Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 15.06.23

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

Science fiction-film

(_film, _sjanger) Filmer som blant annet viser alternative verdener/virkeligheter i framtiden. Filmene involverer alltid bruk av avansert teknologi (i motsetning til fantasyfilmer).

De fleste science fiction-filmer har blitt og blir fortsatt produsert i USA (Hollywood).

Regissøren Fritz Lang's *Metropolis* fra 1927 er "generally considered the first example of the science fiction genre in film." (Hoesterey 2001 s. 50)

Viktige aktører er vitenskapsmenn og astronauter. Forskere og vitenskapsmenn framstilles ikke alltid sympatisk. "*Madmen, Sceptics and Nerds: Images of the Scientist*: Benign boffins do their best to help humanity; crazed lunatics play Promethean games with humanity and the fabric of the universe; and those poor nerdy cerebral types sometimes need to summon more muscular heroics if they are to save the day. Science fiction cinema offers scientists in a range of guises, from good and bad to somewhere in between, from rigorous rationalist to completely nutty professor." (King og Krzywinska 2002 s. 43)

Noen science fiction-filmer angriper organisasjoner og institusjoner som vil bruke ny teknologi til å øke sin makt og som truer menneskeheten. En slik destruktiv organisasjon er "a typical science fiction manifestation of the evil force that subverts the scientific version of the utopian dream – one way of absolving science and the scientist from the blame when things go wrong." (King og Krzywinska 2002 s. 48)

"The science fiction films provide a solution to the problems presented by intrusion, i.e., they tell us how to deal with what may be called "the other." […] No possible advance in knowledge gained from communication could possibly outweigh the dangers It presents – the only sane response is to eradicate It. […] The uneasiness Americans feel about scientific advance and intellectuals in general is evident in many of these films – often a wild haired scientist is willing to hand over the country to the invaders in order to learn more about the secrets of the

universe. He is either annihilated by the very invaders he has tried to protect, or he regroups when confronted by the invaders' lack of concern with our traditional values and social structures. Usually, however, the scientists (often they are allied with the military) are the first to recognize the extent of the aliens' ill will and band together to defeat them. Great ingenuity and immediate scientific advance are required to win the fight, but the scientists discover the necessary materials in the nick of time and save the world. Although a few films question the absolute evil of the aliens (20 MILLION MILES TO EARTH USA, Nathan Juran, 1957; THE DAY THE EARTH STOOD STILL, Robert Wise, 1951), these films were not well received. It was those films which gave a single, unequivocal answer to the problem of "the other" which were the most successful. The message of these films was that "the other" will do only evil, no matter what blandishments disguise its true intent. The only recourse is to destroy it utterly. And, so say these films, we can. These films build on fears of intrusion and overpowering and thereby promote isolationism. Also, they imply that science is good only in as much as it serves to support the existing class structure." (Judith Hess i http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/onlinessays/JC01folder/GenreFilms.html; lesedato 05.12.14)

I essayet "The Imagination of Disaster" (publisert i *Against Interpretation, and Other Essays*, 1961) skriver Susan Sontag at science fiction-filmer "perpetuate cliches about identity, volition, power, knowledge, happiness, social consensus, guilt, responsibility which are, to say the least, not serviceable in our present extremity. But collective nightmares cannot be banished by demonstrating that they are, intellectually and morally, fallacious. This nightmare – the one reflected in various registers in the science fiction films – is too close to our reality. A typical science fiction film has a form as predictable as a Western, and is made up of elements which are as classic as the saloon brawl, the blonde schoolteacher from the East, and the gun duel on the deserted main street. One model scenario proceeds through five phases:

(1) The arrival of the thing. (Emergence of the monsters, landing of the alien space-ship, etc.) This is usually witnessed, or suspected, by just one person, who is a young scientist on a field trip. Nobody, neither his neighbors nor his colleagues, will believe him for some time. The hero is not married, but has a sympathetic though also incredulous girlfriend.

(2) Confirmation of the hero's report by a host of witnesses to a great act of destruction. (If the invaders are beings from another planet, a fruitless attempt to parley with them and get them to leave peacefully.) The local police are summoned to deal with the situation and massacred.

