he might spot the leopard – or, rather, its heat signature – through the foliage once or twice. On two occasions, he saw it hunting. Once, the big cat turned directly toward him, standing just feet away. It eventually wandered off. This kind of footage simply would not have been possible without cameras that did not exist a few years ago. Heat-sensitive cameras, stabilized rigs, and drones provided an unprecedented view into the lives of the world's weirdest and most wonderful creatures.” (David Pierce i <https://www.wired.com/2017/03/crazy-new-camera-tech-made-planet-earth-2-possible/>; lesedato 22.04.20)

“New filmmaking techniques also infuse *Planet Earth II*. Ed Charles, who directed the episode “Deserts,” relied heavily on time-lapse photography to reveal the power of desert storms and the explosion of life and color that accompanies the spring bloom. The “Jungles” episode features John Brown's work using a high-speed camera to film the elusive glass frog, a Costa Rican animal the size of your fingernail. The frog's fight to save its brood from a swarm of wasps occurred so quickly that Brown didn't know exactly what he'd filmed until he played it back later. High frame-rate cameras slow the action down enough to let you follow along. [...] Put nearly any camera in the cradle, turn on the stabilizer, and you can run alongside a monkey and capture pin-sharp, rock-steady footage. Viewers literally follow along in the animal's footsteps.” (David Pierce i <https://www.wired.com/2017/03/crazy-new-camera-tech-made-planet-earth-2-possible/>)

com/2017/03/crazy-new-camera-tech-made-planet-earth-2-possible/; lesedato 22.04.20)

“As a general rule, it takes about a week to film one minute of wildlife footage. The producer and crew dedicate a significant chunk of that time to letting animals grow accustomed to the presence of a camera: they might erect a camera in the animal’s territory and leave it there for several days. Or they might turn on a drone, but not fly it, letting animals get used to the whirring of the propellers. Generally speaking, once the animal decides the camera is neither predator nor prey, they leave it alone. Some animals simply don’t fear humans, because they’ve never known they should. But others want nothing to do with *Homo sapiens*. The BBC filmmakers spent a lot of time tucked away in makeshift blinds and hides. “It’ll be two people on a shoot,” [Ed] Charles says. “Every morning you both walk down to the hide. The cameraman gets in, and then the other person walks away.” The idea is for the animals to see people coming and going, but not keep track of everyone. In other instances, crews might control a camera remotely, or simply leave it running and hope for the best. At the beginning of production, the team spent months researching their territories. They identified possible characters, tried to plan shoots, and sketched out the show. But this is wildlife, so you work on Mother Nature’s timeline. Luck plays a role, which means being in the right place at the right time, or patient enough to wait. And wait. And wait some more. Even if the mosquitoes are driving you nuts.” (David Pierce i <https://www.wired.com/2017/03/crazy-new-camera-tech-made-planet-earth-2-possible/>; lesedato 22.04.20)

Seven Worlds, One Planet (2019) “is a new nature documentary presented by Sir David Attenborough. The documentary looks at wildlife in each of the world’s seven continents and took almost 1800 filming days in 41 countries to complete. [...] Filming a nature documentary means getting close to wild animals without scaring them away, and sometimes that means thinking outside the box. This was the case when the crew were filming with pelicans in the Danube Delta of Romania, the home to the largest colony of pelicans outside of Africa, so getting close was going to need some creative thinking. One of the camera operators was the master of disguise when he swam in the Danube with a fake swan on his back. [...] They used a drone to capture around 100 fin whales, arguably the largest great whale aggregation ever shot. [...] The team carried kit through the Andes mountain range and set up camera traps to capture Andean bears on film over the next few days and nights. The plan sounds good in theory, but when the team returned, they found that the bears had messed around with the cameras and one was thrown down a hill.” (<https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/articles/zf7n6v4>; lesedato 13.10.20)

Christopher Palmers bok *Shooting in the Wild: An Insider’s Account of Making Movies in the Animal Kingdom* (2010) avslører hvor mye manipulasjon av publikum som foregår i naturfilmer. “His “Whales” film, “follows” Misty and Echo, a mother and her calf along their migratory path. But Palmer and his filmmaking team had no means or money to follow two whales at ocean depths for

3,000 miles. “We made them up,” Palmer said. “Down in Hawaii there is lots of mothers and calves, this is their breeding grounds. They make this massive 3,000 mile migration from their breeding grounds in Hawaii to their feeding grounds in Alaska. Through the film, viewers watch Misty and Echo taking off from Hawaii. Along the way, they encounter amazing obstacles and challenges, including killer whales, drift nets, collisions with ships and more. “So the tension in the film builds as we wonder whether we will see Misty and Echo arrive in Alaska,” Palmer said. “Our ship goes up to Alaska, we are waiting for them there, and will we see them?” The music crescendos when Misty and Echo arrive safely in Alaska, a perfect conclusion for an audience who, presumably, loves a happy ending. “The point is that we made that up,” Palmer said. “The mother and the calf that we see arriving in Alaska (are) not the same animals that we saw leaving in Hawaii,” he said. Palmer says it is possible to make great films honestly, “But it takes a lot of creativity, a lot of hard work.” [...] Nature filmmakers say their films won't work without helping viewers connect with the animals, a trick often achieved by naming them, as Palmer's film had named “Misty” and “Echo.” [...] When filmmakers resort to faking scenes, it is typically done in service of helping viewers to care about the animals and the environment. The desired result is to inspire awe, even love, for the animals, and to make viewers take the side of the animals. And that is why Palmer makes films about wildlife, he said. He wants viewers to develop respect and understanding for wildlife. [...] “Maybe it is worth it to have told the lie,” he said.” (<http://abcnews.go.com/>; lesedato 02.11.12)

