

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 25.04.25

Om leksikonet: https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/om_leksikonet.pdf

Naturfilm

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

Filmene kan fungere som “scientific research and documentation, education, wildlife conservation advocacy, animal rights advocacy, artistic expression, as well as mass entertainment, advertising, tourism promotion, and other, more overt forms of commerce.” (Bousé 2000 s. 94)

“By 1910 the three major categories of proto-wildlife films – Safari Films, Scientific-Educational Films, and Narrative Adventures – were all coming into focus.” (Bousé 2000 s. 46)

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)

“In *Wildlife Films*, Bousé argues that wildlife/wilderness/natural history films and television present an image of nature that is “molded to fit the medium” (4), whose “market-driven, formulaic emphasis on dramatic narrative and ever-present danger” (5) results in a natural world full of “movement, action, and dynamism” (4), but one in which decontextualized subjects, especially those of charismatic megafauna, dwell in visually magnificent settings well outside human history or the vagaries and complexities of social and scientific practice.” (Adrian Ivakhiv i <https://www.uvm.edu/~aivakhiv/GreenFilmCrit.pdf>; lesedato 29.12.22)

“[W]hile factual television’s claims to the ‘truth’ have been repeatedly problematized and queried, ‘In nature documentary, with its history of association with the biological sciences and tradition of apparently “recording” unmediated behaviour, residual truth claims have persisted’ (Bagust 2008, 217). The genre therefore often maintains a privileged position of authority, especially in

comparison to other forms of television.” (Diane Leblond i <https://journals.openedition.org/inmedia/1957?lang=en>; lesedato 30.08.22) Phil Bagust har skrevet artikkelen “ ‘Screen Natures’: Special Effects and Edutainment in ‘New’ Hybrid Wildlife Documentary” (2008).

“Naturfilmen är en källa för kunskap och spänning, skönhet och underhållning. Här dokumenteras och benämns med vetenskaplig legitimitet, men här används i lika hög utsträckning filmens möjligheter till dramatiskt berättande och gestaltade bildvärldar bortom det mänskliga ögat. Naturfilmen kan erbjuda insikter om djur och ekologisk mångfald, inspirerande detaljinformation om växter och varelser vi sällan eller aldrig kommer att uppleva i verkligheten. Som populärvetenskaplig och dokumentär underhållning är den ett mediefenomen och bildkultur i släktskap med den illustrerade föreläsningen, vetenskapsfilmen och expeditionsfilmen.” (Malin Wahlberg i <https://www.svenskfilmdatabas.se/sv/i-narkontakt-med-naturen/>; lesedato 18.06.22)

En type naturfilmer “might be called “environmental documentaries” – films made with the express purpose of addressing environmental or wildlife protection issues and effecting changes in attitudes, behaviors, policies, and the like. [...] wildlife films continue to be seen by many audience members as a form of environmentally committed documentary.” (Bousé 2000 s. xiv) Morgan Richards hevder at “David Attenborough’s *The State of the Planet* (2000), a smaller three-part series, was the first wildlife documentary to deal comprehensively with environmental issues on a global scale. A few years later, BBC series such as *The Truth About Climate Change* (2006), *Saving Planet Earth* (2007) and *Frozen Planet* (2011) finally gave environmental issues the mainstream prominence and high production values they were lacking.” (Richards 2013)

“Environmental issues have been part of television wildlife documentaries almost since the genre’s inception, featuring regularly in the BBC’s *Life* (1965-1968) and *Nature* (1983-1994) series, and in environmental or conservation films like National Geographic’s *Save the Panda* (1983) and Bullfrog films’ *Blow Pipes and Bulldozers* (1988). [...] There are exceptions to the wildlife genre’s avoidance of “talking head” formats as a vehicle for controversial issues. *Warnings From the Wild: The Price of Salmon* (2001), for example, used this format to highlight the catastrophic environmental impacts of fish farming on wild salmon populations. However, the use of counter-posed “talking head” interviews remains an underused device in natural history programming. [...] *The Living Planet* (1984) [...] In this twelve-part series on the world’s ecosystems, the final episode was devoted entirely to the destruction of ecosystems.” (Richards 2013)

“Wildlife documentaries have their own responsibility in the conservative denial of global warming, because they portray nature as magnificent and unaffected by humans and industrialization [...] The less filmmakers show man’s impact, the less connected to reality audiences will be. Viewers cannot see the biodiversity

degradation for themselves, therefore wildlife documentary filmmakers are messengers with a moral responsibility towards environmental causes. Wildlife documentary crews are responsible for turning the cameras away from human traces on location, therefore they detain part of the responsibility in how the public views nature and climate change.” (Daniel 2020 s. 18-19)

“Andrew Ross’s discussion of “images of ecology” is pertinent here. Ross lays out the clichés of environmentalist imagination: “belching smokestacks, seabirds mired in petrochemical sludge, fish floating belly-up, traffic jams in Los Angeles and Mexico City, and clearcut forests; on the other hand, the redeeming repertoire of pastoral imagery, pristine, green, and unspoiled by human habitation, crowned by the ultimate global spectacle, the fragile, vulnerable ball of spaceship earth.” (171) [...] at some point it is necessary to ask the larger question of whether a reliance on visuality can ever be enough for eliciting the kind of change in consciousness that many environmentalists would like to see.” (Adrian Ivakhiv i <https://www.uvm.edu/~aivakhiv/GreenFilmCrit.pdf>; lesedato 29.12.22)

Men “nearly all wildlife films on television are made by run-for-profit production companies with no formal wildlife preservation or conservation agenda. [...] there is little to suggest that the genre itself makes a significant contribution to protecting the lives of wild animals, or to preserving species or habitat, in the sort of systematic or predictable ways that would prove it an effective tool.” (Bousé 2000 s. xiv) Det finnes ifølge en ekspert på naturfilmer en “common misperception that wildlife films can help save species from decline or extirpation. For evidence that wildlife populations have declined significantly during the very years that mark the heyday of wildlife television, see the World Wildlife Fund’s *Living Planet Report* (1998).” (Bousé 2000 s. 224)

“David Attenborough is a well-known documentary voice over and producer, associated with both *Blue Planet II* and *Our Planet*. [...] The success of his animal series *Zoo Quest* (1954) motivated the BBC to create its National History Unit in 1957, which is responsible for all of their wildlife documentaries [...] Since then, Attenborough has worked on a colossal number of nature documentaries which have earned him the reputation of being one of the most influential people at the BBC, and in the United Kingdom. In recent years however, instances of journalists criticizing his work’s lack of environmental accountability multiplied. The Guardian repeatedly accused him of betraying the environment he claimed love, by downplaying climate change [...] In a 2018 article George Monbiot, a journalist and former employee of the BBC, accused Attenborough and the channel of having done less for environmental awareness than fossil fuel companies. Monbiot argued that Attenborough’s influence on wildlife documentary production made it morally condemnable for him to have waited until 2017’s *Blue Planet II* to incorporate climate change in his narrative.” (Daniel 2020 s. 11-12)

Den amerikanske naturforskeren Peter Steinhart “based his arguments on the assumption that the presence of wildlife films on television is somehow directly connected to wildlife conservation and protection – that is, that they are helping save animals by raising consciousness and concern, and perhaps even motivating people to action. There is little real evidence of this, however.” (Bousé 2000 s. 232) I en artikkelen av J. Madslien fra 2004 med tittelen “Making wildlife films sexy” hevdes det at det er en “widespread eco-fatigue among TV-viewers”. En annen betegnelse for det samme er “green fatigue” (gjengitt fra <http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc48.2006/AnimalTV/index.html>; lesedato 05.12.14).

Noen naturfilmskapere “go so far as to suggest that if wildlife program makers do not foreground conservation issues, they are guilty of major deceit. [...] Television, after all, is primarily an entertainment medium, and wildlife films fill an escapist, non-controversial slot ... The wildlife filmmaker is in a moral bind. Put simply: he makes his living out of nature; nature is disappearing. If he says too much I about that, he loses his audience. If he does not, he loses his subject.” (Stephen Mills i <http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc48.2006/AnimalTV/index.html>; lesedato 05.12.14)

I artikkelen “Wildlife Documentaries: From Classical Forms to Reality TV” (2006) Jan-Christopher Horak “convincingly argues that contemporary impulses to document nature seem to transfer any preservationist agenda to a “virtual” plane: “an appeal to viewers to participate actively in preserving the natural environment is a narrative element in many modern wildlife documentaries, but these are usually depoliticized, calling for individual action, rather than social struggle [...] Animal film producers are seemingly preparing the public for the day when all wildlife will merely be seen in zoos, wildlife reserves, aquaria or virtually as moving images.”” (Diane Leblond i <https://journals.openedition.org/inmedia/1957?lang=en>; lesedato 30.08.22)

Det sugereres 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 de fleste 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.” (filmskaperen Stephen Mills sitert fra Bousé 2000 s. 14) Det er også en “widespread commitment to an ethic (or an illusion) of nonintervention” (Bousé 2000 s. 27). Dyrene kan derfor ikke f.eks. mates for å komme nærmere fotografen.

“All over the world, we frame our pictures as carefully as the directors of costume dramas, to exclude telegraph poles and electricity pylons, cars, roads and people. [...] The commissioners of television programmes believe that the public watch wildlife films because they wish to be reassured that there is an unspoilt earth out there, somewhere beyond the street lighting. We the film-makers must be the

intrepid explorers with the skill and patience to spend years in the wilderness to capture it for them. True wilderness, however, has mostly disappeared. Wildlife, wherever we try to film it, is rarely living an unencumbered, natural existence. Almost everywhere, it is in some way involved with man and dependent on him for its survival.” (Stephen Mills: “Pocket tigers: The sad unseen reality behind the wildlife film”, i *Times Literary Supplement* 21. februar 1997 s. 6; her sitert fra <https://www.abc.net.au/cm/lb/5617728/data/pocket-tigers-article-data.pdf>; lesedato 29.12.22)

“This tragic loss of wilderness presents the wildlife film-maker with a fundamental dilemma. So long as we sustain the myth of nature, our programmes find a wide and appreciative audience. So many viewers could do a lot for conservation. But, as viewing figures adamantly prove, once we make a habit of telling the bad news our audience slinks away. Television, after all, is primarily an entertainment medium, and wildlife films fill an escapist, non-controversial slot. Of course, there are exceptions. When the BBC first broadcast *Tiger Crisis*, about the soaring rise of tiger-poaching to supply traditional medicines to the Chinese, there were 3,000 phone calls to the switchboard. But such interest cannot be maintained in film after film, even though the crisis is continuous and affects almost every other species on earth. [...] The loss of wilderness is a truth so sad, so overwhelming that, to reflect reality, it would need to be the subject of every wildlife film. That, of course, would be neither entertaining nor ultimately dramatic. So it seems that as filmmakers we are doomed either to fail our audience or to fail our cause.” (Stephen Mills i <https://www.abc.net.au/cm/lb/5617728/data/pocket-tigers-article-data.pdf>; lesedato 29.12.22)

“The wildlife filmmaker too is in a moral bind. Put simply: he makes his living out of nature; nature is disappearing. If he says too much about that, he loses his audience. If he does not, he loses his subject. Film-makers have evaded this dilemma by concentrating on the wonder of nature. Sir David Attenborough, for instance, believes that it is his task simply to persuade the public that animals are interesting and beautiful. His revelations will then make people susceptible to the harder conservation messages purveyed by campaigning bodies like Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth. So far, this policy – of using entertainment to open the eyes and leaving it to politicians and philosophers to make people act and think – has been quite effective. Popular awareness of animals and their plight has, after all, increased exponentially” (Stephen Mills i <https://www.abc.net.au/cm/lb/5617728/data/pocket-tigers-article-data.pdf>; lesedato 29.12.22).

I mange naturfilmer etter ca. år 2000 tematiseres det at habitatet forsvinner og at en rekke dyrearter er truet av utryddelse. Det rettes mer eller mindre direkte advarsler til seerne om skadelige virkninger av klimaendringer og krympende områder for vill natur. De flotte bildene fungerer indirekte som en advarsel om det vi er i ferd med å miste.

“In crass contrast to the insatiable fascination that viewers bring to the experience of viewing wildlife films, the rate at which animals are becoming extinct is accelerating.” (Jan-Christopher Horak sitert fra <https://journals.openedition.org/inmedia/1957?lang=en>; lesedato 13.09.22) “[T]here are two planet earths. One of them is the complex, morally challenging world in which we live, threatened by ecological collapse. The other is the one we see on the wildlife programs ...” (George Monbiot i <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10304310701861564#d1e187>; lesedato 02.09.24).