(3) In the capital of the country, conferences between scientists and the military take place, with the hero lecturing before a chart, map, or blackboard. A national emergency is declared. Reports of further atrocities. Authorities from other countries arrive in black limousines. All international tensions are suspended in

view of the planetary emergency. This stage often includes a rapid montage of news broadcasts in various languages, a meeting at the UN, and more conferences between the military and the scientists. Plans are made for destroying the enemy.

(4) Further atrocities. […]

(5) More conferences, whose motif is: "They must be vulnerable to something." [… og til slutt seier for menneskene]

[…] Science fiction films are not about science. They are about disaster, which is one of the oldest subjects of art. In science fiction films, disaster is rarely viewed intensively; it is always extensive. It is a matter of quantity and ingenuity. If you will, it is a question of scale." (Sontag sitert fra https://americanfuturesiup.files. wordpress.com/2013/01/sontag-the-imagination-of-disaster.pdf; lesedato 19.12.18)

" "The proliferation of science fiction films is one of the most interesting developments in post-World War II film history. An estimated 500 film features and shorts made between 1948 and 1962 can be indexed under the broad heading of science fiction. One might argue convincingly that never in the history of motion pictures has any other genre developed and multiplied so rapidly in so brief a period. […] Moreover, Alan Frank observes that the 1950s 'saw science fiction at its peak in terms of sheer output and diversity of theme and diversification into various subgenres, notably the monster picture.'..." Thus begins Patrick Luciano's intriguing book *Them or Us: Archetypal Interpretations of Fifties Alien Invasion Films* [1987]. From any perspective the emergence and popularity of low-budget Horror, Science Fiction and Monster movies in the 1950s was an extraordinary cultural fashion. One reason for their becoming fashionable was the emergence of a cinema based (or even led) by the development of new special effects: 'Monster' movies were an ideal form from which to display innovative novelties in film production." (http://www.glyndwr.ac.uk/rdover/other/the_50s_.htm; lesedato 06.05.13)

En av de første science fiction-filmene var den sovjetiske regissøren Yakov Protazanovs *Aelita* (1924). Filmen "has gone down in history with the interesting honour of being the first Soviet science fiction film. Critics have most vividly remembered its expensive Martian scenes with futuristic and Constructivist sets and costumes by Alexandra Ekster and Isaak Rabinovich and the infamous passage where the protagonists start a proletarian revolution on Mars. […] The majority of the film is set in Moscow, where the action begins, develops and has its ultimate resolution. What action does occur on Mars is eventually shown to have been illusory and a result of the hero's dissatisfied imagination, giving an end feeling of it being more of an anti-climatic non-science-fiction film if anything. […] Aside from doubts about the film's commitment to the revolution, contemporary film-makers were scathing about the film's alleged continuity with the bourgeois cinema of the Tsarist age. […] Protazanov employs a series of interlinking metaphors

centring around images of differing times, differing spaces, journeys between these spaces, substitution and doubling, building and change, and oppositions between domestic life and fantasy. It is within this context that the film draws on the realm of science fiction – not as an end in its own right, but as part of Protazanov's rich metaphoric language to talk about earth-bound affairs." (http://www.ce-review.org/00/1/kinoeye1_horton.html; lesedato 12.03.15).

"Another big Soviet innovation, led by director Yakov Protazanov's Aelita, was the development of the sci-fi genre. Aelita was the first movie to depict space flight and an alien society. On top of that, its constructivist Martian sets and costumes, as well as its unique score, set the stage for what sort of aesthetics and music people around the world would come to expect from sci-fi. In this classic, a Soviet engineer named Los dreams of building a spaceship to take him to Mars. In the meantime, he suspects that his wife is cheating on him and so kills her. Pursued by detectives, he escapes from town – in his spaceship. On Mars, Los falls in love with the Cleopatra-like Princess Aelita and organizes a Soviet-style uprising of the Martian underclass. However, the uprising reveals Aelita's true, non-communist colors." (Richard Wess i https://www.rbth.com/arts/332258-soviet-classic-movies; lesedato 15.01.21)

På 1930-tallet var Hollywood-filmene preget av den økonomiske nedgangstiden, som blant annet viste seg ved at en "mad scientist" ikke var uvanlig i periodens science fiction-filmer (Lennard Schädel i https://monami.hs-mittweida.de/frontdoor/deliver/index/docId/7729/file/20160606_BA_LennardSchaedel.pdf; lesedato 08.04.23). Den gale vitenskapsmannen bruker det teknologiske framskrittet til å true verden med undergang.