“Wildlife films, too many of them, involve deceptions, manipulations, misrepresentations, fraudulence, and the audience doesn't know [...] Nature TV is popular because it offers a bird's eye view of the wonders of the world as they unfold, out there for anyone to see, but available to only the relative few who have the time, the money, and the equipment for adventure. [...] “We had a scientist who had this killer whale skull and we asked him if he would bring it and then we put it at the bottom of the sea,” said [Christopher] Palmer, referring to his film “Whales: An Unforgettable Journey.” In his “Wolves” documentary, a lupine pack fed on a carcass that was not the tasty bounty of nature it seemed to be. “We found a dead animal,” said Palmer. “You know there is lots of road kill around ... so we put it there” on the set. Palmer added that often, though not in his “Wolves” film, when producers want to show a feeding scrum, they will place M&Ms [dvs. sjokolade] or other treats inside an animal carcass to entice other animals to devour it. He acknowledges other artifice in his “Wolves,” documentary. In the film, mother cubs scratch out an existence on the side of an unforgiving mountain, their only refuge a den dug out of the hard earth. But the wolves pictured are, in fact, rented. Animal actors who live on a game farm. And the den they are living in? “We dug it out, we help set it up,” said Palmer. “Now see, we're inside now this is not a real den,” he said, as he watched the film with ABC News. “I mean the mother is acting like this is a real den and this is not dissimilar from what you might see in real life, in reality. But in order to get a camera in there, the wolf is habituated to the noisy

camera and the cameraman, this is all made up.” ” (<http://abcnews.go.com/>; lesedato 02.11.12)

“These manipulations are sometimes excused by filmmakers because they are revealed, in fine print, during the closing credits. Palmer's “Wolves” film included this disclaimer in the credits: “Sections of this film were made possible by employing captive animals. This reduces stress on wild populations that would otherwise be affected by prolonged or intrusive filming requirements. No animals were harmed during the production of this film” [...] “But who reads the credits? Except my mother?” said Palmer. “Technically we’re covered, but there is no indication in the film, that those are (not) wild wolves, people would think they were watching wild and free roaming wolves.” Wildlife filmmakers play on viewers’ heartstrings because they want to make them care.” (<http://abcnews.go.com/>; lesedato 02.11.12)

“Nearly all close-up shots of insects, such as the pseudo-scorpions in the forest leaf litter and the grass-cutting ants in the pampas, were taken in a studio under specialised conditions. Several of the creatures would have spent their whole life in captivity, far away from their natural habitat. [...] It would be wrong to suggest that film taken under these controlled conditions – in tanks, laboratories and zoos – makes up more than a small proportion of the final programmes.” (Langley 1985 s. 59-60)

“Wildlife film soundtracks are a combination of sounds recorded in the wild during the filming, or recorded in the wild previously, as well as sounds that must be re-created in a studio and, of course, music. Some sounds are removed because they would distract from the tone of the film (e.g. helicopter rotor blades may be replaced by music over sweeping aerial shots). This is normal in documentary filmmaking. In many ways recording wild sounds for natural history films is an even bigger challenge than getting the shots. Sound recordists face many of the same challenges as directors and camera operators – they cannot direct wild animals in the way you can direct people, and they risk disturbing wildlife by their presence. But these difficulties are exacerbated by the fact that microphones have far shorter ranges than lenses. [...] The challenge of range can sometimes be overcome if you can predict where the wildlife will appear and can set up microphones before the animals arrive – much as you would set remote cameras – and then retreat to a safe distance. This approach worked well when the Africa team staked out a waterhole visited by rhinos at night. Another challenge for wildlife sound recordists is trying to isolate the call or song of a particular bird or animal from the rest of the ambient noise. [...] Occasionally it is possible for the sound recordist to bring the animal subject into a studio where all noise distractions can be eliminated. Chris Watson did this with some very tiny creatures for *Life in the Undergrowth*. [...] it would be very difficult to safely record the footsteps of a bear as it walks through a forest. As a result, wildlife filmmakers often turn to sound designers, or foley artists, to recreate something that sounds like it would in

the wild – a soundtrack that is true to nature.” (<http://www.bbc.com/earth/story/20160314-sounds-of-nature-for-wildlife-films>; lesedato 30.01.17)

Noen gamle, pioner-eksempler på naturfilmer:

Eadweard Muybridges *The Horse in Motion* (1882) er snarere en serie av fotografier enn en film. “A groundbreaking piece of work from innovative photographer Eadweard Muybridge, *The Horse in Motion* is a series of stills featuring a galloping racehorse and was the first animal ever to be shown in a moving image format. Born in Kingston upon Thames, Muybridge moved to America where he developed a pioneering technique to photograph the animal in fast motion after being hired by the Governor of California, Leland Stanford, to prove scientifically that when a horse gallops it does, in fact, become airborne. Parallel to the racing track, he aligned a series of fifty cameras, each with a specially designed rapid shutter, and by connecting them to trip wires lain across the track he ensured each one automatically took its own picture as the horse sped by and the string broke. Projecting the pictures in rapid succession to reproduce the horse's motion, Muybridge did much more than just win Stanford the \$25,000 he reportedly bet on the outcome – he laid the groundwork for the development of motion pictures cameras, and hence the entire cinematic industry.” (<http://www.wildfilmhistory.org/>; lesedato 16.10.12)