“Documentaries also have the potential to increase support for conservation or conservation organizations through an increase in volunteering, wildlife tourism, or direct donations. They may also generate positive public attitudes and subsequently social norms towards an issue, making policy change more likely. The final episode of the 2017 documentary *Blue Planet II* has been widely credited with influencing UK policy change on marine plastics (the so-called “Blue Planet effect”; Schnurr et al., 2018). However, the extent to which the documentary, and the resulting public outcry, directly influenced policy change is not well understood.” (Julia P. G. Jones, Laura Thomas-Walters m.fl. i <https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/pan3.10052>; lesedato 04.06.22)

“One of the main ways *Blue Planet II* tackles global warming is by letting viewers develop affection for a number of animals during the first six episodes, and offering solutions to environmental problems touching these animals in the seventh. In the six first episodes the visual codes of wildlife documentaries are perfectly respected, with a brief occasional twist reminding viewers of man’s impact on the environment. These occasional twists typically only last a few seconds, and vary auditively from the narrator talking about a plastic bottle in the ocean to him briefly explaining the impact raising oceans can have on cities. *Blue Planet II* mostly kept its environmental message for the last episode, an episode which alone could belong to a very different branch of the genre. The decision of revealing the most important information at the end of this eight part series is the biggest difference between *Blue Planet II* and *Our Planet*, which discusses global warming in each episode. [...] After having spent the first 35 minutes of the episode celebrating the variety of life that depended on a coral reef, the episode indeed concludes by showing its rapid death. This visually implies that other animals filmed for the series had a similar fate, due to the global warming related issues described by the narrator.” (Daniel 2020 s. 28-29)

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)

“John Sparks, series producer of the Natural World [...] is reputed to have coined the phrase, “blue-chip”: “It just means basically that kind of film, you know, which has got no people in it. Lovely, natural history. Nature in the raw. Beautifully filmed. High production values, good editing, good photography that sucks you into a place” (John Sparks, interview 13.6.95) [...] ‘An “ooh” film is about pandas or koala bears, and it shows how they spend their whole lives cuddling their young without the interference of social workers. An “aah” film makes you gasp with wonder. It describes how the peculiar fly orchid is pollinated by just one species of insect – and shows you the process from inside the flower. The “yuck” film shows in sticky detail the slimy sex-life of the large yellow slug *Limax pseudoflavus*, and it lasts for half an hour. The “click” film is the slimy sex-life of *Limax pseudoflavus* part 2, including a treatise on the need to conserve the species in Stow-on-the-Wold: the click is everyone turning off their televisions’. [...] Few people, observed Mills, watched natural history tv ‘to exercise their brains’. ‘At least 80 percent said they watched simply “for the photography”. TV natural history, noted Mills ‘enhances reality ... it shows you things you really wouldn’t see’. [...] The BBC was embarking on its mission to amaze, impress and stupefy natural history audiences.” (Chris Rose i <http://threeworlds.campaignstrategy.org/?p=1396>; lesedato 13.12.22)

“In wildlife film making the concerns have centred on two main issues: 1) the degree of intervention which could be justified in the quest to obtain revealing wildlife footage without jeopardising the welfare of the animals you were filming (Boswall, 1982) and 2) the lengths to which one could go in editing together the filmed material into an attractively packaged narrativized account to which viewers could relate (but one which necessarily omitted many of the more boring or routine aspects). The first of these concerns highlights the difficulty of striking a balance between the wish to connect with the audience and the need to provide scientifically informed insights into wildlife behaviour. The second foregrounds issues of anthropomorphism (the ascribing of human traits and tendencies to animal

behaviour) and the degree of distortion which can occur when any filmed event is presented within a narrative frame (Bouse, 2000: 4-10; Englaender, 1997: 6-7). Whilst these concerns remain, contemporary developments in wildlife program making have tended to foreground a new set of issues. Most of these relate to the concepts of “performance” and “performativity.” Traditional wildlife has, of course, always been preoccupied with “performance,” whether this be capturing on film the performance of animals within their natural habitats or whether it refers to the performance of the intrepid film maker/tracker as (s)he seeks to gain access to the wildlife world on our behalf. An additional traditional performative category might include the various types of interaction which are caught on camera when wildlife filmmaker meets wildlife creature.” (Richard Kilborn i <http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc48.2006/AnimalTV/index.html>; lesedato 05.12.14)

“Though most wildlife filmmakers have, over the years, been scrupulous in maintaining a respectful distance from the animals they were filming, there have always been some who have not been averse to provoking a response from their subjects. Sometimes the provocation has taken the form of activating a normally somnolent creature into producing “action for the camera”; sometimes there was a calculated attempt to produce a frisson for members of the audience as they witnessed potentially dangerous confrontations between the courageous film maker and those unpredictable creatures of the wild (Bouse, 2000: 29-31). Almost always the staged confrontations had less to do with revealing characteristic traits of wildlife behaviour and more with the production of sensational footage.” (Richard Kilborn i <http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc48.2006/AnimalTV/index.html>; lesedato 05.12.14)

“Whilst human-animal confrontations and interactions have, over time, become one of the conventional tropes of wildlife film making, in the last decade or so they have virtually become a generic requirement. Much that passes for natural history on our screens today not only involves the standard tracking down of wildlife creatures, but also requires getting up close to them, sharing their worlds or frequently triggering a “fight or flight” response from them. While the declared objective here may be to bring us closer to nature than ever before, the shows focus equally on celebrating the technological skills required to develop the recording hardware to capture these images and the performative skills displayed by the new generation of “gladiatorial” presenters, who have nowadays thoroughly colonized the world of wildlife TV. [...] Austin Stevens, one of the new breed of performer/presenters in contemporary wildlife film making, proudly announces to camera in the program *In Search for the Great Anaconda* (Channel 5, 2004): “My mission is to scour the waterways in search of the biggest anaconda I can find, pull it from the water and photograph it” (cited in Bell, 2004: 22). [...] foregrounding particular types of aggressive or extreme animal behaviour in the belief that this is how audience interest will be maintained” (Richard Kilborn i <http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc48.2006/AnimalTV/index.html>; lesedato 05.12.14).

Den britiske naturfilmprodusenten Jefferey Boswall har hevdet at “the majority of the world’s wildlife film-makers still [believe] that most wildlife conservation is boring, worrying and depressing to the public. They feel that their duty is to show viewers what is there, let them wonder at it and be enthralled, and then let them decide for themselves whether or not it worth keeping” (her sitert fra <http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc48.2006/AnimalTV/index.html>; lesedato 05.12.14).

Fra tidlig på 1920-tallet ble det lagd filmer med “screen depiction of wild animals from exotic curiosities to fully developed characters in well-constructed narratives – indeed, they could even be *heroes*. Wild animals were thus integrated into the formal structures of narrative cinema, from shot/reverse-shot editing to close-ups, that helped individualize them as characters, to point-of-view shots that allowed us to see things from their perspective. Taken in concert, these techniques helped viewers identify emotionally with animal characters, perhaps almost as much as with humans.” (Bousé 2000 s. 116) “The close-up shot creates a false intimacy between the human audience and the animal subjects, and among the dangerous results of the technique is the impression that animals have human-like thoughts and emotional responses. While this identification of humans with animals might provide the basis for successful political, economic and social action on behalf of animal welfare, use of the technique raises several important ethical questions regarding the representation of nature and science.” (Derek Bousé i https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233280861_False_intimacy_Close-ups_and_viewer_involvement_in_wildlife_films; lesedato 24.04.23)

Sjangeren har ført til mange milepåler knyttet til tidspunktene når ulike tekniske løsninger begynner å bli anvendt: filming av fugler fra småfly, minikamera inne i et bjørnehi, osv., og milepåler for hva som blir filmet for første gang: snøleopard, sjimpanser som spiser kjøtt, løver som dreper en elefant, en gaupe med unger, osv.; “a claim to *firstism* that was sustained mainly, if at all, on technicalities” (Bousé 2000 s. 53)

“[J]ust as ethnocentrism is built in to every culture’s ways of thinking, so is there little reason to suspect that the cultural biases built in to other genres of industrialized, commodified entertainments do not also find their way into wildlife films – even if they are imperceptible to the people who make them. [...] Wildlife filmmakers, moreover, are fairly candid in acknowledging that their films are closer to mainstream entertainments than to science.” (Bousé 2000 s. 156)

“It has been argued, for example, that British audiences have come to expect BBC natural history programs “to be based on scientific truth” (Prince, 1998: 61). Yet it might just as well be argued that audiences have come to expect convincing, well-executed, realistic *illusions* of truth, presented in accordance with the conventions of television entertainments.” (Bousé 2000 s. 246) “In order to survive, wildlife program making must dress itself up more and more in the clothes of the other entertainment formats, with which it is now competing for slots in the schedule.

[...] Critics also say that because many doing natural-history filmmaking have traditionally come from the scientific rather than the television program-making community, they have shown a stylistic conservatism and failure to innovate (Willis, 1998: 4)." (Richard Kilborn i <http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc48.2006/AnimalTV/index.html>; lesedato 05.12.14)

"To earn back their investments, wildlife films must have stories that are easily exportable and able to travel well across cultural borders." (Bousé 2000 s. 96)

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 dødkampen 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.

"The most noted observer and prolific commentator on ethics in wildlife filmmaking is Jeffery Boswall" (Bousé 2000 s. 225). "In a 1988 paper, *The Moral Pivots of Wildlife Film-making*, Boswall raised the issue of ethics, advocating that the audience should not be deceived. He asserted that this sometimes happened when film-makers baited an animal or gave it food not normally eaten, or introduced it to another with which it did not usually interact. He considered adding sound to the footage to be dishonest." (Anthony Hayward i <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2012/aug/27/jeffery-boswall>; lesedato 04.06.22)

"[R]equirements could oblige film-makers to keep confidential any information that could threaten animal life and welfare if it were spread (e.g. the location of nesting sites)." (Simone Pollo m.fl. i https://iris.unito.it/retrieve/handle/2318/139271/7200/anim_behav_2009_published.pdf; lesedato 18.06.22)

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 handlingsmønster (Lehmann og Wulff 2016 s. 9). De blir "individualized, personified, and experienced on a personal, emotional level" (Bousé 2000 s. 125). "Inevitably, behavior typical of a whole species is interpreted in terms of individual psychology: the wolf is seen seeking interactions with others – the wolf must therefore *feel lonely*." (Bousé 2000 s. 158) "[P]ersonifying and individualizing nature led inexorably to reliance on animal

characters with whom audiences could sympathize and even identify emotionally.” (Bousé 2000 s. 127) Likevel skal det være som om naturen selv forteller sin historie. Filmtrailer til den franske regissøren Luc Jacquets *Pingvinenes marsj* (2005) lokker med denne formuleringen: “Naturen skriver de vakreste av alle historier” (sitert fra Krohn og Strank 2012 s. 227).

“[I]mposing narrative on nature not only represents the lives of wild animals according to dramatic convention, but also individualizes and psychologizes behavior typical of entire species. Further, attempts to render such behavior intelligible to audiences have often entailed finding simple human analogies for it, which, in turn, have forced it into familiar, moral categories – good, bad, kind, cruel, generous, mean, and so forth. Whether or not it is appropriate to apply such notions to animals has seemed to matter less than that they offer audiences a way of making sense of things, and a vision of a world in which things do make sense – in which each individual life and death has a meaning, a reason for occurring, and an explanation that can be easily understood in terms we already know.” (Bousé 2000 s. 152)

Dyr blir antropomorfisert, dvs. menneskeliggjort, i “anthropomorphic animal storytelling” (Bousé 2000 s. 96). 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).

“[P]eople continue to identify unconsciously with animals and therefore continue to impose human taboos upon them.” (Bousé 2000 s. 175)

I Disney-konsernets naturfilmer antropomorfiseres dyrene (Niney 2012 s. 224). Blant annet blir dyrene tilskrevet menneskelige egenskaper av kommentator-stemmen. 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.

“[A]fter more than fifty years of wild animals on the big screen, Tom McHugh’s color footage depicting the birth of a bison calf in Disney’s *The Vanishing Prairie* (1954) was considered shocking enough to be banned in New York by the State Board of Censors (although it was later overturned).” (Bousé 2000 s. 174)

“Routine acts of predation, for example, become *dramatic conflicts* enlisting all the elements of Aristotelian dramaturgy to engage audiences emotionally. By way of formal devices – close-ups, point-of-view shots, reaction shots, etc, not to mention voice-over narration and dramatic music – we, as audience members, are often “teamed” emotionally with one or the other of the animals involved. Depending on which one, and on the outcome of the chase, the event becomes either a tragedy or

a triumph, an occasion for mourning or for celebration.” (Bousé 2000 s. 153) “The addition of voice-over commentary explains and reinforces them, and fills in whatever gaps there may be in the visual evidence.” (Bousé 2000 s. 170)

“I ännu högre utsträckning än inom andra genrer är dessa filmberättelser framklippta ur ett mycket stort material av tagningar, omtagningar och ljudupptagningar; ett urval marineras i svåra inspelningssituationer och det tidskrävande arbetet att helt enkelt invänta det skygga djuret, det perfekta ljuset, eller det flyktiga ögonblicket då rovfågeln dyker. När väl urvalet av sekvenser är avvägt och organiserat tillkommer den poetiska bearbetningen. En insiktsfull text, ljudredigering och filmmusikens tolkande roll kombineras med den ton och känsla som berättarrösten tillför. [...] den riktade uppmärksamheten mot undervattensvärldar eller insekters livscykel inte bara erbjuder fakta och kunnigt erkännande av okända världar, utan även en meditativ drömvärld att förlora sig i.” (Malin Wahlberg i <https://www.svenskfilmdatabas.se/sv/i-narkontakt-med-naturen/>; lesedato 18.06.22)

Et “sympathetic example is *Mozu, the Snow Monkey*. One of the most popular films ever shown in the PBS series *Nature*, it deals with a severely birth-defected Japanese macaque. With the odds against her survival seemingly overwhelming, the story is about (or *projects*) the courage, nobility of character, and indomitable spirit that allow Mozu to triumph over adversity. The emotional climax comes when she gives birth to a healthy, normal offspring and proves herself a caring mother like the able-bodied members of her clan. Yet if her disability were the result of a defective gene she carried, it might, arguably, have been better if she had not risked passing on that gene by giving birth, but the film is clearly in sympathy with the happiness of the individual. Scientific questions are silenced by emotionally compelling dramatic narrative.” (Bousé 2000 s. 163)

“The fact that fighting for survival more often means *avoiding* life-threatening conflicts would be unlikely to make for saleable projects, let alone for exciting footage, and so is simply discarded, along with other unphotogenic or inconvenient realities.” (Bousé 2000 s. 183)

“[I]t probably remains true that how we see the natural world influences how we treat it. As audiences grow larger, wildlife films become more technically and artistically sophisticated and move farther away from depicting nature on its terms and more toward dramatically recreating it in terms set by visual media. As the twenty-first century finds more and more people removed from direct experience of the natural world, what will be the consequences of an increasing diet of images that distort perceptions of nature by portraying it as a place of incessant drama and action, of sound and fury, or as a place where our own moral and social values can be easily and straightforwardly applied?” (Bousé 2000 s. 192) Dyr kan framstilles i en “gladiatorial spectacle” som inngår i “nature-tainment” (Derek Bousé og Karen

D. Scott i <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10304310701861564#d1e187>; lesedato 02.09.24).

“Whether by design or by default, most of our nature films, in my view, are intended to serve as fables or moral tales, in which animals are employed as surrogate humans, manipulated by the filmmakers to enact contemporary culture myths, which serve the primary purpose of defining and reinforcing social values.” (Barry Clark sitert fra Bousé 2000 s. 93-94)

“[W]ildlife films today still tend to portray individual survival as a reward for effort and virtue. In *Crocodile Territory* (1996), when a croc lunges suddenly to catch a goose we are told that “patience, a virtue crocodiles have mastered, reaps its rewards.” This pattern of moralizing survival successes may seem faint, but it is widespread and systematic.” (Bousé 2000 s. 164)

I Disneys filmer har det vært vanlig at stedene ikke gis sine ekte navn, men “quasi-mythic locales such as “Seal Island,” “Beaver Valley,” “Bear Country,” and “Nature’s Half Acre.” [and] exclude images that would ground them in the historical present.” (Bousé 2000 s. 134) Det er ikke uvanlig med “the repetition of cultural stereotypes (such as the innate “nobility” of some animals, e.g. the lion as “king” of beasts), assumptions that nature includes “good” animals (deer, rabbits, and songbirds) and “bad” ones (snakes and scorpions), as well as the notion that “heroes” and “villains” are also found among wild creatures. [...] celebrated nature’s supposed commitment to idyllic monogamy, nuclear families, and lifelong parent-child relationships.” (Bousé 2000 s. 135)

“Disney realized that documentaries could be at once engaging, dramatic, emotional, *and* succeed at the box office.” (Phil Bagust i <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10304310701861564#d1e187>; lesedato 02.09.24)

“Its archetypal pattern traces the story of an individual animal from birth, through the perils of youth, the trials of adolescence, and finally to the time when he (and in some cases *she*) enters society as an adult, often after a victory of some sort. The nature writers who preceded wildlife films also found that survival adventures alone [...] proved insufficient material for a worthy plot. The chosen animal must be a hero.” (Bousé 2000 s. 131) “[T]here was little reason why wildlife films should not have rising and falling action, dramatic conflicts and resolutions, uplifting endings, perhaps even a little comedy or tragedy. Was there any reason, therefore, why they should not also have heroes, or for that matter villains? There was one: *none of these things are found in nature*. Bravery, heroism, drama, tragedy, comedy, good, evil, and even narrative itself may all be among the categories by which we make sense of the natural world, but we project them onto it just as surely as we look into the stars and see a giant dipper. [...] Wildlife films can hardly be expected to succeed, after all, or even to communicate effectively without patterns their audiences would recognize” (Bousé 2000 s. 129).