Filmene innen sjangeren produsert i Hollywood på 1950-tallet "gjenspeilte en verden av kald krig og kommunistfrykt der flygende tallerkener og invaderende romvesener var bilder på invaderende russere." (Iver B. Neumann i *Dagbladet* 28. september 2016 s. 30) "[T]here are also many cases where the 'attack/invasion' has a quasi political overtone – Communist infiltration/takeover, colonialism, anti-War message – as in many 1950s Cold War films" (Donato Totaro i https://offscreen.com/view/vertical_topography; lesedato 19.12.18).

"Science fiction appeared to occupy a unique space in being able to critique the modern world without actually representing the modern world itself, deferring critique into the future or alien worlds. […] This critique continued throughout the second world war as the genre represented war, invasion and the looming threats of totalitarian regimes. […] The genre also subtlety tackled fears of communist invasion and subversion throughout the 1950s with films like *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (1956) […] the invasion anxieties of the war years" (Michael Parkes i http://saffronscreen.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Science-Fiction-Cinema-Booklet-Day-Course.pdf; lesedato 19.12.18).

"One particular instrument associated with 1950s science fiction is the theremin, invented by Lev Theremin in the early 1920s. Its eerie wailing glissando seems to capture a sense of other-wordliness and was often used to accompany the presence of aliens, as in Bernhard Herrman's score for *The Day the Earth Stood Still*. The use of the theremin more recently in *Mars Attacks!* is an important aspect of the film's effort to evoke the character of 1950s science fiction." (King og Krzywinska 2002 s. 69)

Det ble skapt mange hybrider av SF- og skrekkfilmer. "For Marxist critics there has been a widespread and general tendency to see such films as thinly-veiled explorations or expressions of the hysteria and fear generated by the Cold War and the threat of that other 'alien Other', Communism. Mark Jancovich, in *Horror*, comments that the films "with which we are now concerned emerged during the Cold War, and the invasion of by an alien force, which they frequently feature, is supposed to represent fears of a Russian threat." However, he goes on to argue that, rather than being simple authoritarian fables and allegories of the need to meet the threat from communism (in which the 'monster' is portrayed as "something to be simply repressed or destroyed by the forces of order"), these narratives are more complex than this. They are, he suggests, concerned as much with "developments within American society as with the threat of Russian invasion", with the prevalence of forms of 'Fordist' social regulation and engineering, (relying on scientific-technical rationality) which accompanied the emergence of a regulated and ordered mass consumer society. The 'Invasion' and 'Monster' movies of the 1950s are, he concludes, far from being products of right-wing hysteria and anti-communist rhetoric, narratives preaching the necessity authoritarian resistance to the anarchy of communism: they are, he suggests, far more anarchic and libertarian in their conclusions than one might imagine in their presentation of the shadow side of "scientific-technical rationality". Looking in detail at the plots, narrative structures and forms of characterisation of such films one can see, Jancovich concludes, a barely-concealed preoccupation with social and political issues which were haunting America in the 1950s." (http://www.glyndwr.ac.uk/rdover/other/the_50s_.htm; lesedato 06.05.13)

"A film like *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* can, he [Jancovich] concludes, be read as "both pro-Macarthy and anti-Macarthy... because it is deeply concerned with a creeping conformity spreading through America, a concern that was shared by both the left and the right during the 1950s. For the right, the collective forms of social organization associated with Fordism, such as social welfare programmes, were indistinguishable from communism. These forms of social organization were a threat to American values, particularly American individualism. For the left, on the other hand, Fordist rationalization was a capitalist form of control and domination which was erasing the possibilities of resistance within the population." Whether viewed from the left or right, such readings emphasize the point that Fifties Horror B-movies are emphatically social and political narratives, with a social and political

message behind the special effects." (http://www.glyndwr.ac.uk/rdover/other/the_ 50s_.htm; lesedato 06.05.13)