Louis Lumières *Pelicans, Lion, and Tigers at London Zoological Gardens* (1895): “The work of pioneering filmmaker Louis Lumière, *Pelicans, Lion and Tigers, London Zoological Gardens* features a large male [lion] as he paces back and forth in his cage. One of the earliest examples of animal life on film, this 1895 black and white production allowed the general public a glimpse of this ‘King of Beasts’, an animal that has long inspired the imagination of man.” (<http://www.wildfilmhistory.org/>; lesedato 16.10.12)

Javier Aguirresarobe m.fl.s *Elephants at the Zoo* (1897): “A cheerful account of exercise time at the London Zoological Gardens, *Elephants at the Zoo* was released in 1897 by the British Mutoscope and Biograph Company, one of the pioneers of early cinema technology. One of the earliest examples of a British natural history film, this short black and white piece consists of a picturesque scene, with one of the large elephants bearing an excited crowd of children along the Park's paths.” (<http://www.wildfilmhistory.org/>; lesedato 16.10.12)

“James H. Whites *The Sea Lions' Home* (1897) viser sjøløver som svømmer i vannet og soler seg på svaberg, og filmen er trolig den aller første som viser den naturlige oppførselen til ville dyr i deres naturlige habitat (Ibid.:45, 197). Slike idylliserte bilder av dyreliv som er uforstyrret av mennesket foregriper delvis den grønne dokumentartradisjonen, hvor slike bilder kan leses som et diskret forsøk på å skape økologisk bevissthet og verdsetting av urørt natur hos seeren: “[...] nature films seek to reproduce the aesthetic qualities of pristine wilderness and to preserve

the wildlife that is fast vanishing from the face of the earth” (Mitman 2009:8). *The Sea Lions’ Home* foregriper altså delvis den grønne dokumentarfilm, men denne tradisjonen kommer likevel direkte til uttrykk allerede i filmmediets første tiår. Robin L. Murray og Joseph K. Heumann regner Lumière-brødrenes *Oil Wells of Baku: Close View* (1896) som den første økologiske filmen i form av at man kan lese den fra et økologisk-kritisk perspektiv: “The film invites such a reading, one that centers on environmental concerns, because of what looks like devastating effects of drilling for oil. The thirty-six second “view” [...] shows huge flames and black smoke streaming from burning oil wells [...] seemingly sure signs of environmental disaster.” (Murray & Heumann 2009:19) Den grønne dokumentarfilm kommer altså til uttrykk tidlig i filmmediets barndom. Det er likevel den underholdende dyrefilm som preger det første tiåret, og den grønne dokumentarfilm fremstår foreløpig ikke som noen enhetlig tradisjon.” (Jan Magnus Larsen i *Grønn dokumentarfilm i et historisk og retorisk perspektiv*, 2012; her sitert fra <http://bora.uib.no/bitstream/handle/1956/6342/100171075.pdf>; lesedato 19.01.17)

Ole Olsens *Lion Hunt* (1906): “Bursting onto the silver screen in a flurry of controversy, *Lion Hunt* was a huge international success, telling the story of two hunters in the ‘jungle’. The film features the stalking and subsequent death of two lions. Sprucing up an island off the Danish coast to resemble a savannah, the head of Nordisk Films, Ole Olsen, employed a couple of actors, bought a couple of lions and set about filming his own ‘African safari’. Trouble arrived when the local humane society reported them to the Minister of Justice for animal cruelty and, ignoring the authority’s ban on filming, one of the camera team ended up in jail. Banned at the time in Denmark, the film had to be smuggled into Sweden before it could be distributed worldwide, and namely due to its notoriety, *Lion Hunt* was a huge success.” (<http://www.wildfilmhistory.org/>; lesedato 16.10.12)

Oliver Pikes *In Birdland* (1907): “A groundbreaking production from renowned natural history photographer and filmmaker Oliver Pike, *In Birdland* was the first British wildlife film to be screened to a fee paying audience. Premiering at London’s Palace Theatre of Varieties in August 1907, the film proved hugely popular with over 100 additional prints being made, so the film could be screened in cinemas across the UK. Sadly all copies of this pioneering production seem to have been subsequently lost or destroyed. Photographers Oliver Pike and Armytage Sanders risked life and limb as they took their cameras over coastal cliffs, hanging from ropes in order to capture an insight into the lives of Britain’s seabirds. Footage, rarely seen before, of the private lives of kittiwakes, gannets, cormorants and puffins required construction of a special silent cine camera and a great amount of skill and adventurous spirit. *In Birdland* marked Pike’s break into the cinematography industry and in a career spanning over half a century, he went on to make over 50 films and publish 25 books about natural history.” (<http://www.wildfilmhistory.org/>; lesedato 16.10.12)

James Williamsons *The History of a Butterfly: A Romance of Insect Life* (1910): “Directed by one of the pioneers of the cinematic industry, James Williamson, *The History of a Butterfly – A Romance of Insect Life* is an intriguing look at the life cycles of butterflies and moths. Caterpillars are seen hatching, feeding and ready for pupation and with three caterpillars changing into chrysalis and the birth of a peacock butterfly, this black and white silent film is an early example of British natural history filmmaking.” (<http://www.wildfilmhistory.org/>; lesedato 16.10.12)

Roosevelt in Africa (1910) “var en så kallad jaktfilm med den förre presidenten i centrum och grundade sig på en årslång expedition där man lyckades döda 40 djur per dag. Den kommersiella naturfilmen har med andra ord haft ett mer spänningsskapande och underhållande publiktiltal än den naturvetenskapliga filmen, men den har lutat sig – och lutar sig än idag – tungt mot vetenskapen för att legitimera den autentisitetensaura som varit och är så grundläggande för naturfilmens status som en realistisk, didaktisk och objektiv TV- och filmgenre.” (Hillevi Ganetz i http://www.nordicom.gu.se/sites/default/files/kapitel-pdf/25_003-016.pdf; lesedato 24.06.15)