Identifikasjon med et dyr kan by på spesielle emosjonelle utfordringer: “Take, for example, a film that follows the story of a young male lion. Endearing and charming as a cub, graceful and impressive as an adult, we may find it easy to become emotionally involved in the story of his “struggle to survive” in a harsh, unforgiving environment. After he moves into a pride of females, however, and suddenly begins a campaign of systematic infanticide, killing every cub sired by the male(s) he has displaced, we are forced to come to terms with the emotional investment we have made in this character. The challenge posed by a realistic portrayal of this sort is to confront the apparent moral ambiguities of the situation and through them the complexities of life. We must try to understand rather than simply to condemn or turn away.” (Bousé 2000 s. 127)

“[A] leopard in *Jungle Cat* is described as “a killer both wanton and ruthless, the executioner of the African plain,” who makes a “career of assassination.” Today, the notion that predators are “nature’s assassins” has, itself, refused to die. Although it seems few would any longer equate predatory killing with aggression or hostility, let alone with murder, as recently as 1998, a BBC film on tigers carelessly characterized a cat species from Madagascar as “skilled assassins.” In the mid-1990s Time-Life Video, already notorious for its provocative and controversial marketing of the *Trials of Life*, packaged another collection of BBC films under the title *Nature’s Assassins*. It might just as well have called them “Nature’s Hit-Men” or “Nature’s Terrorists.” Advertisements spoke of “ingenious predator tricks and deceptions... strategies so diabolically effective, no mere human could have invented them.” [...] moralistic hyperbole has declined generally in wildlife films today” (Bousé 2000 s. 160).

“[I]f a species were widely perceived as being unfaithful, disloyal, untrustworthy, perhaps even treacherous, would there be popular support for it if it were faced with extinction? Consider the still ongoing effort to extirpate wolves by “predator control” factions in the American west, and the moral language on which they still rely to portray their efforts as a righteous crusade to rid the world of treacherous, murderous, cowardly villains – the “Jeffrey Dahmers of the wilderness.” [...] routinely seize on human analogies and metaphors as convenient, easily grasped illustrations of elusive and subtle concepts.” (Bousé 2000 s. 161) Jeffrey Dahmer var en amerikansk seriemorder og kannibal.

“*Death of a Legend* [1971]. Bill Mason’s film is one of the first to deal with wolves, and to put forth the argument that they are more victims than killers.” (Bousé 2000 s. 215)

Det er ikke uvanlig med “science popularization’s reduction of complex processes to oversimplified formulations, of what should have been metaphors to literal interpretations, and of broad, biological principles to narrow, psychological

motives on the part of individuals – in this case, jealousy, consuming desire, angst, suspicion, and other *obsessional neuroses*.” (Bousé 2000 s. 169)

Mange filmer “focus on “charismatic” species considered more attractive to human audiences [...] tendency to narrativise, dramatise, and insist on sensationalist forms of violence and predation, in order to compensate for how “boring” wild animals actually are.” (Diane Leblond i <https://journals.openedition.org/inmedia/1957?lang=en>; lesedato 30.08.22) “Uncharismatic or unpopular species have long suffered “symbolic annihilation” on television (media theorists’ term for their systematic elimination from the screen), but a process of “symbolic selection” (as opposed to natural selection) may be just as pronounced.” (Bousé 2000 s. 165)

“Ethnographic film is film which endeavors to interpret the behavior of people of one culture to persons of another culture by using shots of people doing precisely what they would have been doing if the camera were not there.” (David MacDougall sitert fra Bousé 2000 s. 25) “Hugo Van Lawick’s portrait of chimpanzee society, *People of the Forest* (1989), arguably has the look, feel, and purpose of an ethnographic film of the sort described above” (Bousé 2000 s. 25).

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. Iblast 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 bøylepingviner. ‘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 gjørnehull 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 dyster 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)

“Wildlife documentary has come to assume a key role in the public understanding of science and environmental issues, generating popular awareness and helping to shape public engagement with environmental politics and conflict. As our contact with the wild has become more remote, wildlife documentary has become the primary frame through which industrialised people view wildlife and nature. To give just one example, 48% of the UK population watched at least 15 minutes of *Frozen Planet* (2011), a remarkable figure considering the fragmentation of audiences brought about by the rise of digital broadcasting and online media.” (Richards 2013)

“Something about these programs is hyper-real. Partly, this stems from the fact that the films are enhanced. It is an open secret that the long zoom lenses used to capture animals up close can make recording real-time sound nearly impossible. And so the wet crunch of lions opening up a gazelle’s rib cage, the hollow clack of birds’ bills closing, the groan and woosh of a calving glacier – these noises are often recorded separately or even created by sound-effect artists and added to the shots later. These sound effects, along with the orchestral music added to nearly all of the high-end wildlife documentaries, set the emotional tone for the vignettes on-screen. Are these seabirds supposed to be majestic or comical as they enact their mating dance? The music tells us. Whom are we to root for [= heie på] in this interaction of predator and prey? Listen for the menacing strings. Alenda Chang, a film and media-studies professor at UC Santa Barbara, finds the ubiquity of orchestral music in the genre “irritating.” Using ambient sound, even if it has to be recorded separately or manipulated to be audible, can give viewers a truer and more complete understanding of the nonhuman world.” (Emma Marris i <https://www.theatlantic.com/culture/archive/2021/04/problem-nature-documentaries/618553/>; lesedato 04.06.22)

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. “The indifference of nature to cherished values, as well as to real suffering, can often make it difficult to resist the temptation of moral judgment, even in response to the most neutral of film depictions. Those who make wildlife films, however, do not come from outside the dominant value systems, and so

moralizing of nature finds its way into wildlife films with surprising regularity.”
(Bousé 2000 s. 152)

“The idea that an animal might be killed through no fault or failure of its own, or that it might be subject to the randomness of an amoral and indifferent nature, to accidents, to chance, to events that can’t be explained, too often gives way in wildlife films to a kind of determinism – not a biological determinism, however, but a moral one.” (Bousé 2000 s. 164)

“Here is where we see that some of the significant occurrences in our own lives – birth, initiation rites, pair-bonding, sexual union, child-rearing, and death – have become the central pillars upon which most wildlife films are built, and make up the “family romance” at the core of the classic narrative model and its variations.”
(Bousé 2000 s. 153)

“An even more systematic attempt to find analogies between the behavior patterns in human and animal families can be found in the 1995 film entitled simply, *Family*. A charming and entertaining work, *Family*, along with its companion piece, *Ceremony*, was part of a series aimed at revealing the “surprising parallels” between people and animals. [...] In *Ceremony*, an elaborate human wedding is similarly juxtaposed with images of animals’ courtship rituals, mating displays, nest-building, and other social or reproductive behavior. [...] cross-cutting between images of humans and nonhumans reinforces the perception of parallels and similarities, and thus projects the model of human monogamous marriage onto the natural world despite the differences described in the spoken narration. Ultimately, both *Family* and *Ceremony*, for all their good intentions, show once again that reasoning by analogy leads to conclusions based on analogy.” (Bousé 2000 s. 169-171)

“From Human Analogy to Moral Biology [...] At the very least, one might say that the portrayal in wildlife films of animals’ family and social relations presents a kind of vast Rorschach pattern in which culturally preferred notions of masculinity, femininity, romantic love, monogamous marriage, responsible parenting, communal spirit, the work ethic, deferred gratification, moral behavior, and the sexual division of labor in marriage can all be read.” (Bousé 2000 s. 157)

“Western notions of responsible parenting, filial obligation, obedience by the young, and other categories of proper behavior and personal responsibility are projected onto animals in ways that often make it seem as if life and death are assigned to the deserving – life to the hard working, the selfless, the obedient, the morally upright; death to the selfish, the disobedient, the lazy, the careless.” (Bousé 2000 s. 164)

“A recent film on animal families notes, for example, that “caring motherhood” is not something all animals practice, and that another method of reproduction “is to

have a lot of offspring and to abandon them.” While literally true, the connotations attached to words such as “caring” and “abandon” are at the very least open invitations to moral judgment. When a sea turtle hatchling is then described as “the image of parental abandonment,” one can almost hear audience members asking, *But why doesn’t the turtle stay and take care of her babies like a good mother?* In fact, infant mortality in the wild is already high even under the most attentive parental care, but filmmakers’ routine reliance on the orphan theme to evoke sympathy can suggest not only that abandonment by uncaring parents is the primary danger to young animals, but that human family arrangements and conventional “family values” are the real keys to individual as well as species survival. Judging from the “success” (i.e., overpopulation) of our own species relative to that of sea turtles, one might even conclude that the cultivation of more humanlike “family values” might be the key to avoiding extinction.” (Bousé 2000 s. 159)

“The vast majority of general behavior patterns, even among primates, are simply innate. Nevertheless, imitation is widely attributed in wildlife films to all sorts of species regardless of the absence of scientific support. [...] Still, animals of all sorts are routinely described in wildlife films as “passing on” skills and knowledge to their young.” (Bousé 2000 s. 177-178) *Toothwalkers: Giants of the Arctic Ice* (1997; regissert av Adam Ravetch) “holds that among walruses, knowledge of a particular feeding site “has been passed on from mother to calf for generations.” ” (Bousé 2000 s. 178)

“Even the most “scientific” of the “True Life” films, *Secrets of Life* (1956), the only one in the series to include a credit for “Consulting Biologists,” failed to steer clear of this pitfall. “Usually nature assigns to the male and female separate and well-defined duties,” we are told. Fair enough. Then this: “as a rule, father provides, mother protects.” It might be more accurately argued that *as a rule, mother provides and father is absent* [...] having been asserted by trusted science popularizer David Attenborough, concern with paternity, like the notion of husbands and wives, takes on the guise of scientific fact regardless of however ironically or rhetorically it was intended.” (Bousé 2000 s. 168)

“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 natur-

filmer. 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” hanner – 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 antropomorfisering, 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 stereotypisrats och missbrukats, både inom och utom vetenskapen. Djurs beteende kan dock visst användas för att förstå mäniskor, 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)

“Just as it is difficult for some to countenance the fact that the model of the human nuclear family so widely touted today has actually enjoyed a relatively brief reign historically, so too does the pervasiveness of mating, reproduction, and the rearing of young in wildlife films today make it easy to forget that these were not always mainstays of the genre. In its earliest years they were not even present.” (Bousé 2000 s. 153)

“Wildlife films today, however, are increasingly guided by *formalist* aesthetics, or at least are farther than in the past from the documentary ideal of cinema as a “transparent” medium. Today wildlife filmmakers seem more often to be using the TV screen not as a window to the world, but as a canvas on which to paint dramatic and expressive images of it. The fact that this canvas, in the age of HD and large format (such as IMAX) screens is getting bigger and more visually powerful has not only helped wildlife filmmakers lay a greater claim to the legitimizing mantle of *art*, but has also increased the tendency toward films that are guided by the demands of art, rather than by those of science or ecological concerns.” (Bousé 2000 s. 188)

“Stephen Kellert (1983, 1993) has identified several categories of attitudes toward wildlife (e.g. aesthetic, utilitarian, humanistic, moralistic, etc.)” (Bousé 2000 s. 234) I en undersökelse brukte han “a typology of nine basic attitudes toward animals. [...]

Naturalistic – Primary interest in and affection for wildlife and the outdoors.

Ecologicist – Primary concern for the environment as a system, for inter-relationships between wildlife species and natural habitats.

Humanistic – Primary interest in and strong affection for individual animals, principally pets.

Moralistic – Primary concern for the right and wrong treatment of animals, with strong opposition to exploitation of and cruelty toward animals.

Scientistic – Primary interest in the physical attributes and biological functioning of animals.

Aesthetic – Primary interest in the artistic and symbolic characteristics of animals.

Utilitarian – Primary concern for the practical and material value of animals.

Dominionistic – Primary satisfactions derived from mastery and control over animals, typically in sporting situations.

Negativistic – Primary orientation an active avoidance of animals due to dislike or fear.

Neutralistic – Primary orientation a passive avoidance of animals due to indifference and lack of interest.”

(Kellert i https://research.ncsu.edu/ges/files/2014/03/Kellert1984_AttitudesUpdate.pdf; lesedato 27.05.22)

“Wildlife filmmakers have increasingly begun, for whatever reasons, to follow Hollywood’s example not only in scripting and storyboarding, but also in areas such as camera, lighting, set construction, and overall production design.” (Bousé 2000 s. 190)

“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 empathize 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)

“Anyone who spends time outdoors has probably realized that most real experiences of the natural world, away from cities and development, tend to be experiences of serenity and quietude. This is what has accounted for most notions of nature’s regenerative and spiritually redemptive power. Yet stillness and silence have almost no place in wildlife film [...] Film and television also have little tolerance for what is normal and usual in life, thriving instead on what is rare and unusual. [...] Wildlife films need not, therefore, give absolutely accurate reflections of the natural world – especially to viewers who may have had little or no direct experience with wild animals and nature and whose expectations may have been shaped more by media images than by real experience. [...] emphasis on speed, action, and excitement” (Bousé 2000 s. 2 og 4-5).