"From a very different perspective, the psychological, these films can be read in a very different way, as demonstrated by Luciano's application of Jungian theory. Luciano attempts to show, by applying Jungian theories of the Collective Unconscious and Individuation, that such films were marked by a concern with the need to assimilate the unconscious 'other', a need and desire which marked American culture in the 1950s in response to growing disillusionment with science, technology, and scientific and instrumental rationality. The 'Monster Movies' of the 1950s are clearly attempting to deal, at some level, with a need to explore, however vicariously, the 'shadow' or 'dark' side of science and instrumental rationality, or they may reflect a less obvious (and almost cultural) neurotic interest in the threats to existing forms of social and political order, the cultural expression of a form of apocalypticism which pervaded American (and British) cinema in the 1950s" (http://www.glyndwr.ac.uk/rdover/other/the_50s_.htm; lesedato 06.05.13).

"The world portrayed in Chris Marker's seminal science fiction film *La Jetée* (1962) is characterized by instability on a variety of levels. Indeed, the background setting and context for this science fiction film is post nuclear holocaust earth; humanity has already realized what may be the greatest threat to its own continuation and stability. This was a possibility which, at the time of the film's release in the developing years of the cold war, was beginning to seem a possibility which need not be confined to the realms of fantastic fiction (note, for example, the Cuban Missile Crisis of the same year, 1962). With the diegetic world's surface reduced to a radioactive wasteland, people have taken refuge below ground, where they engage in maniacal efforts to save humanity through time travel facilitated by people with strong mental images of their past. The theme of madness and psychological instability looms large. Given the film's unique formal properties – except for one brief shot, it is composed entirely of still images – editing is a key stylistic and thematic element of the film." (Jason Lindop i https://offscreen.com/ view/editing_la_jetee; lesedato 15.11.18)

"Humans are supposed to embody particular qualities – especially feelings, intuition and emotions – that often clash with the demands of 'scientific' objectivity or rationality. Science fiction films can be seen as an area in which we can explore exactly what it is to be 'human', partly through the juxtaposition between the human and a variety of opposites [...]. This way of reading science fiction films owes much to a *structuralist* approach to cultural products pioneered by the French social anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss (1968). A structuralist analysis views cultural products, such as myths or popular films, as devices through which societies try to work out difficult issues in one way or another, directly or implicitly. What these products appear to offer in many cases is an imaginary way of resolving problems that may be impossible to resolve in reality. They take on board very real difficulties and give the appearance of bringing about a 'magical'

6

resolution [dette er perspektivet i Thomas Schatz' bok *Hollywood Genres: Formulas, Filmmaking, and the Studio System*, 1981]. Many science fiction films can be read as offering this kind of imaginary resolution of the opposition between the human and science, technology and rationality. They often set up an initial opposition that is eventually reconciled. Real issues are raised and difficulties are sometimes tackled quite seriously, but in mainstream films they are more likely to be evaded in the pursuit of a more reassuring narrative closure." (King og Krzywinska 2002 s. 12)

Den amerikanske regissøren Stanley Kubricks film *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968) er forholdvis eksperimentell. "Since the completion of *2001: A Space Odyssey*, Stanley Kubrick has repeatedly suggested that his films are inapplicable to verbal formulations. "I tried to create a visual experience," he said of *2001* in 1968, "one that bypasses verbalizing pigeonholing and directly penetrates the subconscious with an emotional and philosophical content. ... I intended the film to be an intensely subjective experience, that reaches the viewer, just as music does." […] *2001* at first resembles a conventional science fiction thriller, but abandons its "plot" midway through the action. The mystery of the monolith is never solved in the traditional manner, there is no climactic discovery, no conclusive explanation. Instead the viewer is left to ponder images and sequences that connote the futility of logic and the primacy of some higher intelligence. As the film deals with the limitations of human perception, it leaves the realm of familiar convention and aspired to subliminal effect." (Mark Crispin Miller i http://www.visual-memory. co.uk/amk/doc/0087.html; lesedato 15.10.08)