Percy Smith m.fl.s *The Strength and Agility of Insects* (1911): “A highly entertaining and revealing account of insect ability, *The Strength and Agility of Insects* presented a view of arthropods quite unlike anything ever seen on film before. Premiering in 1911, the production caused a sensation, detailing our insect friends as they lift tiny dumbbells, twirl matchsticks and juggle objects much heavier than themselves. Sparking a huge press debate, renowned wildlife photographer Percy Smith had to dispel rumours of trickery and cruelty by sharing his innovative filming techniques. Examining a whole host of these tiny creatures and their relative power and dexterity, *The Strength and Agility of Insects* is an intriguing insight into the skills of a variety of species.” (<http://www.wildfilmhistory.org/>; lesedato 16.10.12)

Paul Rainey's film *Paul Rainey's African Hunt* (1912) “proved far more successful with audiences in America than had any of Cherry Kearton's films of wildlife. Rainey's innovation was to use a pack of hounds to hunt African animals. Scenes of these violent chases grabbed audiences' attention and held it for an unprecedented run of fifteen months in New York. The film grossed an astonishing half-million dollars, making it one of the biggest money makers of the decade. [...] Rainey's films were among the early demonstrations that a faster-moving and more sensational American style had already emerged. In the 1912 film a rhino is shot, and Rainey's camera is moved in close to record the last gaspings of its slow, agonizing death. [...] their tendency to provoke animals into a filmable reaction, often goading them into charging toward the camera before shooting them in “self-defense.” ” (Bousé 2000 s. 47-48 og 51)

“Jakt- og ekspedisjonsfilmene svarte med å låne narrative teknikker fra fiksjonsfilmen: enkelte sekvenser måtte regisseres for å skape spenning, noe som betydde

at dyr måtte provoseres så de fremstod som aggressive i den ferdige filmen. Den aggressive adferden i de mange jakt- og ekspedisjonsfilmene støttet antagelsen mange i publikum hadde på forhånd om mannevonde villdyr. Filmskapere hadde dermed en legitim grunn til å kunne drepe dyrene. Denne holdningen til dyr fortsatte til langt ut på 1930-tallet (Petterson 2011:102-103). Martin og Osa Johnsons *Simba* (1928) er et eksempel på en slik type film. Filmen ble markedsført som et autentisk portrett av løven som levde fritt i urørt villmark – i motsetning til å være buret inn i dyrehager eller sirkus, slik publikum var vant til. *Simba* var blant de første naturfilmene hvor publikum kunne identifisere seg med dyrene på skjermen, noe som hovedsakelig skyldes Johnson-parets utstrakte bruk av antropomorfisme – i *Simba* får blant annet flere dyr tildelt navn i filmens tekstplakater: hyenene i filmen blir for eksempel kalt ‘onde og listige kjeltringer’ (Mitman 2009:32-33). Johnson-paret hadde likevel fremprovosert en aggressiv adferd hos enkelte dyr, slik at de hadde en legitim grunn til å drepe dem (Bousé 2000:50-51).” (Jan Magnus Larsen i <http://bora.uib.no/bitstream/handle/1956/6342/100171075.pdf>; lesedato 18.01.17)

“Den grønne dokumentartradisjonen begynner følgelig å spire på 1920-tallet. Dette var likevel en marginalisert og sporadisk tendens, som sjelden fikk noen kinodistribusjon. I Sverige hadde for eksempel filmskaperen Bengt Berg merket en drastisk nedgang i landets kongeørnbestand – en nedgang som blant annet skyldtes samtidens plutselige interesse i ornitologi og fugleeggsamling. Resultatet ble *Sagan om De Sista Örnarna* (1923) – en dokumentarfilm som tok for seg den svenske kongeørnen som en truet art. Berg ønsket å opplyse det svenske folket om den utrydningstruede ørnen, og filmen var et direkte forsøk på å redde den sterkt reduserte bestanden (Petterson 2011:144). I USA forsøkte William Finley å gjøre folk oppmerksomme på hvorfor naturvern var viktig gjennom *The Forest* (1926). Filmen opplyser om at skogen er viktig – ikke bare for dyrene som bor der, men også fordi trærnes røtter forhindrer jorderosjon. Det økologiske budskapet er svært eksplisitt: en tekstplakat i filmen lyder for eksempel ‘When men kill beavers streams go dry’ (Ibid.:129). Greg Mitman hevder Finley gjorde mer for å promotere naturvern i USA enn “the works of sentimental nature writers or the practice of feeding bears in the national parks” (Mitman 2009:96).” (Jan Magnus Larsen i <http://bora.uib.no/bitstream/handle/1956/6342/100171075.pdf>; lesedato 18.01.17)

Clyde E. Elliotts *Bring ‘Em Back Alive* (1932): “In the depths of the Malayan jungle, world-famous American movie actor, hunter and animal collector Frank Buck launches an eight month expedition in search of some of the region’s most exotic species. Stunning footage details a wealth of bird, mammal and reptile life and includes Buck’s capture of a rare monitor lizard, a black leopard and his adoption of a young elephant. Leading to accusations that the production ‘staged’ their animal encounters, several spectacular fights culminate in a full-on battle between a Bengal tiger and a thirty foot rock python. The fight scene is described by cameraman Nick Cavalerie as “the most spectacular in the picture”, lasting over ten minutes, the fight scene aroused suspicion as unlike most jungle encounters, it

ends in a draw. Celebrating the exploits of the dashing young trapper, *Bring 'Em Back Alive* was hugely popular, its success paving the way for Buck's long career on the silver screen." (<http://www.wildfilmhistory.org/>; lesedato 16.10.12)