Mange av filmene skaper “an emotionally compelling and dramatic story, and that is what matters. [...] in wildlife films it is nearly always story that matters most.” (Bousé 2000 s. 36) Den amerikanske naturfilmskaperen Marty Stouffer har kommentert amerikanske TV-selskapers ønske om naturfilmer som er “packed full of drama, comedy, suspenseful cliff-hangers, and happy endings – ‘warmth and jeopardy,’ [...] As for ABC, “They weren’t interested in the day-to-day lives of wild animals going through their courtship rituals or bringing food to the nest. ... They wanted to see more babies barely escape the jaws of villainous predators while the mother risked her life to rescue her young.” ” (Bousé 2000 s. 80-81) “Stouffer was told by American network executives that they were interested mainly in chases, narrow escapes, mothers risking their lives to save their young, and suspenseful cliffhangers.” (Bousé 2000 s. 137)

“Given the pervasive media image of nature as a site of action and excitement, it is not surprising that a common complaint heard in national parks is that the animals don’t seem to *do* anything; they just lie there. [...] This is also true in zoos, where, as John Berger has noted, animals almost never live up to expectations, and where, especially to children, “they appear, for the most part, unexpectedly lethargic and dull. [...] a woman who thought that “wildlife films actually discouraged children: they made nature seem so spectacular, and when the children rushed out into the woods burning with enthusiasm, they found there wasn’t a bird to be seen.” [...]”

Wildlife films may be full of scientific facts, but they have largely been freed of the responsibility of looking just like reality. Like advertising, they have become an entertaining art that operates according to its own codes and conventions.” (Bousé 2000 s. 6-7)

“A film about prairie dogs, for example, shows one of them confronting a ferret, a coyote, an owl, a badger, a falcon, a bison, a storm, a fire, and a flood, all in direct succession, if not in real time. The narrator remarks, “In nature, breathless moments and narrow escapes are all part of the *daily routine*.” Another film repeats the pattern: in only a few minutes of screen time, a single prairie dog is depicted as confronting a pronghorn antelope, a bison, a rattlesnake, a badger, an eagle, and a marsh hawk, again edited together in a way that suggests real time. The narration concludes that “these small dramas of life and death are *typical of any day* on the prairie.” In fact, encounters with predators are quite rare for prairie dogs, just as they are for many other “prey species,” if only by virtue of the fact that most of them outnumber predators greatly. Still, wildlife films often follow a formula of successive predator-prey interactions.” (Bousé 2000 s. 8-9) Et annet velbrukt mønster for filmene er “the year-in-the-life, or “life-cycle” story line, with its grounding in the cycle of the changing seasons” (Bousé 2000 s. 143).

Hugo Van Lawick’s films for Partridge confirmed his commitment to biographical storytelling, with the separation-initiation-return formula being firmly in evidence in films such as *The Year of the Jackal* (1990), *The Wild Dogs of Africa* (1990), and *Born to Run* (1994), as well as in his 1996 theatrical feature *The Leopard Son*.” (Bousé 2000 s. 150)

“[R]espondents in the United States, Japan and Germany expressed strong, positive attitudes toward large and higher vertebrates, especially mammalian and bird species generally regarded as aesthetically appealing, culturally important, and historically familiar [...] This sort of skewed emotional attachment is the reason for the tendency, widely noted in wildlife conservation, for the focus on particular “charismatic” species of animals, such as pandas, elephants, and whales, while other species attract far less, if any, public concern [...] The saving of such “celebrity” species can come to represent the conservation of wildlife as a whole. An example of this is international whale conservation, in which “whales have come to play the role of a metonym for nature” [...] Whaling becomes a symbol of humanity’s destructive relationship to the environment in general, and whaling nations such as Japan or Norway are accordingly cast as environmental miscreants. Large terrestrial carnivores such as the wolf have also been accorded a special status. In North America, “[t]he wolf has functioned as a particularly powerful barometer of changing and conflicting attitudes toward wildlife” [...] Special status – now ecologically predicated – continues to be invoked for wolves and other large carnivores in relation to future conservation strategy. The scale of their home range makes them “umbrella species,” species whose habitat encompasses the habitats of a great many other species and that can serve as “good indicators of complete and

healthy ecosystems” (Noss et al. 1996: 950).” (John Knight i <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1178791.pdf>; lesedato 27.05.22)

“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) En film om regnskogen “people seeing the film are likely to image that the forest is pullulating with creatures, whereas in fact they are extremely difficult to find.” (David Attenborough sitert fra Bousé 2000 s. 16)

“If disappearing species, such as the wolf, became ubiquitous in mass-produced stories and images, could it undermine public perceptions of the reality of their dwindling numbers, or of the threats to their existence?” (Bousé 2000 s. 97)

Naturfilmer “often betray sympathies that lie with animals whose interests may be in conflict with those of humans” (Bousé 2000 s. 21).

“[T]here often seems a greater need for voice-over narration to interpret behaviors that might otherwise seem foreign or offensive to the cultural sensibilities of many viewers” (Bousé 2000 s. 24).

“The film *Dressing for Dinner* (1993), a survey of animal feeding behavior, opens with this recitation by narrator Anthony Hopkins: “Survival of the fittest: the strongest, the fastest, the toughest. In evolution’s world it is always muscle that survives ... *always.*”” (Bousé 2000 s. 34) Adrian Ivakhiv skriver i artikkelen “Creating the World We Must Save: The Paradox of Television Nature Programs” (1998): “In nature documentaries [...] viewers are commonly encouraged to identify with an omniscient narrator and all-seeing camera, assuring an “innocence of involvement in the forces affecting the natural world” even while being allowed a penetration of that world’s most inaccessible reaches (232).” (her sitert fra <https://www.uvm.edu/~aivakhiv/GreenFilmCrit.pdf>; lesedato 29.12.22)

“[M]ost wildlife films are based on a treatment, if not on a script (often as a requirement for obtaining funding commitments), so that wildlife filmmakers usually go into the field with a list of preselected shots and scenes, as well as of actions and behaviors they hope to capture on film. Some wait for weeks until the desired actions occur. In such cases, they are essentially seeking footage to illustrate preconceived ideas rather than to discover something new. The long hours of waiting for desired behaviors are not only a constant theme in many of their written accounts, but have even led some impatient filmmakers to resort to provocation and staging in order to capture on film the actions they need to suit their storyline.” (Bousé 2000 s. 25)

“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 thumb 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 Sumatrasheshornet 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>; lesdato 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 filmsjangerer. 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)

“It is difficult enough to record sync sound under any conditions in the wild, but it is virtually impossible when using long lenses. As a result, nearly all sound in wildlife films is added later, and much of it is fabricated by technicians in a studio using various props. Attenborough has noted, “When you’re filming with a long-focus lens, you can’t record the real sounds; many of those horrible bone-crunching noises are actually done by a man in a studio, carefully crunching bones in front of a microphone.” [...] sound works to control the potential for disunity, helping to unify into a conceptual whole shots that may in fact be unrelated to each other,

suggesting a spatial and temporal unity that may never have actually existed.”
(Bousé 2000 s. 32)

Filmskaperne kan bruke “slow-motion photography that may maintain spatial continuity, but no longer depict real time. [...] In films for popular audiences, the main function of slow-motion is to create dramatic, eye-grabbing images that hold their attention – regardless how unreal the depiction of reality becomes. Boswall recalls being told by one filmmaker that he had filmed sea lions in slow-motion because “it would add grandeur,” not science. The problem with this, he argues, is that “the slower an animal moves, the larger it appears,” and that this makes the filmmaker’s decision not just an aesthetic choice but an ethical one. Why? Because to lead viewers to make a false inference, even if only about an animal’s size, is to *mislead* them, and to *mislead* viewers is a violation of their trust and of the filmmaker’s ethical responsibility to them.” (Bousé 2000 s. 10-12)

“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 dyrrene 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).

“[T]echnological innovation has become so central that it is often presented as the driving force behind attempts at representing nature. Commenting on Frédéric Rossif’s *La Fête sauvage* (1976), [John] Berger reminds the reader that “each of these pictures lasted in real time less than three hundredths of a second, they are far beyond the capacity of the human eye.” To him this evidences a concern for animals as objects of interest within the field of “our ever-extending knowledge.” In exploring how we document animal life, we are not so much asking how we look at animals, but how ever-more sophisticated cameras look at them for us.”
(Diane Leblond i <https://journals.openedition.org/inmedia/1957?lang=en>; lesedato 30.08.22)

In-Flight Movie (1987) ble filmet av blant andre briten John Downer, for BBC, på nyskapende måter. I et intervju fortalte han: “I put cameras on birds, filmed them wingtip to wingtip from the air as well as from model gliders shaped like birds. I also pioneered the use of a model helicopter as a filming platform. [...] For the first

time, we were able to mount real HD cameras on condors, vultures and snow geese and see the world as they see it. We used microlights to fly with imprinted birds, filming at high speed over some of the world's great cities. We created a vulture cam, a model of a flying vulture, which could film from inside the flock. For the first time, we used multi-bladed drones to film massed flocks of 2 million flamingos. In fact, through the course of the series, we must have attached cameras to every conceivable flying device; from paragliders and gliders to full-sized helicopters with stabilized mounts and, of course, the birds themselves. [...] The camera-carrying birds wore specially-designed harnesses. They were created to be as comfortable as possible and not interfere with the birds in flight. All the birds were trained to become used to flying with the harness before the camera was added. [...] Imprinting is a technique where birds are exposed to a foster parent as soon as they hatch. They then react to this surrogate parent as if it were their mother, following "her" wherever she goes. We imprinted our birds on selected crew members so they'd fly alongside their human "mother" as soon as they were able to fly, even if this person was in a moving boat or vehicle or even up in a microlight. [...] I hope that people will discover that birds are clever and adaptable creatures often with a complex social life not so different from our own. They have an unrivalled knowledge of the life of the planet and through their remarkable journeys they bring countries and continents together in ways that are constantly surprising." (<https://www.pbs.org/wnet/nature/earthflight-q-a-with-earthflight-filmmaker-john-downer/8392/>; lesedato 04.06.22)

"*Le Peuple migrateur* (*Winged Migration*, 2002), produced and directed by [Jacques] Perrin and released by Sony, earned \$10 million in the United States. The film, containing footage obtained from inventive aerial camera units, and sometimes using imprinted geese, ducks, cranes, and storks hand-raised for use in the film, suggested that significant audiences could still be drawn to theaters around especially spectacular nature projects. [...] *La Marche de l'empereur* (*March of the Penguins*), directed by Luc Jacquet for Bonne Pioche, was released in the United States by Warner Independent and National Geographic films in 2005 to wide acclaim. *March*, said to have been made for \$2 million, earned \$70 million in the United States within three months, was awarded an Academy Award in 2006, and became a best-seller as a home video release. Despite these exceptional theatrical releases, nature remains in the twenty-first century a predominately televisual genre." (Cynthia Chris i <https://www.encyclopedia.com/arts/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/nature-films>; lesedato 27.05.22)

I *The Birth of a Flower* (1910) av Percy Smith "Time-lapse photography shows plant growth." (Bousé 2000 s. 201)

"The opening of the weird rafflesia flower in a tropical rainforest was filmed on location in Indonesia by freelance film-makers Jim Frazier and Densey 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)

Naturfilmserien *Life in Colours* (2021; med David Attenborough) gjør bruk av "UV cameras [...] Ultraviolet cameras can't film both in our human color vision and ultraviolet at the same time, so we had to adapt the system to have these two cameras – a beam splitter system, it's called – where the light is split into two parts that the ultraviolet goes into one camera, and the other color range, red, green, blue – we call it RGB – goes into the other camera. [...] The polarization cameras, however, are so new that they've primarily only been used by scientists before now. You can also see their effects in the first episode of *Life in Color* during the segment on fiddler crabs on the mudflats of Northern Australia. The crabs use polarized light to spot other crabs from far away. [...] One was being used in the U.S. for medicine to detect cancerous tumors, and another one was developed in Australia by a biologist who was studying underwater animals. [...] Those cameras didn't take big lenses, so we could only film animals that are easy to get very close to [...] a first glimpse into the world that's been hidden from our eyes until now." (<https://www.movie-maker.com/david-attenborough-life-in-color-netflix-sharmila-choudhury/>; lesetdato 27.05.21)

Margaret Cohens bok *The Underwater Eye: How the Movie Camera Opened the Depths and Unleashed New Realms of Fantasy* (2022) "tells the fascinating story of how the development of modern diving equipment and movie camera technology has allowed documentary and narrative filmmakers to take human vision into the depths, creating new imagery of the seas and the underwater realm, and expanding the scope of popular imagination. Innovating on the most challenging film set on earth, filmmakers have tapped the emotional power of the underwater environment to forge new visions of horror, tragedy, adventure, beauty, and surrealism, entertaining the public and shaping its perception of ocean reality. Examining works by filmmakers ranging from J. E. Williamson, inventor of the first undersea film technology in 1914, to Wes Anderson, who filmed the underwater scenes of his 2004 *The Life Aquatic with Steve Zissou* entirely in a pool, *The Underwater Eye* traces how the radically alien qualities of underwater optics have shaped liquid fantasies for more than a century. Richly illustrated, the book explores documentaries by Jacques Cousteau, Louis Malle, and Hans Hass, art films by Man Ray and Jean Vigo, and popular movies and television shows [...] the book also asks compelling questions about the role film plays in engaging the public with the

remote ocean, a frontline of climate change.” (<https://english.stanford.edu/publications/underwater-eye-how-movie-camera-opened-depths-and-unleashed-new-realms-fantasy>; lesedato 29.12.22)

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)

“A wildlife camera trap is a camera left at a location, rigged so that any approaching wild animal will automatically trigger the shutter release and take one or more photos or video sequences, without the photographer being present. The first attempts to do this were made as early as 1877. In 1906, camera trap photos were seen widely for the first time when George Shiras published photos of free-living wildlife in the National Geographic Magazine. [...] Miniaturised heat and motion sensors have replaced wires and pressures pads. Invisible infra-red flash units provide night time monochrome images without the startling effect of conventional flash. Very large numbers of high quality digital images can be stored and modern batteries allow these devices to operate unsupervised night and day in remote locations for months at a time. This gives us the opportunity to learn new things about elusive wild animals and some of the problems they face.” (<https://www.zsl.org/what-we-do/conservation/protecting-species/monitoring-and-technology/camera-trapping>; lesedato 18.05.24)

“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/>; 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)

"Given the emphasis in wildlife films on narrative, on dramatic action, and on creating animal characters that invite viewers to become involved emotionally, it should not be surprising that one of the chief ways in which they communicate scientific content is by dramatizing it with the actions of individual animals." (Bousé 2000 s. 33) "[S]cience's inability to deal with animals as individuals often places it at odds with the goals of wildlife filmmakers who, working in a storytelling medium, often rely as much as the nature writers on audiences' emotional involvement with individual animal characters." (Bousé 2000 s. 110)

"[E]vidence nevertheless suggested that staging, manipulation, and fakery were widespread, and that wildlife films may not have been as true to nature, or to science, as they appeared. [...] calculated constructions and deliberate illusions." (Bousé 2000 s. 85)

Disney lanserte i 1957, i serien *True-Life Adventures*, dokumentarfilmen *Perri*, der ekornet Perri ble spilt av "many different squirrels" (Bousé 2000 s. 29). Publikum skulle tro at de kun så ett ekorn som hovedperson, en film med "a strong central character and a biographical structure" (Bousé 2000 s. 131).