John F. Kennedy lansert USAs romprogram, der målet var å få amerikanere til månen, som en "New Frontier", i analogi til det "siviliserte" menneskes erobring av det vestlige USA på 1800-tallet. Kubricks arbeidstittel for det som ble *2001* var *How the Solar System was Won*, med referanse til westernfilmen *How the West Was Won* (1962; regissert av Henry Hathaway m.fl.) (Jean-Pierre Sirois-Trahan i https://papyrus.bib.umontreal.ca/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1866/19772/sirois_ trahan_jean_pierre_2008_le_monolithe_noir_de_2001_a_space_odyssey_de_stanle y_kubrick.pdf; lesedato 06.03.20). Astronautene begir sin inn i ukjent territorium med en blanding av begjær og frykt, og møtet med andre livsformer der kan minne om de hvites møte med de amerikanske urfolkene som levde der. Erobringen av verdensrommet på 1960-tallet og senere ble av amerikanerne oppfattet som en slags "forlengelse" av erobringen av Vesten i USA, og de ukjente, utenomjordiske skapningene i science fiction-filmer ble møtt med samme blanding av redsel og fascinasjon som urinnvånerne (indianerne).

Menneskene som i *2001: A Space Odyssey* har skapt den svært avanserte datamaskinen HAL 9000, og som vil overføre til den sine beste egenskaper, overfører også sitt maktbehov og sitt ønske om kontroll (Renault 2013 s. 118). Begynnelsen av filmen viser at et bein fra et dødt dyr kan bli et våpen, og senere blir HAL et våpen som mennesket ufrivillig retter mot seg selv. Teknikk er et

tveegget sverd. Konflikten mellom de to gruppene av apemennesker i starten av filmen har blitt oppfattet som et fjernt speilbilde av konkurransen eller konflikten mellom amerikanerne og sovjetrusserne om erobringen av verdensrommet (Renault 2013 s. 118). Knokkelen i lufta blir dessuten et symbol på menneskets framtidige erobringer og dominans, ikke bare over andre levende skapninger, men over hele naturen (Renault 2013 s.117).

HAL blir menneskelig gjennom å drepe slik den store apen i begynnelsen av filmen blir. Fordi den er "human", blir den farlig (Jean-Pierre Sirois-Trahan i https://papyrus.bib.umontreal.ca/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1866/19772/sirois_trahan_jean_pierre_2008_le_monolithe_noir_de_2001_a_space_odyssey_de_stanley_kubrick.pdf ; lesedato 06.03.20).

2001: A Space Odyssey har en svært gåtefull slutt. Astronauten Dave Bowman ser seg selv med grått hår i et rom utstyrt som i den franske kongen Ludvig 15.s tid. Rommet minner om et terrarium, dvs. en lukket beholder for levende skapninger som skal observeres utenfra (Hahn og Jansen 1985 s. 310). Dave lever antakelig i rommet under oppsikt av de utenomjordiske skapningene som har plassert han der. Noen lyder kan oppfattes som deres latter (s. 310). Dave ser seg selv eldes, og døende peker han på den svarte monolitten som står ved enden av senga. Dette kan bety at frelsen ligger i steinen. Kameraet beveger seg inn i monolitten, og plutselig er vi i verdensrommet, der et stjernebarn som ligner Dave svever i retning jorden. "Menneskets utvikling fra ape til engel er slutt." (Hahn og Jansen 1985 s. 311) I filmen framstilles menneskets intelligens som en impuls gitt av en utenomjordisk sivilisasjon, og menneskets vesen vil en gang inngå i denne sivilisasjonen (s. 312).