"*The True-Life Adventures* series is a collection of short subject documentary films produced by Walt Disney Productions roughly between the years 1948 and 1960. The film series was exposed in 1982 by the CBC newsmagazine *The Fifth Estate* for Animal Cruelty and faking nature scenes. It is also credited as the source of the myth of lemming mass suicides. The series won numerous Academy Awards for the studio including five awards for Best Two Reel Live Action Short. It inspired a daily panel comic strip that was distributed from 1955 to 1971. Several of the films were adapted in comic book format as one shots in the Dell Comics Four Color series. The films were among the earliest production experience for Roy E. Disney." (http://disney.wikia.com/wiki/True-Life_Adventure; lesedato 27.05.15)

Blant filmene i serien var *Seal Island* (1948), *In Beaver Valley* (1950), *Nature's Half Acre* (1951), *The Olympic Elk* (1952), *Water Birds* (1952), *Bear Country* (1953), *The Living Desert* (1953), *The Vanishing Prairie* (1954), *The African Lion* (1955), *Secrets of Life* (1956), *Perri* (1957; delvis fiksjon, basert på en barnebok), *White Wilderness* (1958), *Nature's Strangest Creatures* (1959), *Mysteries of the Deep* (1959), *Jungle Cat* (1960) og *Islands of the Sea* (1960). Noen ble brukert adaptert til undervisningsfilmer for skolen.

"Herb Crisler became associated with the Disney Studios in 1950 to film the elk herds of the Olympic Mountains, and in 1952, the Studio released the True-Life Adventure Film, *The Olympic Elk*. In April 1951, the Disney Studios sent the Crislere to Colorado to film bighorn sheep and in the fall of 1952, they continued on to Denali National Park in Alaska to film grizzly and brown bears. The Crislere moved on to the Brooks Range within the Arctic Circle in April 1953 for 18 months, where Herb filmed the caribou and Lois kept journals of her observations of the wildlife and her surroundings. These observations resulted in her book, *Arctic Wild* (1958)." (<http://eadsrv.denverlibrary.org/>; lesedato 18.06.15)

Etter Disneys *Beaver Valley* (1949) "most of the "True Lives" also included awkwardly edited (and usually "comical") montages, usually depicting behavioral quirks members of some species exhibit regularly or repeatedly (the "joke" seemed to lie in their repetition). Yet most of what distinguished them today as "Disney films" came with the addition of animated introductions, insistent musical scores, and breezy narration – the latter often singlehandedly creating animal characters by assigning them names and describing their personalities. Film footage shot in the field was essentially a platform on which the Disney team could go to work, applying the conventions and formulas they had already developed in making animated films. [...] Ironically, later distribution for use in school helped turn the "True Lives" into educational films by default, as well as making them popular with new generations of audiences, not only increasing their longevity but further institutionalizing the Disney view of nature." (Bousé 2000 s. 67-68)

“Det amerikanska 1950-talet präglades av en ideologi där familjen och Gud stod i centrum – med andra ord inte särskilt olikt 2000-talet. Walt Disney själv omfattade denna ideologi och bidrog till att den spreds i breda lager av befolkningen, då han genom massmediet film om och om igen hyllade dessa “eviga värden” (Mitman 1999: 125). I hans naturfilmer framstår naturen som en idyll, en väv där arterna i balans med varandra lever och frodas under Guds välvilliga men stränga uppsikt. Denna världs minsta enhet är familjen, bestående av exempelvis “mamma” fågel, “pappa” fågel och deras ungar. I en av filmerna sägs exempelvis att mamma fågel står för “moderskärleken (som) uttrycks i tålmod och hängivenhet – i ur och skur finns mamma alltid där” (Mitman 1999: 127). Naturligtvis ingick inte våld eller sexualitet i denna bild av naturen.” (Hillevi Ganetz i http://www.nordicom.gu.se/sites/default/files/kapitel-pdf/25_003-016.pdf; lesedato 24.06.15)

“I amerikansk TV:s första och mest framgångrika naturprogram *Zoo Parade* (NBC, premiär 1950), som riktade sig till hela familjen, visades olika djur upp som ulliga, gulliga, trevliga vänner, ibland smartare än människorna själva. *Zoo Parade* finansierades av reklam för produkter avsedda för husdjur. Denna marknad växte sig större och större under 1950-talet och framåt: djur hade blivit något som ingick i kärnfamiljen. Filmsuccéer under 1960-talet som *Lejonet Elsa* och *Flipper* är utvidgningar av det fenomen som Mitman (1999: 157) kallar “The Pet Star”, men i den sistnämnda filmen fanns givetvis inte en enda filmruta som visade den aggressiva, vidlyftiga och samkönade sexualitet som vetenskapen och naturfilmen ständigt förtigit vad gäller delfinerna (jfr Bryld & Lykke 2000). Men även en annan faktor påverkade naturfilmen under denna tid, och det var den framväxande turismen (Mitman 1999: 180ff). Naturprogrammet *Wild Kingdom* (NBC, premiär 1963), som avlöste *Zoo Parade*, var inriktad på äventyr, “vild” natur och manliga dygder, något som företrädesvis hittades i 1900-talsföreteelsen nationalparkerna. Naturfilmerna blev ett slags reklam för dessa turistattraktioner som inte bara fanns på amerikansk grund.” (Hillevi Ganetz i http://www.nordicom.gu.se/sites/default/files/kapitel-pdf/25_003-016.pdf; lesedato 24.06.15)