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 film-makers [...] seem to have developed a collegiate view, amounting to a code of conduct, that any scene can be staged provided it depicts a scientifically observable fact. [...] most nature films are entertainments, based on truth but not “true”. They are cut and assembled just like dramas, from disparate shots, sometimes filmed months and miles apart. Just as film-stars have body doubles, so the fox that enters the rabbit hole may not be the same one that eats the rabbit; it may even have been filmed in a different continent.” (Stephen Mills i <https://www.abc.net.au/cm/lb/5617728/data/pocket-tigers-article-data.pdf>; lesedato 29.12.22)

“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)

I BBC-produksjoner har det vært vanlig med “behind the scenes” på slutten av filmene eller episodene, der vi får se filmteamet og høre om deres utfordringer. “Such “behind the scenes” moments have actually become a regular feature of the Natural History Unit’s production, and crucial to their documentary agenda [...] if documentaries necessarily make a truth-claim in order to be understood as such, this claim must somehow be rendered within the programme or presumed to have been part of its production process. [...] One of the key ways in which many BBC wildlife programmes make this claim is via their accompanying ‘making of’ programmes.” (Diane Leblond i <https://journals.openedition.org/inmedia/1957?lang=en>; lesedato 30.08.22)

“[T]he 2015 Sky TV series *David Attenborough’s Conquest of the Skies* (Lee 2015) [...] explored the evolution of flight. In a fourth episode, screened after the official episodes, the production techniques used to make the series were examined. This episode was called *The Making of David Attenborough’s Conquest of the Skies* (McGown 2015) and was promoted as offering rare “behind-the-scenes” insights into how wildlife or natural history television was created. “Making of” shows have been on the increase over the last twenty-five years. They are symptomatic of what Teurlings (2013a) describes as the rise of “the society of the machinery” or a major mutation in popular culture in which the self-evidence of representations is debunked, and audiences are invited to look beyond appearances and engage with the technical and organizational aspects of media production (p. 518). [...] These programs celebrate the dynamics of staging and the ingenuity of media production processes in getting animals to perform their natural selves (Gouyon 2016).” (Gay Hawkins og Ben Dibley i <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0162243920945381>; lesedato 13.12.22)

“Provoking animals is the central concept that underpins how we approach and analyze *The Making of David Attenborough’s Conquest of the Skies*. [...] It draws attention to the processes of both stimulating and crafting animal realities, and the effects of broadcasting and circulating them. It also foregrounds the event and

interactivity of provocation as a reality-generating technique involving both an interventionist *and* a reactive relation to the world. The idea of a genuine unconfined empirical reality collapses in this framework, as do concerns with representational correspondence or accuracy. Instead, questions about the specific techniques and practices of media provocations become central, particularly how the world pushes back and how animal bodies and agencies are registered and negotiated.” (Gay Hawkins og Ben Dibley i <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0162243920945381>; lesedato 13.12.22)

“Making of”- og “Behind the scenes”-filmer er oftest basert på “revisiting key scenes in the series and showing the production processes and technical innovations involved in creating them. “Making of” shows, while not always a full episode, are now a standard component of many natural history documentaries and are regularly included in DVD and web releases. As we have noted, critics of these shows often dismiss them as profit driven and offering little more than promotional celebrations of new camera technologies or the patience and tenacity of the heroic filmmaker. [...] While there is no question that one of the key functions of “Making of” shows is to extend the economic value of the content by exploiting audience fascination with the actual processes of getting animals screen, they also have other effects. According to Pick (2013, 21), their audience fascination is partially an effect of what she calls the increasing “ocular inflation” of the wildlife genre, a trend toward showing nature and animals in ways that involve heightened visibility or forms of seeing that are extensive and excessive. This ocular inflation is often framed in terms of “never before seen footage” that is celebrated as a technical feat delivering vision beyond the capacity of a normal human gaze. [...] The “Making of” program addresses the audience as savvy viewers who understand that wildlife content involves performances of nature and science and sets out to show how these performances are realized.” (Gay Hawkins og Ben Dibley i <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0162243920945381>; lesedato 13.12.22)

“The BBC has denied misleading Frozen Planet viewers with footage of newborn polar bear cubs filmed in an animal park, rather than in the wild. Episode five of the series featured the cubs in a den with their mother, with many people assuming they were born and filmed in the Arctic. But the cubs were actually in a Dutch animal park, as revealed in behind-the-scenes footage on the show’s website. The BBC said the filming was “standard practice” for natural history shows. “This particular sequence would be impossible to film in the wild,” a BBC spokesperson said. [...] David Attenborough said: “If you had tried to put a camera in the wild in a polar bear den, she would either have killed the cub or she would have killed the cameraman.” He added that an explanation about the animal park footage would have ruined the atmosphere of the sequence. “It’s not falsehood and we don’t keep it secret either,” said Sir David. [...] Later, the film cuts to a mountainside: “On lee-side slopes beneath the snow, new lives are beginning,” Sir David narrates. The den was actually created by humans before the polar bear entered.” (<https://www.bbc.com/news/entertainment-arts-16137704>; lesedato 18.06.22)

“Habituated animals have been more common on camera than viewers realize, and call into question wildlife films’ relationship to documentary.” (Bousé 2000 s. 26-27) “[S]kies could be made more blue, telephone lines and tourist vans deleted, and a few hundred wildebeests or flamingoes added to panoramic shots where needed.” (Bousé 2000 s. 189)

“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)

Det er vanlig med “percussive music to heighten the sense of drama, danger, and unease. [...] set to music, with reality’s most exciting moments highlighted, and its “boring” bits cut out.” (Bousé 2000 s. 1 og 3)

“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)

Den britiskproduserte *Night on Earth* (2020) viser dyre- og planteliv om natten rundt omkring i verden. Det brukes varmesøkende kameraer i fullstendig mørke, slik at vi ser lysende dyrekropper. Det ble også tatt i bruk ultrasensitive kameraer som kun trenger månens lys for å vise et relativt klart bilde. Fortelleren vektlegger i første episode at noe av det som er filmet, “has never been seen before” og dermed innebærer nye oppdagelser av dyrs oppførsel.

Jonathan Burt forklarer i boka *Animals in Film* (2004) at “the mobility of animals presented technical and conceptual challenges to early film-makers, the solutions of which were an important factor in advancing photographic technology, accelerating the speed of both film and camera. The early filming of animals also marked one of the most significant and far-reaching changes in the history of animal representation, and has largely determined the way animals have been visualized in the twentieth century.” (<https://www.perlego.com/book/2854424/animals-in-film-pdf>; lesedato 30.06.22)

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 Lumière's *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)

"Because many of the first wildlife films were shot in zoos, the animals were usually seen doing little more than standing or walking or being fed." (Bousé 2000 s. 153) 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 oppførelsen 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 dokumentarfilmen kommer altså til uttrykk tidlig i filmmediets barndom. Det er likevel den underholdende dyrefilmen som preger det første tiåret, og den grønne dokumentarfilmen 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)

En av de første naturfilmene lagd i Norge, i 1905, hadde den engelske tittelen *Bird Rock, Nordland, Norway* (produsert av Holmes and Dupue) (Bousé 2000 s. 199).

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)

“[T]here could be impatience with nature’s languor, with its slowness in giving rise to exciting, filmable events. Provocation, staging, and faking thus seemed born of necessity. [...] When hunting films began to arrive on the scene, with their greater dramatic, and therefore narrative possibilities, feeding was quickly replaced by hunting, stasis by action, and, ultimately, nurturing by killing. [...] Wild animals, outdoor locations, chases, pursuits, dramatic editing, and rudimentary narrative had all come together; the reign of the “safari film” had begun.” (Bousé 2000 s. 113-114)

I 1907 “Stephen Leek films elk migration in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, and later uses his films to arouse public concern for the elk, whom he favored over predator species.” (Bousé 2000 s. 200)

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 publiktilltal än den naturvetenskapliga filmen, men den har lutat sig – och lutar sig än idag – tungt mot vetenskapen för att legitimera den autenticitetsaura 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 fiksionsfilmen: 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 sjeldent 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 svenska kongeørnen som en truet art. Berg ønsket å opplyse det svenska folket om den utrydningstruende 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)

Amerikaneren Ernest B. Schoedsack regisserte *Rango* (1931), en film som “includes patient, close-up studies of animal behavior and interaction, voice-over narration, a convincing sound-effects track (although it was shot silent), continuity editing, and above all a coherent story centering on an animal protagonist who engages our sympathies, and with whom we can identify emotionally. The result may well be the first fully realized wildlife film, in the modern sense, and the first feature-length prototype of the classic narrative model that would soon give definition to wildlife films as a distinct film genre. Perhaps as a way of making *Rango* seem more of a *talkie*, a scripted studio-filmed prologue was added in which a man recounts the story of Rango, the young orang-utan, to his own young son (with obvious parallels). [...] Having engaged our sympathies for the forest’s primates, Schoedsack introduces us to Ali, the tiger hunter in the human village below the forest canopy. He and his young son make up the third father-son relationship in the film, and the one that directly parallels and intersects that of Tua

and Rango. [...] The story's real dramatic conflict, however, centers on the tiger, whose loud roar appears (by way of overly-dramatic editing) to send the entire animal population running in terror. [...] The tiger, however, is an ever-present danger to such poignancy – or so we are told in some of the narration's most regrettable excesses: “it must be remembered that any way is a good way to kill tigers. They're a menace to every creature that lives. They're outlaws – ferocious, cunning, greedy, with but one thought: to kill.” [...] Schoedsack had taken wild animal storytelling to the brink of modernity, but in the end did not broaden his story back out to the level of animal species interrelationships. Instead, it remains at the level of individual characters, where every death is tragic. Nevertheless, Rango had shown that a character study of an individual animal could also be (or perhaps could not avoid being) an animal study as well, and therefore, ultimately, a profile of an entire species with genuine scientific potential.” (Bousé 2000 s. 120-122)

Clyde E. Elliott's *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)

“In France, the experimental filmmaker Jean Painlevé (1902–1989) advanced underwater cinematography with shorts such as *The Sea Horse* (1934) and *Freshwater Assassins* (1947).” (Cynthia Chris i <https://www.encyclopedia.com/arts/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/nature-films>; lesedato 27.05.22)

“In 1935 Cornell University professor Arthur Allen successfully filmed the ivory-billed woodpecker, which was already precipitously close to extinction. His footage is considered the only existing film record of the now extinct species, but was not put into commercial distribution.” (Bousé 2000 s. 61) “Arthur Allen, an ornithologist from Cornell, makes what is thought to be the only surviving film record of the now extinct ivory-billed woodpecker.” (Bousé 2000 s. 210)

I 1937 “Cinematograph Films (Animals) Act passed in Britain to prevent cruelty to animals in films.” (Bousé 2000 s. 210) “*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 bruker-adaptert til undervisningsfilmer for skolen.

Disneys *Seal Island* (1948) “was one of the first documentaries to use an uplifting narrative voice giving animals anthropomorphic qualities, while also excluding humans from visuals (Giliberti 14). Giving anthropomorphic qualities to animals is no surprise coming from a company already established in entertainment for children, as well as animation. This practice undoubtedly helped viewers identify with the species on screen, and thus participated in increasing human empathy towards the “animal kingdom”. *Seal Island* won an Oscar, which contributed to increasing the demand for and the production of similar documentaries. Disney thus continued to produce documentaries using the same recipe until 1960, as part of their *True-Life Adventures* (1948-1960) series. These documentaries always began with a disclaimer promising that animals had not been harmed in the making and that scenes had not been staged either. For the most part, they also excluded humans from the picture, a concept which inspired the modern wildlife documentary format. Various countries in that time period began to forbid animal cruelty on screen. In 1938, the Cinematograph Films Act was signed in Great Britain in order to forbid harming animals for audiovisual purposes. Two years later in the United States, the American Humane Association created the “No animal was harmed” disclaimer” (Daniel 2020 s. 10).

“*The Living Desert* (1953), for example, was produced for roughly \$300,000 and is reputed to have earned between \$4 and \$5 million in its first domestic cinematic release. The following year in 1954, *The Vanishing Prairie* earned \$1.8 million, or around fifteen times its production costs” (Richards 2013).