"On landing he finds himself incomprehensively in a room, decorated in a manner consistent with apparent high culture (the furniture, paintings, decor, etc) but which is emotionless and meaningless. This high culture, created by man's ability to sublimate his drives, is rendered impotent. It has lost its power over him as he reclaims his humanity from the things created by man which had become more important than himself. During this time he is brought into the intimate realisation of his mortality, he literally sees himself age a generation at a time before lying on his death bed and pointing to the final monolith to appear in the film. Remember, the monolith represents that which we do not know, that which we do not understand, that which we cannot find meaning for, and is symbolic at this moment of the unknown after death. As the camera tracks into the monolith we are literally swallowed up by this unknown, this uncertainty – we are forced to recognise it and live with it. As reward for accepting that we cannot know everything, this uncertainty, which no longer appears as scary, and for the acceptance of his own mortality, Bowman (who is now fully representative of Man) can be symbolically reborn as the 'star child'. He is fully cognisant of his mortality and capable of living with uncertainty and the unknown. He is able to return to the world he left behind (literally and metaphorically) and look upon it with new eyes. He is both child-like and god-like, and finally, shorn of the excesses of sublimation and

repression which dissolve his own freedom. He can redefine himself, as if from birth, to be master of his own destiny." (Leon Saunders Calvert i http://offscreen. com/view/2001_uncovering_intelligence; lesedato 19.09.14)

I et intervju om *2001: A Space Odyssey* sa Kubrick: "It's not a message that I ever intend to convey in words. *2001* is a non-verbal experience; out of two hours and 19 minutes of film, there are only a little less than 40 minutes of dialogue. I tried to create a visual experience, one that bypasses verbalized pigeonholing and directly penetrates the subconscious with an emotional and philosophie content. To convolute McLuhan, in *2001*, the message is the medium. I intended the film to be an intensely subjective experience that reaches the viewer at an inner level of consciousness, just as music does; to "explain" a Beethoven symphony would be to emasculate it by erecting an artificial barrier beteen conception and appreciation. You're free to speculate as you wish about the philosophical and allegorical meaning of the film – and such speculation is one indication that it has succeeded in gripping at a deep level – but I don't want to spell out a verbal road map for *2001* that every viewer will feel obligated to pursue or else fear he's missed the point. [...] certain ideas found in *2001* would, if presented as abstractions, fall rather lifelessly and be automatically assigned to pat intellectual categories [...] How much would we appreciate *La Giaconda* today if Leonardo had written at the bottom of the canvas: "This lady is smiling slightly because she has rotten teeth" – or "because she's hiding a secret from her lover"? It would shut off the viewer's appreciation and shackle him to a "reality" other than his own. I don't want that to happen to *2001*." (Kubrick i 1968; her sitert fra http://vadeker.net/articles/cinema/ kubrick/Le_monolithe_noir_de_2001_a_space_odyssey_de_stanley_kubrick.pdf; lesedato 27.04.22)

I *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968) er det vakker musikk, men relativt lite tale, og det har blitt hevdet at "the sparseness of dialogue [is] reflecting what the film presents as a waning of humanity in the face of technology and cosmic forces." (King og Krzywinska 2002 s. 71)

Bjarte Breiteigs essaysamling *Den andre viljen* (2016) inneholder en analyse av *2001: A Space Odyssey*. "Gjennom å nærlese filmelementer belyser Breiteig hvordan det gåtefulle og mangetydige manifesterer seg i hver eneste scene. I tillegg viser han konkrete eksempler på hva han mener når han forbinder det gåtefulle med metaforen "sorte hull", noe som bare "er" – i filmen representert ved den karakteristiske steinstøtten." (*Bergens Tidende* 22. april 2016 s. 51)

Den amerikanske regissøren John Carpenters science fiction-film *Dark Star* (1974) har trekk av komedie. En tenkende og selvbevisst atombombe klemmer seg fast i utskytningsrampen, og truer med å eksplodere rett under romskipet Dark Star. Astronautene klarer å få bomben til å tenke over sin egen eksistens ("Jeg tenker, altså er jeg") og sin bestemmelse i livet. Problemet er at en bombes mål med tilværelsen er å eksplodere (Hahn og Jansen 1985 s. 144).

"Moderne science fiction-film preges av et grunnleggende misforhold mellom ideer og budsjetter. […] Hollywood pumper ut den ene hjernedøde effektorgien etter den andre. […] Et av kjennetegnene på stor science fiction er som kjent at den ikke lar seg oppklare, men forblir gåtefull." (Aksel Kielland i *Dagbladet* 11. november 2016 s. 32)

I DDR, det kommunistiske Øst-Tyskland, ble det produsert noen science fiction-filmer. I et tilfelle der filmen skulle foregå i år 2500 var regissøren i tvil om hvilke bilder som skulle henge på veggene i denne fjerne framtiden – om det fortsatt skulle være bilder av Lenin og Marx (Brockmeier og Kaiser 1996 s. 283). Skulle filmen framstille kommunismen som en ideologi som varer evig?