“Under 1950- och 60-talen började röster höjas från västerländskt och välutbildat håll som menade att Afrikas vilda natur hotades. Man klagade på den civilisations följderna som man själv varit så ivrig att införa och menade att naturen måste skyddas från detta eller som etologen Julian Huxley uttryckte det: “Afrikas djurliv hör inte bara till de lokala invånarna, utan till hela världen” (Mitman 1999: 194). Man kan alltså tala om ett slags naturimperialism, där djurlivet och naturen fräntas Afrikas infödda invånare. I detta propagandakrig spelade naturfilmen en viktig roll. I exempelvis filmen *Wild Gold* (1961) regisserad av James R. Simon, framställs massajerna som hotet mot naturen, eftersom deras boskap tog mat och vatten från de vilda djurarterna i nationalparkerna. Men enligt filmens speaker skulle de snart nog lära sig förstå att verkligt välstånd inte kommer genom horder av värdelösa boskapsdjur, utan genom turism (Mitman 1999: 198).” (Hillevi Ganetz i http://www.nordicom.gu.se/sites/default/files/kapitel-pdf/25_003-016.pdf; lesedato 24.06.15)

www.nordicom.gu.se/sites/default/files/kapitel-pdf/25_003-016.pdf; lesedato 24.06.15)

Et filmselskap kalt Disneynature, som inngår i det internasjonale Disney-firmaet, har siden etableringen i 2007 lagd en rekke naturfilmer. “Disneynature’s earliest features – including 2007’s *Earth*, 2010’s *Oceans*, the little-seen European release *The Crimson Wing: Mystery Of The Flamingos*, and 2011’s *Wings Of Life* – all center on larger stories that are primarily interested in placing one habitat or one species inside the greater wheel of nature. Recent offerings, however, have shifted the gaze to more personal stories, often bolstered by narrators who inject comedy and personality, familiar elements from Disney’s narrative films. *African Cats* started the still-new Disneynature trend of anthropomorphizing its subjects in 2011, focusing on a pair of big cat families – a lion and her single cub, a cheetah with a brood of five – and using their individual stories to illuminate the lifestyle of all their species brethren. That switch from more traditional nature film to one that transforms its subjects into actual characters, complete with names, family trees, motivations, and morals, has proven to be a winning formula. It’s been more finely tuned in subsequent features, as *Chimpanzee*, *Bears*, and the studio’s newest release, *Monkey Kingdom*, all focus on single stories inside larger animal communities. [...] If there’s one thing Disney knows, it’s that kids love animals, and they especially love animals that they can relate to and recognize.” (<https://thedissolve.com/features/exposition/996-disneynature-is-creating-a-new-generation-of-docum/>; lesedato 20.05.15)

Skaperne av Disneynatures filmer “often stumbles on stories that would be nearly impossible to invent, like *Chimpanzee*’s narrative about a male chimp adopting an orphaned baby (believed to be the first instance of its kind captured on film, and certainly an extremely rare occurrence in the chimp world), or *Monkey Kingdom*’s storyline about a displaced monkey tribe temporarily moving to the city before reclaiming their jungle home from a rival group. [...] *African Cats*, the first Disneynature film to go full-throttle on personalizing the lives of its subjects, includes a genuinely heart-stopping sequence that ends in the death of two of its cheetah cubs thanks to a pack of hyenas [...] Their bodies are not shown on-screen, but the implication is obvious, and the inclusion of this development is essential. Other animal deaths turn up in both *Chimpanzee* and *Monkey Kingdom*, though they are equally bloodless. [...] No matter how attached to their subjects the filmmakers and production team may be, they cannot inject themselves into the story, even if it’s to save a cuddly creature they may have literally observed since the day they were born. Even if it’s to keep a planned narrative from collapsing. That dedication to upholding the rules of documentary filmmaking has scarcely been clearer than in 2014’s *Bears*, which focuses on an Alaskan brown bear named Sky and her two cute cubs, Scout and Amber. The film – jollily narrated by John C. Reilly, whose good nature is often the only thing keeping the feature from crumbling into total despair – is rooted in hard facts: Raising one bear cub is tough, two is nearly impossible. As Sky and her twins battle for basic

survival, every day seems tougher than the last. Which is why it's so wrenching when baby Scout nearly drowns during an ill-advised jaunt on a rocky beach. Sky is preoccupied elsewhere, and as the tide rises around a still-tiny Scout, a few things become clear: Scout probably can't get out of this alone, and the production team could likely help without Sky ever being the wiser. Of course, they didn't help baby Scout (and, yes, he still survived), but the lines are drawn: They cannot interfere.” (<https://thedissolve.com/features/exposition/996-disneynature-is-creating-a-new-generation-of-docum/>; lesedato 20.05.15)

Claude Nuridsany and Marie Pérennous naturfilm *Mikrokosmos: Folket i gresset* (1996) lar seeren i innledningen “være” et lite innsikt som flyr høyt oppe mellom skyene (til vakker musikk og barnesang). “One hour and fifteen minutes on an unknown planet: Earth, rediscovered on a scale of centimetres. The inhabitants are incredible creatures: insects and other animals living in the grass and in the water. The landscape: impenetrable forest, tufts of grass, drops of dew as big as balloons... A land where the animals walk on water, stroll with their head down and fall without fear from over a hundred times their height, slowed down only by the resistance of the air. In this world the hourglass of time moves faster: one hour equals one day, one day equals one season, one season equals one lifetime. This is a voyage from the inside, leading the spectator to the heart of the action, as though he/she was the size of an insect. In making the spectator forget their human condition – within the framework of film – he/she can better delve into this marvellous reality, normally inaccessible.” (<http://www.festival-cannes.com/>; lesedato 01.11.12)