“In spite of the absence of explicit conservation messages in its wildlife films, Disney won the support of conservation organisations like the Wilderness Society and the Audubon Society in the 1950s. Greg Mitman notes that by bringing beautiful visualisations of nature into people’s homes, Disney “established film as an important propaganda tool in the enlisting of public support for environmental causes” (1999: 130). One reviewer in The Wilderness Society’s publication, *The*

Living Wilderness, praised Disney's portrayal of "the simple beauty of untouched woodlands and their wild inhabitants". The Audubon Society even saw fit to award Walt Disney with the Audubon Medal in 1955, for "distinguished service to the cause of conservation" (quoted in Mitman 1999: 123). [...] The preferred narratives of many of the films, with their motifs of young animals struggling to survive and of journey's undertaken in harsh and unforgiving environments, were more theological than scientific. This is best demonstrated by *Nature's Half-Acre* (1951), a two-reel film ostensibly about the origin of species, which manages to make no mention of evolution. Instead, as Mitman observes, the "web of life" is explained in theological terms reminiscent of the nineteenth century Linnaean notion of the balance of nature, in which species vary and keep one another in check (but never explicitly evolve) under "Nature's" watchful eye (1999: 128) As such, they were designed to keep conservationists, scientists and evangelicals onside. And for a time they succeeded." (Richards 2013)

I 1950 "The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), under the direction of Philip E. Brown, begins filming birds as part of its efforts to protect them. The films are silent, and are intended as lecture accompaniments." (Bousé 2000 s. 212)

"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 Crislers 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 Crislers 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)

"Walt Disney's True-Life Adventures began with a printed statement. "These films," it said, "are photographed in their natural settings and are completely authentic, unstaged and unrehearsed." This promise was there at the start of *Seal Island* in 1948, and the following 27 minutes of narrated footage all but invented the nature documentary. [...] after *Seal Island* won an Oscar and became a hit, the struggle was to meet demand. By the time the series finished in 1960, there had been 14 True-Life Adventure films, eight of them Oscar-winners. They were now fixtures in classrooms all over the world. However, as Disney's nephew Roy, who produced the series, later put it: "We kept that disclaimer a little longer than we should have." [...] The first feature-length True-Life Adventure, *The Living Desert*, was mostly staged, according to the cameraman and animal trainer Bill Carrick. "They built all the interiors and put mice and rattlesnakes and everything in their little sets," he said. For *Perri*, essentially a live-action sequel to *Bambi* about the life of a squirrel, they found a very simple way to film the heroine narrowly escaping predators: just film her not narrowly escaping at all, shout cut, then call for a fresh *Perri*. But most infamous of all was the lemming sequence, also

in White Wilderness. Ironically, the film-makers set out to disprove the myth that the animals sometimes commit mass suicide. Instead, they show what appears to be hundreds of lemmings “migrating” senselessly into the sea. “It’s not given to man to understand all of nature’s mysteries,” says Winston Hibler in his best fireside tones. “But, as nearly as he can surmise, it would appear that these lemmings consider this body of water just another lake.” [...] In fact, man did know better, or some men did – because the footage was shot in Alberta, Canada, where there aren’t any lemmings. To fix this problem, the crew paid children in Canada’s northern Manitoba region 25¢ per lemming to round some up. The animals were then driven south and placed on purpose-built turntables to make it seem like a horde of them was passing the camera. Finally, they were taken to the Bow river and shovelled off the bank. “Soon,” we are told, to the sound of a mournful clarinet, “the Arctic Sea is dotted with tiny bobbing bodies.” [...] White Wilderness and The Living Desert each won an Oscar, and Disney continues to market the films, and other True-Life Adventures, despite Roy Disney himself having said: “There was a time when we were presenting a lot of footage – that we knew was staged – as having occurred naturally.”” (Leo Benedictus i <https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2016/nov/01/planet-earth-ii-david-attenborough-blood-thirsty-evolution-of-the-nature-documentary>; lesedato 04.06.22)

“Under Disney control, the classic form of the nature film shifted from expedition travelogues based on human activities to the struggle for survival or the coming of age of anthropomorphized animal protagonists. Most of the True-Life Adventures featured North American wildlife and landscapes, whereas pre-World War II expedition films had emphasized more exotic locations. The True-Life Adventures hinted far more often than their expedition predecessors that wild species were not endlessly plentiful and expendable but instead threatened by shrinking habitats and other factors as well as inherently valuable. They also infused explicit conservationist values into the genre.” (Cynthia Chris i <https://www.encyclopedia.com/arts/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/nature-films>; lesedato 27.05.22)

“To be fair to Disney, few of the nature film-makers who came immediately after were much better, and some were worse. Jacques Cousteau’s first film – 1956’s The Silent World, which won an Oscar and the Palme d’Or at Cannes – encourages viewers to care about marine life. Yet the crew blow up a coral reef with dynamite, accidentally ram a baby whale with their ship, shoot it out of mercy, then hack to death the sharks that come to eat the corpse. “All the sailors of the world hate sharks,” the voiceover explains, as if nothing else needs to be said. [...] Even the most famous footage of all – when Attenborough frolics with gorillas in Rwanda in 1979’s Life on Earth – might now be considered dishonest and dangerous. Dishonest because they were not typical gorillas, but groups being studied by Dian Fossey and thus comfortable around humans. Dangerous because no researcher now would interact so closely with wild gorillas, for fear of giving them a human disease to which they have little immunity.” (Leo Benedictus i <https://www.>

theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2016/nov/01/planet-earth-ii-david-attenborough-bloodthirsty-evolution-of-the-nature-documentary; lesedato 04.06.22)

Etter Disneys *Beaver Valley* (1949) “most of the “True Lifes” 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 Lifes” 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)

Disneys naturfilmer på 1940- og 50-tallet “maintained, however, that nature always “casts her characters to type,” and among them, fortunately, happened to be a number of “natural comedians.” [...] the music “enhances all the effects – but chiefly the comic ones.” [...] too many animals seemed to move to the “dance rhythms of a Hollywood musical.” [...] centering on sympathetic (i.e., humanized) animal protagonists [...] Cruelty and comedy, drama and laughs, cuteness, music – it was a formula, and whatever its shortcomings, it worked. [...] nothing is imitated like success.” (Bousé 2000 s. 67-68 og 72)

“The real Disney legacy to wildlife films, however, was not a prescriptive formula but the revelation that moving images of wild animals could be thoroughly integrated with narrative conventions from mainstream Hollywood films – formal devices, plots structures, situations, themes, motifs, and character types – with which filmmakers, distributors and audiences were already familiar and comfortable.” (Bousé 2000 s. 68)

“American television executives had become slaves to the tyranny of the Disney formula, and were conditioned to seeking only Disneyesque sorts of films about wild animals.” (Bousé 2000 s. 69)

“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)

“Cynthia Chris has published *Watching Wildlife* [2006], which looks at animals in films and television as a reflection of ideology, telling us as much about our attitudes about race, gender, and society as about the ever-shrinking wildlife on the planet. [...] the financially successful Disney films “were steeped in postwar ideologies of progress and individualism, homeland prosperity, and so-called family values” (28). [...] the extremely successful *Wild Kingdom* (1963-88), which was filmed as a travelogue in natural environments around the globe. According to Chris, “Rendering indigenous populations invisible, wildlife TV presented these lands as untroubled, untouched, unaltered nature – and as attractive tourist destinations” (60). This statement also holds true for the National Geographic Specials shown on CBS and ABC in the 1960s and 1970s and on PBS in the 1980s.” (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236831129_Watching_Wildlife_review; lesedato 27.05.22)

“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 Miman (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 avlöstes *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 följer 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 fråntas 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 välvänt inte kommer genom horder av värdelös 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)

Tyskeren Heinz Sielmanns *Woodpeckers* (1954) (også vist med tittelen *Carpenters of the Forest*) var innovativ i sin tid. “Sielmann was known for ever afterwards as ‘Mr Woodpecker’. [...] The secret of its success was that it combined a simple approach with a highly ambitious technique. As well as filming the birds entering and leaving the nest hole, and feeding in the surrounding forest, Sielmann made the bold decision to insert cameras inside the nest – something never before attempted. Zoologists and foresters he consulted considered this impossible, but his obsession with woodpeckers, fostered by a childhood spent in the woods and forests of East Prussia, drove him on. After several failed attempts, the finished film contained intimate portraits of several species, including Europe’s largest, the black woodpecker. Sielmann also pioneered the technique of cutting sections through rotten trees in order to film his subjects using their extraordinarily long tongues – up to five times the length of their bills – to remove ants from chambers inside the wood. In 1959, Sielmann published a book on the making of the film, *My Year with the Woodpeckers*, which, like the film, was a critical and commercial success. [...] In his foreword to Sielmann’s book, naturalist and broadcaster James Fisher coined the term “escape to reality” to describe films such as Sielmann’s. This phrase perfectly suited the German’s meticulous approach: spending long periods with his subjects so that he could really understand their habits [...] The same year [1974], he founded the Heinz Sielmann Foundation, devoted to giving children a better understanding of conservation issues.” (<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2006/oct/21/guardianobituaries.obituaries>; lesedato 27.05.22)

“*Serengeti Shall Not Die* [1959]. prod: Bernard Grzimek. Filmed in 35mm by Alan Root. Wins Academy Award in 1960 for “Best Documentary Feature.” The Motion Picture Academy reportedly threatened to deny the award unless Grzimek removed two lines from the narration in which he pleads for preservation of nature and wildlife.” (Bousé 2000 s. 215)

“Although wildlife films abound with examples of attempts to represent the point-of-view of animals, some of the most innovative and visually arresting can be found in *Supersense* (1988), a BBC series exploring animal perception. Its producer described it as depicting “the sensory worlds experienced by other creatures” (Downer, 1988: 9). This was followed by a sequel entitled *Lifesense* (1990), which was “inspired by the belief that the relationship between animals and ourselves could also be viewed afresh from this unique perspective” (Downer, 1991: 7). Part of its purpose was to show how animals see us.” (Bousé 2000 s. 235)

“The IMAX film *Whales* [1999], produced by National Wildlife Productions, earns nearly \$40 million at the box-office, further attesting to the future possibilities for wildlife in large-format productions.” (Bousé 2000 s. 222)

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 Pérennou naturfilm *Mikrokosmos: Folket i gresset* (1996) lar seeren i innledningen "være" et lite insekt som flyr høyt oppet 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)

TV-serien *Spy in the Wild* (2017; med David Tennant m.fl.) "embraces the double demand of the closest possible intimacy with nature and the use of state-of-the-art technology by mounting some of its cameras onto animatronic creatures, to be sent as spies amongst animal populations. The trailer for BBC One exclusively focuses on this feature, by combining images of the "spy" creatures interacting with animals with a voiceover comment: "A team of spy creatures is on a mission to uncover the secret lives of wild animals. Their hidden cameras capture extraordinary behaviour. [...] Maybe they're more like us than we ever thought possible." [...] the ambition to produce the most authentic form of immersion. This explains the effort to camouflage the cameras. [...] In the first minutes of "Love," "[Spy pup] makes a submissive gesture and wags his tail." Once the pack adopts him, "he [...] gains the most intimate view of wild dogs ever seen." [...] the play of shot-reverse shot between images of and from the spy creatures serves as a visual corollary for the interaction the series is seeking to elicit between wildlife and the machines. The crucial role this visual exchange is meant to play in enabling our feeling of immersion is made clear by the positioning of the cameras within the creatures' eyes. The intention is not simply to capture images the sort of which we would not have seen, but to put us in a position visually to interact with the animals

as their robotic homologues.” (Diane Leblond i <https://journals.openedition.org/inmedia/1957?lang=en>; lesedato 30.08.22)

Seerne av *Spy in the Wild* “were promised a companionship with the machine that would immerse us in nature, the sequence of episodes ultimately invites them to focus on the robots that humans built instead. [...] the creatures’ very status as “spies,” though presented in playful fashion, points to the aggression and power-play implied by their presence within the pack. [...] The viewer is not truly introduced to what could be an animal viewpoint; indeed, she is rather invited to marvel at how convincing our decoys look and thus fail to acknowledge the violence inherent in our voyeurism. [...] The last sentence of the trailer, “Maybe they’re more like us than we ever thought possible,” subsumes all curiosity for other ways of being under the overriding need for anthropocentric or anthropomorphic assimilation. The series as a whole makes good on that promise: before the finale, each episode centres on a “human” trait discovered in wildlife: “Love,” “Intelligence,” “Friendship,” “Mischief.” In this process of appropriation, the potential of the animal’s gaze *qua* other is eroded. It seems that what we were looking for in seeking them out was little more than a lifeless reflective surface, a mirror in which to catch a reflection of ourselves.” (Diane Leblond i <https://journals.openedition.org/inmedia/1957?lang=en>; lesedato 30.08.22)

“New convergences and techo-interventions can be seen at work in series like *Animal Camera* (BBC 2004), which ‘sets new standards in wildlife filmmaking ... [as] a miniature camera takes viewers on board a golden eagle as it soars through the air’ (BBC News Online Citation2004). *Animal Camera* uses radar transponders, infrared, ultra-slow and ultra-high-speed cameras, and ultrasound microphones to track its animal ‘prey.’” (Phil Bagust i <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10304310701861564#d1e187>; lesedato 02.09.24)

“The attempt to create that sense of being (un)comfortably close to wildlife creatures – whether these be living or extinct! – is mirrored in the frequent use of gerunds in the titles of recent (nominally) wildlife series: *Walking with Dinosaurs*, *Swimming with Dolphins*, *Talking with Fishes*” (Richard Kilborn i <http://www.ejmpcut.org/archive/jc48.2006/AnimalTV/index.html>; lesedato 05.12.14).

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 foreldrelost 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 *Cinemateket* nr. 1 i 2015 s. 11)

Annauds *Bjørnen* viser “the unlikely situation of an orphaned bear cub being adopted and shown the ways of survival in the wild by an older, more experienced adult male. [...] Scenes of a young animal separated from its mother and wandering alone in a harsh wilderness needed no commentary to have greater emotional resonance and dramatic impact. There seems little doubt that audiences will tend to root more strongly for a helpless youngster to escape danger than for a capable and experienced adult – almost regardless of the species.” (Bousé 2000 s. 115)

“*L’Ours (The Bear, 1988)*, by the eclectic French director Jean-Jacques Annaud (b. 1943), employed Bart the Bear, who also appears in *Legends of the Fall* (1994) and a dozen other films, as an adult male who adopts an orphaned cub. Entirely a fiction, *The Bear* contains many features derived from classic Disneyana: as in *Bambi*, the animal protagonist’s mother is killed, while the surrogate father and the cub evade hunters; the coming-of-age narrative also echoes elements of the *True-Life Adventures*. Annaud’s second dramatic wildlife feature, *Deux frères (Two Brothers, 2004)*, features an equally unlikely tale of twin tiger cubs, separated upon their mother’s death, abused in captivity, then reunited and returned to the wild.” (Cynthia Chris i <https://www.encyclopedia.com/arts/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/nature-films>; lesedato 27.05.22)

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 sterkt filmopplevelse for både barn og voksne.” (<http://www.filmfrasor.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 dominar: 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)

“Kunskap och känsla, riktad uppmärksamhet och ett poetiskt inlyssnande är kvalitéer hos naturfilmen, som i bästa fall kan påminna oss om att människan inte nödvändigtvis är alltings centrum. I naturfilmen vänds uppmärksamheten till artrikedom och livsberättelser i ett mikrokosmos vi sällan ägnar en tanke, eller som vi kanske inte ens vet existerar. Det behöver inte ens handla om hisnande havsdjup eller okända urskogar, utan kanske är scenen för skådespelet björken utanför vårt hus. I *Ljusår* (Mikael Kristersson, 2008) riktas kameran och mikrofonen mot “jättehagtornen”, “det knotiga äppelträdet” och “getingarnas liv inne i björkstammen”. Den cykliska livsrytmen som matchar årstidernas gång speglas uppmärksamt i filmberättelsens form och den långa tagningens tidsrum.