Jon Raundalen publiserte i 2009 doktoravhandlingen *Mellom Ersatzprodukt og Massenwirksamkeit: Genrefilmen som kulturelt felt i DDR 1966-1976*, som blant annet handler om øst-tyske science fiction- og westernfilmer. I et intervju sa han: "Jeg har analysert filmene som skueplasser for konflikten mellom verdens-systemene på populærkulturens område. [...] I en av filmene, *Im Staub der Sterne* fra 1976, reiser heltene ut i rommet og redder undertrykte gruvearbeidere på en fremmed planet. En god marxistisk historie satt inn i sci fi-konteksten." (*Morgenbladet* 6.–12. november 2009 s. 44)

"It is significant that the only major film based on the Apollo Moon programme is [den amerikanske regissøren Ron Howards] *Apollo 13* [1995], which focuses on the mission that went wrong. It is the failure of technology, in this case, that enables the astronauts to prove their worth and to validate the merits of human ingenuity in the face of impending disaster." (King og Krzywinska 2002 s. 25)

"Beskrivelsen av intergalaktiske reiser gjennom "ormehull" i *Interstellar* [2014; regissert av Christopher Nolan] er så solid at filmen bør benyttes i undervisning om den generelle relativitetsteorien, ifølge en artikkel i American Journal of Physics. Særlig den visuelle fremstillingen av ormehullene skal være tatt på kornet. Til BBC sier redaktøren at "eksperter har gått grundig gjennom fysikken i filmen og funnet at den er korrekt". Regissør Christoper Nolan virker rørt over oppmerksomheten. Han beskriver ekte vitenskap som "filmens DNA". Underveis samarbeidet han tett med en fysikkprofessor, og skikkelige vitenskapelige ligninger ble tatt i bruk for å skape de visuelle effektene. Det ytterste siktemålet med filmen, sier han, var å "inspirere morgendagens astronauter"." (*Morgenbladet* 26. juni–2. juli 2015 s. 29)

Arrival (2016; regissert av Denis Villeneuve) handler om problemene med å kommunisere med utenomjordiske vesener som ankommer jorden. Filmen "invites epistemological reflection on what Christian Metz terms "film language" by invoking the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which suggests that language structures the way we think and behave. Amy Adams plays Dr Louise Banks, a linguist who attempts to communicate with an advanced alien species that uses a semasiographic

language resembling intricate mandalas with no beginning or end, no linear sequence, and no relationship to spoken sounds. "They use non-linear orthography," Banks states, "Do they think like that too?" As she learns their language, Banks begins to dream in alien graphemes and to experience the world and its temporal structures in ways facilitated by this novel linguistic form." (https://eprints.qut.edu.au/132143/; lesedato 11.08.21)

Arrival "revolves around Dr. Louise Banks (Amy Adams), a linguistics professor who is called on to lead a team of scientists in learning an alien language. After 12 mysterious obelisks appeared in the sky, Banks and her team board one of these obelisks and discover it is a ship, and meet two aliens inside. These aliens are unlike any depiction of an alien previously seen in cinema. They are terrifying and strange; masses of dark flesh without clear form or distinction. These aliens are called heptapods, because of their seven legs. As Banks studies their language, she discovers that their sentences are written in a circle, and that they can be read starting anywhere in the circle. If we wrote our sentences that way, the phrase "I went to the store", written circularly, could also be read as "Store. I went to the", or any other combination. Banks becomes increasingly fascinated and engrossed in learning the language of the heptapods, until she eventually begins to even dream in their language. Eventually, she discovers the secret which the heptapods are trying to communicate with humans: that heptapods can see the future. Banks realizes that heptapods have a different conception of time than humans; one which is nonlinear. For heptapods, the future can be remembered just as easily as the past. When Banks realizes this, she also gains this ability, through the mastery of the heptapod language. The alien language reflects their circular conception of time, and learning this changes the way in which Banks conceptualizes time as well. The philosophy of the film is clear: the languages we speak can actually change the way that we think, including the way we think about time. […] For a heptapod, the future could be known apriori just as humans understand intuitively that there is a future. *Arrival* makes a bold claim: that our understanding of apriori knowledge is actually dependent on our language." (Mason Leaver i http://www.cinema blography.org/blog/the-philosophy-of-language-in-arrival; lesedato 03.11.21)