Noen naturdokumentarfilmer er bygd opp på grunnlag av en fiktiv historie, som en spillefilm. Dette gjelder blant annet den franske regissøren Jean-Jacques Annauds prisbelønte naturfilm *Bjørnen* (1988), som bygger på den usannsynlige premissen at en liten bjørnunge som har mistet moren, blir adoptert av en voksen hannbjørn. Begge to framstilles som helter i villmarken. Scenene med den lille ungen som etter morens død vandrer alene og ensom, trengte ingen kommentarstemme for å vekke seernes medfølelse. Publikum vil nesten med nødvendighet føle medynk med et foreldreløst dyr, relativt uavhengig av dyreart. Publikum skal sympatisere og identifisere seg emosjonelt med et dyrs prøvelser i kampen for tilværelsen. “Ti bjørner ble trent i fire år og filmteamet på 180 personer måtte rette seg etter dyrenes egenart og rytme.” (tidsskriftet *Cinamateket* nr. 1 i 2015 s. 11)

I den franske regissøren Thierry Ragoberts *Amazonia* (2013) “følger vi kapusinerapen Saï, som binder sammen fantastiske bilder fra Amazonas til en rørende fortelling. Saï er født i fangenskap og har jobbet på sirkus hele sitt liv. Når han en dag skal transporteres med fly fra Rio til et sted nord i landet, styrter det lille flyet i jungelen, og Saï slipper ut av buret sitt. Nå må han prøve å overleve i den store regnskogen helt på egenhånd. På sin reise møter Saï en rekke andre dyrearter som utgjør en drøm av en skuespillerbesetning, blant annet anakonda, jaguar, delfin, krokodille, beltedyr, villsvin, ørn, gribb, fugleedderkopp og vandrende

blader. Rollene som statister har gått til over 5000 dyrearter og 40 000 plantearter. Fortellingen er nervepirrende og særdeles dyktig utført, og omfatter både villmarkens underverker og farer. Moder jord viser seg virkelig fra sin flotteste side i denne brasiliansk-franske filmen, og sammen med fantastisk kamerateknikk og musikk som er med på å understreke filmens stemninger, er Amazonia en sjeldent sterk filmopplevelse for både barn og voksne.” (<http://www.filmfrisor.no/no/nyheter/2014/10/Barnas>; lesedato 28.10.14) “The methodical presentation of the fauna making up this tropical Noah’s Ark should please educators and parents, providing ample scope for “name that specimen” games [...]. Some inclusions, however, may stump even learned grown-ups: An apricot-colored caterpillar with the lush, wobbling adornments of a Vegas showgirl is a particularly delightful discovery. Sure enough, Sai eventually happens upon a troupe of his own kind, though acceptance is a hard-won battle in a third act that also incorporates a subtly pointed ecological message about man’s imposition on this florid but fragile ecosystem.” (<http://variety.com/2013/film/reviews/amazonia-review-venice-toronto-1200603555/>; lesedato 04.12.14)

“I naturfilmgenren konstrueras naturen genom att gränser dras gentemot det som uppfattas som kultur. En av dessa gränsdragningar karakteriseras av ett döljande, ett osynliggörande av naturfilm som en mediegenre bland andra. Detta sker bland annat genom att genrens fiktiva drag och beroende av teknik osynliggörs. [...] Desto mer motsägelsefull kan den frekventa användningen av *musik* verka. Filmmusiken bryter illusionen av ren natur, men knyter naturfilm desto tydligare till underhållningsgenrerna. Detta försöker man balansera genom att lägga på något som i skivbutiken skulle kategoriseras under “New Age” – ett slags musik som mest består av skira och “glesa” klanger. “Aggressiva” instrument som trumpeter och elgitarrer är ovanliga liksom snabba, hetsiga rytmer. Musiken har aldrig några texter: om människoröster förekommer används de för ett ordlöst gnolande och nynnade – om det inte handlar om afrikanska röster, då texter på språk som den västerländska tittaren inte förstår förekommer. Ett vad man skulle kunna kalla “etniskt” sound dominerar: indiantrummor, afrikanska trummor, träflöjter, akustiska instrument eller drömska syntklanger. Valet av sound och instrument kan naturligtvis förklaras med att musiken bör ha en relation till platsen – är filmen från Afrika, så bör det också låta “afrikanskt”. Men valet av “folkliga”, “etniska” instrument associerar inte till det nutida Afrika, utan kopplar musiken till föreställningar om “primitiva naturfolk”, snarare än det moderna Afrika. På detta sätt försöker man skapa något som kan associeras till “naturlig” musik – vilket naturligtvis, liksom övriga gränser som dras mellan natur och kultur i filmerna, är en konstruktion.” (Hillevi Ganetz i http://www.nordicom.gu.se/sites/default/files/kapitel-pdf/25_003-016.pdf; lesedato 26.06.15)