Kristerssons filmer representerar naturfilmen som innovativt filmiskt experiment. Kommenterandet är här ersatt av en kompromisslös naturfilmsestetik där tytnaden hörs och kameran ges tid att utforska världar bortom det mänskliga ögat. Det ligger nära till hands att skriva om de spektakulära ögonblicken av äventyr och spänning i naturfilmen, men något som är minst lika kännetecknande är den intensitet med vilken stillsamma skeenden förvandlas till ett fängslande skådespel. I en filmisk motsvarighet till naturlyriken kombineras omnämndet som respektfull gest med inväntandet och inlyssnandet av livsprocesser och existenser att uppskatta och

värna om.” (Malin Wahlberg i <https://www.svenskfilmdatabas.se/sv/i-narkontakt-med-naturen/>; lesedato 18.06.22)

Det er også andre tendenser: “[W]e now have an increasing number of wildlife programs which make use of the celebrity presenter, frequently a well-known personality from the world of TV entertainment. [...] In these cases, the hard-nosed calculation predicts a winning formula will result from sending the celebrity off to an exotic foreign location (shades of the travelogue here), where he or she will confront various forms of wildlife (shades of the adventure yarn). Another category comprises the diverse “vets and pets” series that have come to dominate our screens in the last decade or so (Hill, 2005: 135-169). Although some might not include this sub-genre within the mainstream category of wildlife programming, it could well be regarded as belonging to the expanded portfolio of wildlife/natural history. Though the animals featured in these programs are, for the most part, domesticated or otherwise made to serve human needs, the “vets and pets” series are nevertheless generically closely related to other forms of animal-centred programming, as well as being formally dependent on the structuring features of the docu-soap and other reality TV formats.” (Richard Kilborn i <http://www.ejmpcut.org/archive/jc48.2006/AnimalTV/index.html>; lesedato 05.12.14)

Serier som f.eks. BBCs *Britain Goes Wild* (2004) og *Springwatch with Bill Oddie* (2005) “secure maximum audience involvement by offering viewers the pleasure of participating in a live transmission, but at the same time use various forms of digital interactive technology to encourage audience participation in wildlife projects in viewers’ own regions” (Richard Kilborn i <http://www.ejmpcut.org/archive/jc48.2006/AnimalTV/index.html>; lesedato 05.12.14).

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 blikk på naturen. Et annet eksempel er den seks minutter lange “Evolution” (2012), som viser “mikroskopiens skjønnhet gjennom spesialdesignete 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)

“Countless animal-film festivals are in operation these days, giving animal lovers, ecology freaks, and the movie-going public an opportunity to commune with nature and creating a new theatrical market for wildlife films. [...] Meanwhile, the production of wildlife films for television has expanded geometrically with the establishment of a number of cable channels specializing in such fare, such as Animal Planet, the National Geographic Channel, and the Discovery Channel.” (Jan Christopher Horak i https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236831129_Watching_Wildlife_review; lesedato 27.05.22)

De fleste naturfilmer som handler om ett dyreslag, handler om sjeldne og “sympatiske” dyr. “Kjempepandaen, tigeren, 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 storøyde 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 ujestmilde 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)

“In 2002 environmental campaigner George Monbiot wrote an article in *The Guardian*, in which he criticised the exclusion of environmental issues in wildlife documentaries. “There are two planet earths,” he wrote. “One of them is the complex, morally challenging world in which we live, threatened by ecological collapse. The other is the one we see in the wildlife programmes”. He singled out David Attenborough for his harshest criticism: “He shows us long loving sequences of animals whose populations are collapsing, without a word about what is happening to them. Indeed, by seeking out those places, tiny as they may be, where the habitat is intact and the population dense, the camera deliberately creates an impression of security and abundance.” (Monbiot 2002) In response, Attenborough defended his programmes by citing *The State of the Planet* (2001), his recent assessment of the “present ecological crisis”, and arguing that the main focus of his other series was “zoology”, an academic discipline which he clearly viewed as separate from environmental politics and conservation (Attenborough 2002b). [...] Attenborough’s defence that his programmes cater to an interest in “zoology” serves to emphasise the point that the exclusion of environmental issues from the majority of wildlife documentaries arises in part from the wildlife genre’s focus on uncontroversial science.” (Richards 2013)

“David Attenborough’s landmark series, by contrast, with their focus on anatomical adaptions and concise explanations of animal behaviour, evoke nature as “balanced and ordered” and deliberately avoid controversy (Jeffries 2003: 529). [...] The stability of the blue chip format, with its reliable economic returns, meant that BBC landmark series shied away from controversial topics in science and environmental politics. In any case, Attenborough regarded the narrow focus on zoology in his landmark series as entirely justified. When asked in an interview in 1984 about his responsibility to the environment as a filmmaker, he argued: “As a conservationist, I think I would be doing the world a great disservice if I tacked onto the end of every single programme that I did, a little homily to explain yet again that mankind is wrecking the environment that I have been showing. My job as a natural history filmmaker is to convey the reality of the environment so that people will recognise its intrinsic value, its interest, its intrinsic merit and feel some responsibility for it. After that has been done, then the various pressure groups can get at them through their own channels and ask them to send a donation to, let us say, the World Wildlife Fund” (Attenborough quoted in Burgess and Unwin 1984: 105-106). Attenborough’s legacy, as a result of the global reach of the landmark format and the programmes he voiced for *Wildlife On One* (1977-2005), is to have

communicated the diversity and uniqueness of wild animals and plants around the globe to countless millions of viewers.” (Richards 2013)

I *Life on Earth* Attenborough “began the tradition, continued in subsequent landmark series, of addressing human impacts and broader environmental issues in his final to-camera statements. [...] This tension has arguably become more pronounced since the BBC’s joint-venture partnership with Discovery, first brokered in 1997, which means that Discovery is now the dominant co-producer of BBC wildlife programming, with considerable editorial clout. *The Life of Mammals* (2002), with a budget of £8 million, is a case in point. Vanessa Berlowitz, who produced the last episode, revealed that executives at Discovery objected to Attenborough’s final remarks in the series, in which he focused on the need to control the human population: “Perhaps the time has now come to put that process into reverse. Instead of controlling the environment for the benefit of the population, perhaps it’s time we control the population to allow the survival of the environment.” Fearing that a veiled reference to contraception might alienate viewers in the American Midwest, the Discovery producers asked for Attenborough’s narration to be altered in the US version of the series (Berlowitz 2012). But Attenborough and senior producers at the BBC steadfastly refused, and his remarks on population control remained intact.” (Richards 2013)

I *Saving Planet Earth* (2007) “Attenborough and a host of British celebrities focused on the success of individual conservation projects – Will Young on Gorillas, Graeme Norton on Wolves, Jack Osborne on elephants, and the slightly bizarre choice to send Carol Thatcher, daughter of Margaret, to the Falklands to save the albatross. In many ways these programmes were an extension of the “green crusade” films featuring environmental activists in the 1980s, which, as Luis Vivanco argues, were popular because they offered “carefully crafted win-win visions of conservation and sustainable development” (Vivanco 2002: 1202). Far from being a condemnatory lecture, *Saving Planet Earth* tended to be more up beat and inclusive. In the first episode Attenborough issued the following invitation, “Some scientists suggest that up to a quarter of animal species could be extinct by 2050. But it’s not too late – you can be involved in *Saving Planet Earth*”. Each programme explored the work of different conservation projects before appealing for public donations to the BBC Wildlife Fund, a charity formed to coincide with the launch of the series. *Last Chance to See* (2009) is another notable series in this tradition. [...] The second approach, exemplified by *Frozen Planet* (2011), was more inclusive. Following the precedent set by *The Living Planet* in 1984, in which the last episode had focused on the destruction of ecosystems, an entire episode of *Frozen Planet* was devoted to the exploration of the effects of climate change on the Polar Regions.” (Richards 2013)

“Over thirty networks bought the series [*Frozen Planet*], but a third of them rejected the additional two episodes. It was rumoured that Discovery, the largest co-producer of the series, were planning not to air the climate change episode due

to a “scheduling issue”. Instead, producers at Discovery planned to incorporate elements from this programme into their final show (Bloxham 2011). In effect, Discovery’s proposal meant that Attenborough’s nuanced take on climate change would not be broadcast in the US, where the largest population of climate change deniers resides. Discovery later backtracked on their decision, and opted instead to broadcast all seven episodes including the one on climate change (Hough 2011).” (Richards 2013)

“Martin Hughes-Games, a presenter of BBC’s Springwatch, says David Attenborough series ignores damage humans are doing [...] David Attenborough’s blockbuster nature series Planet Earth II is “a disaster for the world’s wildlife” and a significant contributor to planet-wide extinctions, a rival natural history producer has claimed. The BBC programme concluded in December and drew audiences of more than 12 million viewers but presents “an escapist wildlife fantasy” that ignores the damage humans are doing to species everywhere, according to Martin Hughes-Games [...] In a direct attack on Attenborough’s flagship series, which features a soundtrack by the Hollywood composer Hans Zimmer and became the most-watched nature programme in 15 years when it was broadcast last month, Hughes-Games said the makers had ignored evidence of mass extinction, most recently from the World Wide Fund for Nature and the Zoological Society of London, which reported last year that between 1970 and 2012 there had been a 58% decline in the abundance of vertebrates worldwide. “These programmes are still made as if this worldwide mass extinction is simply not happening,” he said. “The producers continue to go to the rapidly shrinking parks and reserves to make their films – creating a beautiful, beguiling, fantasy world, a utopia where tigers still roam free and untroubled, where the natural world exists as if man had never been.”” (Robert Booth i <https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2017/jan/01/planet-earth-ii-david-attenborough-martin-hughes-games-bbc-springwatch>; lesedato 13.12.22)

Hughes-Games hevdet at “Attenborough and others “are lulling the huge worldwide audience into a false sense of security [...] No hint of the continuing disaster is allowed to shatter the illusion.” Attenborough, however, did use the series to make an impassioned plea for greater conservation. At the end of the final episode he spoke of “our responsibility to do everything within our power to create a planet that provides a home not just for us, but for all life on Earth”. He has also insisted that his programmes enable an increasingly urbanised global population to remain in touch with nature. “More people are out of touch with the natural world than have ever been,” Attenborough said at a press conference to launch the series in October. “But since we depend on the natural world, understanding it is absolutely paramount. Television can provide that link better than ever before, in some ways. Fifty years ago, there was hardly a species on [Planet Earth II] that anyone would have seen. Now everybody has. It’s remarkable, and it’s valuable.” [...] Hughes-Games proposed injecting conservation themes into TV dramas and children’s programming.” (Robert Booth i <https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and>

radio/2017/jan/01/planet-earth-ii-david-attenborough-martin-hughes-games-bbc-springwatch; lesedato 13.12.22)

“[T]he Natural History Unit [in BBC] fell back on Attenborough’s traditional recipe of safe celebration of nature through marvellous pictures with only oblique, almost whispered moral generalities about our responsibility to look after it.” (Chris Rose i <http://threeworlds.campaignstrategy.org/?p=1396>; lesedato 13.12.22).

“The single biggest thing the BBC could now do for conservation would be if it were to announce that the corporation is no longer making ‘blue chip’ nature spectaculars because it is concerned that they mislead people about the real state of the planet. If David Attenborough announced there would be no *Planet Earth III* until the tide was turned on destruction of the environments it showed, that would send an unequivocal signal and provoke a global social and political conversation. [...] unless the content of the programme or an accompanying ‘message’ makes the audience feel it is somehow responsible, there will be no ‘it’s about me’ alignment and no result. [...] Film makers have long known that ‘all doom and gloom’ is a turn-off: healthy people stay sane by not making themselves unhappy.” (Chris Rose i <http://threeworlds.campaignstrategy.org/?p=1396>; lesedato 13.12.22)

BBCs *Our Planet* (2019) fikk i løpet av 2020 over to hundre seeranmeldelser og -kommentarer på nettsidene til International Movie Database. En seer uttalte at serien hadde “breathtaking shots” og var “jaw-dropping beautiful”, men samtidig “depressing og annoying” på grunn av de mange påminningene i serien om naturødeleggelse og habitater som forsvinner. En seer kalte det “doom and gloom”, en annen “blatant propaganda”, en tredje “a global warming scare documentary” og en fjerde skrev: “This show is just slap on the face of humanity, perhaps one of the last few wake up calls before everything reaches a point of no return”. I serien vises det hvordan hvalrosser som har klatret opp på høy klipper faller ned og slår seg i hjel. I filmen antydes det at det er klimaendringer som har skylden for denne oppførselen, mens en seer skriver at hvalrossenes oppførsel antakelig skyldtes at det var isbjørner i området og at mennesker var til stede og filmet.

“*Our Planet* was able to integrate global warming so fully in its narrative, despite the usual reluctance of producers to create politically engaged wildlife documentaries.” (Daniel 2020 s. 21) “*Our Planet* does not attempt to create change through fear but through empathy, hope and highlighting connections. [...] The two essential emotions *Our Planet* creates for that purpose are shock and hope.” (Daniel 2020 s. 39-40)

“Plastic apparitions are distressing in this type of documentaries, because they take viewers out of the story to remind them of the doom of climate change. Therefore *Our Planet*’s scarce use of such images, participates in alleviating some of the paralyzing fear which is associated with climate change.” (Daniel 2020 s. 41)

“Mennesker får stor plass i den nye sesongen [i 2024] av den populære BBC-serien *Planet Earth*. Betyr det at den klassiske naturdokumentarens tid er over? [...] I Storbritannia har seere kastet seg over den nye sesongen av *Planet Earth*. Serien er antagelig verdens mest populære naturdokumentar [...] - Alle sesongene er som trinn i evolusjonen av forholdet vårt til naturen, historiefortelling og hva publikum ønsker seg. Det sier Mike Gunton, med tittelen Creative Director and Senior Executive i BBC Natural History Unit, og flere prisbelønte naturdokumentarer på CV-en. Arbeidet med *Planet Earth* begynte for vel tyve år siden. Som produsent av serien har Gunton samarbeidet tett med den legendariske programlederen Sir David Attenborough, som er fortelleren også på *Planet Earth III*. Den største forandringen i den nye sesongen er alle menneskene. To av åtte episoder er viet mennesker, men de dukker også opp ellers i serien. I en episode om ferskvann møter vi plutselig en gruppe pakistanere som redder delfiner som setter seg fast i vanningskanaler. [...] - Den tredje sesongen viser at vi ikke kan overse at nesten alle levende skapninger på jordkloden nå forholder seg til, eller rammes av, menneskelig aktivitet, sier Gunton. [...] David Attenborough laget allerede i 1980-årene en serie som heter *The Living Planet*. Den siste episoden handlet om menneskehets makt og hvordan vi ville endre verden, sier Gunton. - Men jeg tror villmarken fremsto så fjern, så enorm og mektig. De med førstehåndskunnskap kunne se problemene, men for folk flest var det kanskje vanskeligere å fatte hva som var i emning. Nå, fortsetter Gunton, er appetitten for slike fortellinger sterkt. - Da filmskapere fortalte slike historier før, virket ikke folk særlig interessert, for å være ærlig. Nå er det en yngre generasjon som ikke bare er interessert, men også bekymrer seg veldig. De vil vite mer, og krever nesten å høre om disse tingene. [...] Gunton kaller naturen i dag for “en ny villmark”. Flere arter tilpasser seg nærheten til menneskene på fascinerende vis, mener han. Serien viser sjimpanser som krysser en trafikkert vei hver dag for å finne mat i en landsby i nærheten. Krabber tar bolig i plasten som fortrenger sjøgress.” (Anders F. Lunde i *Morgenbladet* 19.–25. januar 2024 s. 32)

Den siste episoden i *Planet Earth III* har tittelen “Heroes” og “handler om mennesker som tar opp kampen mot naturtapet. En ung mann har som livsprosjekt å finne en make til en enslig, utrydningsstruet frosk. To kvinner blir fostermødre for den utrydningsstruktede fuglen skalletibis når eggene klekker, og lærer ungene å fly så de kan overvinstre varmere steder. En vietnamesisk kvinne tar på seg skjult kamera i dekkoperasjoner for å avsløre kriminelle som selger elfenben ulovlig. [...] - Mye dystert skjer [sier Gunton]. Enkelte anmeldere i Storbritannia reagerte med å si at “det er for vondt, jeg kan ikke se det”, mens andre sa det motsatte, og at den ikke slo hardt nok. [...] Serien må ha underholdende innslag, det må være litt eskapisme. Hvis man kringkaster et manifest, får man bare 20 seere som alle var enige i utgangspunktet. Vi må ha et publikum, og underholdning er måten å gjøre det på. Gunton er ikke redd for en typisk kritikk mot naturdokumentarer: såkalt antropomorfisme. Dette betyr å menneskeliggjøre dyr, og lage en fortelling der seeren typisk legger sine følelser over på arten som portretteres. - Når du ser noen av disse dyrene kjempe for å overleve, kan du ikke unngå å projisere ditt liv over på

dem eller motsatt – og det synes jeg er bra. Jeg elsker når folk kritiserer meg for å være antropomorfisk. Jeg gnir meg i hendene og sier: “Bra, jeg har lyktes. Jeg har fått deg hektet”. [...] - Det er ikke det spektakulære som nødvendigvis gjør at du lykkes, men hjertet, sannheten og underet. [...] - *Planet Earth* påvirker folk på komplekse måter. Noen ganger ser du dyr dø på veldig ubehagelig vis på grunn av menneskelig aktivitet. Dette vekker nok sinne og frustrasjon. Men jeg tror også folk synes serien er sjeldent empatisk.” (Anders F. Lunde i *Morgenbladet* 19.–25. januar 2024 s. 32-33)

“The UK secretary of state for the environment at the time of the diffusion of *Blue Planet II*, Michael Gove, claims that the viewing of the series “haunted” him and inspired his proposition to ban single use plastic on a governmental level [...] governmental plastic bans did follow his proposition, and after *Blue Planet II*’s release, the BBC also announced that they aimed to ban single use plastic from their offices by 2020. They shared a three step program including the removal of containers from their cafeterias, as well as plastic cutlery, packaging and cups (“BBC to Ban Single-Use Plastics”). On the website of the BBC, the director general Tony Hall is quoted claiming “like millions of people watching *Blue Planet II*, I was shocked to see the avoidable waste and harm created by single-use plastic. We all need to do our bit to tackle this problem, and I want the BBC to lead the way” (“BBC to Ban Single-Use Plastics”). *Blue Planet II* seems to have helped taking concern for plastic pollution to high decisional spheres of society, thus creating environmental laws. While accurately measuring the impact of the series on the entirety of its viewers seems impossible, the fact that both Michael Gove and Tony Hall were able to influence the discourse surrounding plastic in the UK and credit the series does seem to show that such documentaries can have a real impact.” (Daniel 2020 s. 25-26)

“*Our Planet* provides actual answers on how to stabilize the balance between humans and animals. Indeed by showing that changes in legislation are extremely effective in terms of environmental protection, the narrator teaches viewers that they can help by pressuring their governments. Later in the episode, the narrator sheds light on how a man almost single handedly saved leatherback turtles from extinction. Once again this highlights the message this episode attempts to communicate to its audience, which is that individual action can make a difference. [...] Close to the end of the episode, one of crew members shares his emotions regarding the coral reef he filmed, which lost all of its ecosystems in the time it took to make the documentary.” (Daniel 2020 s. 31)

I *Blue Planet II* forklarer en dykker “that he spent his life swimming in the area without witnessing any coral bleach. In 2015 however, while he was filming the documentary, he witnessed the complete bleaching of corals happening in only a few weeks. This passage is illustrated by hyperlapses of the coral whitening, implying the death of the species that depended on it. This is a way of putting into perspective how rapidly these changes are happening, and a way of letting viewers

know that they are living at a crucial time. As every problem presented in the episode however, the whitening of corals is given a hopeful solution. A scientist interviewed by Attenborough explains that by reducing our carbon dioxide emissions, we could keep coral reefs from disappearing before the end of the century. As this example shows the last episode of *Blue Planet II* addresses serious problems, but remains full of hope. The aim of using hope as a discursive tool is to make viewers feel empowered and take responsibility for the problems oceans are facing, after being exposed to other people making positive changes.” (Daniel 2020 s. 32)

“[E]ven positivity must be handled with caution, otherwise it would make the reality of global warming seem less serious than it is, and would not lead viewers to take action [...] Filmmakers must thus avoid being too optimistic, as that creates misinformation and inaction. Simultaneously, they must not be too pessimistic either, as pessimism can have the same effect [...] Throughout the episodes, these dramatic moments are consistently followed by uplifting ones. This technique avoids overwhelming the viewer with global warming tragedies which would be counterproductive, scare them and make them feel hopeless [...] Attenborough alternates between dramatic and admirative intonations, and between serious and comedic discourse in order to keep the viewer interested and optimistic. After giving the viewer information about global warming which seems unsurmountable, Attenborough systematically softens his tone to bring viewers back to a positive outlook, using sentences such as “but the natural world is resilient, great riches still remain, and with our help, the planet can recover.” (One Planet 00:03:00-00:03:30).” (Daniel 2020 s. 40-41)

“On the North Eastern coast of Russia, thousands of walrus are filmed from above, stacked on top of one another because of the lack of space on the narrow shore. Close ups are used to show how suffocating that environment is. To avoid this crowd, Attenborough explains [i 2. episode i *Our Planet*] that despite not being designed for climbing, some find ways to struggle up a rocky mountain. While he continues his description by saying that these animals are almost blind when outside of the water and are not made for climbing, the music takes a turn to set the tone for the shocking and saddening sequence ahead. Attenborough explains that these animals eventually need to go back to the sea. Due to their unadapted eyes and heavy bodies however, hundreds fall from the edge of the mountain in a horrific spectacle. The falls are filmed in a way which resembles the notorious photographs of people jumping from the twin towers on the infamous terrorist attacks of September 11th, strengthening the feelings of connection and empathy between humans and the “animal kingdom”. Studies have proved that when a documentary provokes anger, shock and optimism, it is more likely to create interest and lead viewers to take action [...] Shocking moments, whether experienced through images similar to the end of episode two described above, or simply through Attenborough’s narration, are always followed by positive moments. This is usually done by changing the music, using comedy, moving to a

different part of the world or by marveling at the beauty of life and its interconnections.” (Daniel 2020 s. 42-43)

“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>; lesetato 19.01.17)

“I’m sympathetic to the idea that not every documentary about the nonhuman world has to be about the environmental crisis. I think most people know about climate change at this point. Rather than a dour sermon about humanity’s environmental sins, I just want a realistic presentation of “wild” animals as creatures embedded in a highly humanized world. Instead of showing the annual wildebeest migration through the Serengeti only via footage of the ambling ungulates [= slentrende hovdyr], why not also show the fleets of jeeps ferrying thousands of tourists up and down the Serengeti’s road network to watch the migration, or the villages and farms pressed up against the borders of the park? By consistently presenting nature as an untouched wilderness, many nature documentaries mislead viewers into thinking that there are lots of untouched wildernesses left. I certainly thought there were, before I became an environmental journalist. This misapprehension then prompts people to build their environmental ideas around preserving untouched places and to embrace profoundly antihuman “solutions” to environmental problems, such as kicking indigenous people out of their homeland. In truth, wilderness doesn’t really exist. [...] when showing the elephants or the agouti, let’s pan back and show the road or the houses or the farms that surround them. Let’s see the faces and listen to the voices of the people who live near these animals. I want to hear what they say.” (Emma Marris i <https://www.theatlantic.com/culture/archive/2021/04/problem-nature-documentaries/618553/>; lesetato 04.06.22)

“Netflix recently [i 2019] launched its high-profile nature documentary *Our Planet*. Voiced by Sir David Attenborough in English [...] threats (and conservation action and success) are discussed. The only other series which comes close to the frequency with which these issues are discussed is *Blue Planet II*, but *Our Planet* is

unique in weaving discussion of these issues throughout all episodes rather than keeping them to a dedicated final episode. However, although Our Planet sounds different to other documentaries, the visuals are very similar. Nature is still mostly shown as pristine, and the presence or impacts of people on the natural world very seldom appear. [...] Despite links between information provision and behaviour change being complex and uncertain, nature documentaries may, at least in theory, elicit change in a number of ways. They may increase willingness amongst viewers to make personal lifestyle changes, increase support for conservation organizations, and generate positive public attitudes and subsequently social norms towards an issue, making policy change more likely. [...] Nearly 15% of the total word count of the Our Planet scripts focuses on what is not well with the natural world [...] While this is only slightly more than Blue Planet II, talk of anthropogenic influence is woven into every episode rather than being the subject of a dedicated final episode. Our Planet also regularly shares uplifting tales of species recoveries. Conservation successes (such as the impact of the international moratorium on whaling and the recovery of the Arabian oryx) are mentioned in every episode of Our Planet. While Blue Planet II devoted slightly more of their overall script length to such issues, again this was mostly concentrated in the final episode and not incorporated throughout the series [...] While the script regularly talks about the threats facing the habitats and species that are shown, visual depictions of these threats remain rare. There are occasional moments which do effectively show viewers just how altered our world is; satellite imagery is used to show the shockingly rapid loss of rainforest in Borneo for example, and one striking sequence reveals how much of the prairies where rutting bison were filmed have been converted to agriculture. Another hard-hitting scene that received much media attention was that of walruses plunging to their deaths from cliffs, but it was only the voiceover that associated this tragedy with anthropogenic impacts. For the most part, habitats are depicted as extensive and pristine and wildlife populations as abundant.” (Julia P. G. Jones, Laura Thomas-Walters m.fl. i <https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/pan3.10052>; lesedato 04.06.22)

“Those who make nature documentaries have, of course, long been aware that the nature they film is often drastically threatened. There has been a view that showing the threats would turn audiences off. As the well-known wildlife film maker Stephen Mills wrote back in 1997: ‘[this] tragic loss of wilderness presents the wildlife film-maker with a fundamental dilemma. So long as we maintain the myth of nature, our programmes find a wide and appreciative audience. ... But as viewing figures adamantly prove, once we make a habit of showing the bad news, our audience slinks away’ (Mills, 1997). The spectacular images revealing the grandeur of nature in Our Planet may inspire and mobilize concern for the remaining biodiversity found on Earth. While fear and guilt are often used to engage viewers, the importance of hope should not be overlooked (Howell, 2011; Moser & Dilling, 2004). However, one could argue that by using camera angles to avoid showing any sign of people, nature film makers are being disingenuous, and even actively misleading audiences. The viewer may be led to believe that things

cannot be that bad for biodiversity as what they are seeing on the screen shows nature, for the most part, doing fine. There is also the risk that by erasing evidence of people from the land/seascapes shown, wildlife documentaries further embed the idea that wild places are ‘for’ nature, and any people there are interlopers (Sandbrook & Adams, 2013). This is potentially troubling, as in many parts of the world the biggest challenge conservation faces is balancing the legitimate need of local people to use natural ecosystems with the need to protect those ecosystems from overexploitation.” (Julia P. G. Jones, Laura Thomas-Walters m.fl. i <https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/pan3.10052>; lesedato 04.06.22)

Our Planet “has gone further than previous documentaries to try to encourage viewers into specific actions. At the end of each episode, viewers are encouraged to look at online materials (www.ourplanet.com), which are explicitly focused on threats to the natural world and how individuals can make a difference, for example by eating less meat, switching to renewable energy, or supporting environmental organization. Viewers are encouraged to pledge online to make a change. [...] By bringing the threats facing nature into the mainstream (however tentatively) documentaries such as *Our Planet* help biodiversity and the pressure it faces gain a little more space in the minds of the citizens worldwide. This seems inherently valuable in an era where there are ever more demands on our attention. It is hard to avoid the impression that a billion people watching the spectacle of a pod of spinner dolphins, or marvelling at the shuffle dance of the manakins would translate (however indirectly) into an increased chance that these wonders could remain in the wild” (Julia P. G. Jones, Laura Thomas-Walters m.fl. i <https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/pan3.10052>; lesedato 04.06.22).

“Some nature film producers already complain about the sums they are charged for filming in National Parks and Nature Reserves in developing countries, even though that can obviously help conservation (a point the BBC could make a virtue of by explaining it). Maybe the BBC, Disney and the like will end up running their own parks to film in? Or possibly just resort to CGI and reworking old material.” (Chris Rose i <http://threeworlds.campaignstrategy.org/?p=1396>; lesedato 13.12.22)

“Launched in 1991, the Jackson Hole Wildlife Film Festival’s biennial 6-day conference is an unmatched international industry event drawing 650+ international leaders in science, conservation, broadcasting and media. The Grand Teton Awards – a nature film equivalent to the Oscars – honors top films selected from over 900 category entries. [...] Location: Jackson Hole, WY” (<https://www.jacksonholewy.com/events/jackson-hole-wildlife-film-festival/>; lesedato 04.06.22).

“At the century’s turn [år 2000], there were isolated efforts to start specialized wildlife and natural history filmmaking schools, the most ambitious of which combined filmmaking experience with study in biology, ethology, and other areas

of science that need more careful consideration in wildlife films. Industry leaders, however, seemed largely indifferent to such efforts.” (Bousé 2000 s. 186)

En del store naturfilmproduksjoner har fått en “companion book” (Bousé 2000 s. 173) etter at filmen eller filmserien er produsert.

Litteraturliste (for hele leksikonet): <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/litteraturliste.pdf>

Alle artiklene i leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>