Det lages naturfilmer som primært har vitenskapelig og teknisk, men også estetisk interesse. *Oceans* (2009; regissert av Jacques Perrin og Jacques Cluzaud) har få fortellerkommentarer og innbyr seeren til å ha et estetisk blick på naturen. Et annet eksempel er den seks minutter lange “Evolution” (2012), som viser “mikroskopiens

skjønnhet gjennom spesialdesignede audiovisuelle effekter. Reisen starter med full, tredimensjonal rekonstruksjon av en bananflue og en sebrafisk. Derfra dykker vi ned til cellens indre og en rekonstruksjon av DNA.” (forskningsmagasinet *Apollon* nr. 4 i 2012 s. 5) Denne kortfilmen “er produsert av overingeniør Frode M. Skjeldal og professor Oddmund Bakke, med støtte fra Forskningsrådet og MN-fakultetet ved UiO. Regien er ved Eskil Waldenstrøm. Den er tidligere blitt representert ved Imagine Science Film Festival i Dublin, og ble laget i forbindelse med fakultetets 150-årsjubileum i fjor. [...] Den årlige Imagine Science Film Festival holdes for femte gang mellom 8. og 16. november i år, og vil inneholde det hittil største antallet vitenskapsrelaterte filmer. Filmfestivalen er ifølge deres egen uttalelse en av de ledende organisasjonene som promoterer vitenskap gjennom film, og vil i tillegg inneholde et program med arrangementer som skal få publikum til å bli mer interesserte i temaene.” (<http://www.mn.uio.no/om/aktuelt/aktuelle-saker/2012/aktuelt-2012-10-03.html>; lesedato 19.11.12)

“Through 89 films (5 features & 84 shorts), the 7th annual Imagine Science Film Festival will explore the theme of “TIME”. Topics including time-lapse, evolution, aging, development, time travel and geologic time will be discussed through experimental, animation, visual data, documentary and fiction films. We are thrilled to present films from 20 counties, including 49 premieres and featuring 35 female directors. Opening night will take place for the second consecutive year at Google New York including a screening, panel and reception. Each night of the festival will take place at a different venue, spanning the tri-state area, ranging from universities to movie theaters to museums.” (<http://imaginesciencefilms.org/festival/>; lesedato 18.11.14)

De fleste naturfilmer som handler om ett dyreslag, handler om sjeldne og “sympatiske” dyr. “Kjempepandaen, tigreren, orangutangen, elefanten og isbjørnen er alle blant verdens mest kjente utrydningstruede dyrearter. Pandaen pryder sågar logoen til World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). Verdens største naturvernorganisasjon har nettadressen wwf.panda.org, og lister opp tiger, elefant, kjempepanda, neshorn og havskilpadder som “prioriterte arter” på sine internasjonale nettsider. Det er ikke tilfeldig at de pelskledde pattedyrene er i flertall. De regnes som “karismatiske arter”, og utløser, i likhet med storøye selunger, stor giverglede og enda større empati. Men en rekke haier, måker, frosker, slanger, edderkopper og gribber er også utrydningstruede – uten at det utløser politiske støttekampanjer og folkelig giverglede. Hvorfor elsker vi mennesker enkelte dyr? Og hva skjer med de truede dyrene som overses, hetses og til og med slaktes ned fordi de vekker alt annet enn varme følelser? 10 prosent av verdens dyr vil sannsynligvis bli utryddet de neste 25 årene. De fleste av dem må kjempe for livet uten menneskenes hjelp.” (*Morgenbladet* 25.–31. januar 2013 s. 9)

“I sin implisitte henvendelsesform tegner [BBCs] *Frozen Planet* et bilde av et urørt urlandskap, der kampen for tilværelsen er altoverskyggende. Her er det imidlertid ikke mennesket som representerer noen trussel: det er årstidene, rovdyr og

rivaliserende artsfrender som gjør polarområdene til ugjestmilde arenaer for en konstant kamp for overlevelse. Gjennom en narrativ struktur og en utstrakt antropomorfismebruk innbyr serien til identifisering og empati med dyrene i Arktis og Antarktis. I disse dyrene ser dermed vi noe av oss selv, noe *Frozen Planet* er avhengig av dersom vi skal identifisere oss med dem. *Frozen Planet* håper denne identifiseringen skal resultere i en økologisk bevissthet hos publikum – noe som er karakteristisk for den implisitte henvendelsesformen (Bousé 2000:30-31, 99). Når *Frozen Planet* henvender seg i en mer eksplisitt, åpen henvendelsesform i den siste episoden, får det økologiske budskapet stor retorisk slagkraft. Vi har allerede investert mye emosjonelt i dyrelivet i disse områdene gjennom de første seks episodene.” (Jan Magnus Larsen i <http://bora.uib.no/bitstream/handle/1956/6342/100171075.pdf>; lesedato 19.01.17)

“I *Media, ecology and conservation* (2010) studerer John Blewitt blant annet hvordan nye digitale medier presenterer utrydningstruede arter, tap av habitat og naturvern. Dokumentarfilmmediet blir gjennomgående studert, og et av kapitlene i boken er viet til filmer med sterk naturverntematikk (Blewitt 2010:101-130). Her benytter Blewitt seg blant annet av næranalyser av filmer for å kartlegge hvordan enkelte naturdokumentarer har ført til faktiske holdnings- og lovendringer (Ibid.:115-117). En viktig diskusjon i Blewitts bok er likevel hvordan frykten for at eksplisitte økologiske budskap skal skremme vekk publikum har ledet til filmer og fjernsynsserier der økologiske budskap ligger mer latent i teksten (Ibid.:100). Blewitt mener naturdokumentaren er av en noe mer økosentrisk art enn dypøkologisk, slik Bousé og Mitman hevder: “Increasingly [...] television documentaries and feature films suggest that animals are an integral part of human culture and that increasingly human beings are attempting to both communicate with non-human creatures and for them” (Ibid.:20-21).” (Jan Magnus Larsen i <http://bora.uib.no/bitstream/handle/1956/6342/100171075.pdf>; lesedato 19.01.17)

Alle artiklene og litteraturlista til hele leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>