Heptapodenes kommunikasjon i *Arrival*, "including the circular way in which it is written, reflects a knowledge of both the future and the past. How are humans to understand the metaphors of the heptapod language when the words of the heptapod language conceptualize experiences which we've never had? How are we to understand another culture when even their written language serves as a metaphor for an experience which we can't have? *Arrival* answers: by steeping ourselves in the culture and mindset of another, we can begin to understand experiences which we've never had. […] In one scene, Dr. Banks briefly refers to a concept called the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. Edward Sapir was a well known Emergentist philosopher of language. It is Emergentism's "aim to explain the capacity for language in terms of non-linguistic human capacities: thinking, communicating, and interacting" (Stanford). *Arrival* holds to an emergentist

approach to language: it's concerned with how language affects our cognition. Emergentists, like Nietzsche, hold that language is a series of constructions (like the notion of time). According to *Arrival*, our human languages form a construction of time which is linear. Yet the heptapods hold an entirely different understanding of time. […] what is thinkable for you might depend on the language you know. *Arrival* answers the question of correct perception of time by answering the same way that Emergentists like Sapir would: Neither perception of time is correct or incorrect, but our languages determine what is thinkable or unthinkable for us. Nietzsche would agree with both Villeneuve and Sapir on this point. Nietzsche would say that the linear or the nonlinear view of time is arbitrary. It's arbitrary which way you perceive the world, because there's no criterion for that. We would need criterion for correct perception, which is nonexistent. How could we form such a judgment, about which perception of the world is correct? Instead, Nietzsche would say that by learning the metaphors of language used by the heptapods, Dr. Banks has learned new ways of conceptualizing the world, and in doing so, also discovered new ways of perceiving it." (Mason Leaver i http://www.cinema blography.org/blog/the-philosophy-of-language-in-arrival; lesedato 03.11.21)

Både Roland Emmerichs film *Independence Day* (1996) og Chris Carter m.fl.s TV-serie *The X Files* (1993-2002) "plays explicitly on the conspiracy lore surrounding the alleged alien crash-landing at Roswell, New Mexico in 1947. The claim that bodies were recovered, and that the truth has since been suppressed, is supported by both fictions. Like *Close Encounters* and *E.T.*, however, *Independence Day* offers a way out of the conspiratorial labyrinth. The president discovers the truth and is eventually able to restore proper democratic control. He goes to 'Area 51', sees the alien craft and the bodies, sacks a duplicitous cabinet member and leads the counter attack against the alien invasion. The conspiracy is shown to be real, but also disentangled. This seems to fit the pattern of cultural products that raise difficulties only to brush them away again. Little of the kind is offered by *The X Files*. Temporary victories are achieved by Mulder and Scully, but for each dimension of the conspiracy uncovered several more appear to be generated, including at times the possibility that the underlying 'truth' about alien contact is itself no more than a cover story for other concealed government machinations. This is partly attributable to the series context of the television and cinema franchise, which requires a lengthy and on-going plot, and partly a quality inherited from the Hollywood conspiracy movies of the early 1970s." (King og Krzywinska 2002 s. 36-37)

"Siden den første Star Wars-film udkom i 1977, har instruktøren George Lucas' science fiction-rumeventyr om det godes kamp mod ondskaben henrykket millioner kloden over. Filmene kombinerer ikke blot vilde effekter og et fascinerende persongalleri, de er også blevet et brand i milliardklassen, som sælger LEGO-legetøj, actionfigurer, bøger, computerspil og selvfølgelig biografbilletter. George Lucas solgte i 2012 sine Star Wars-rettigheder til Disney, der har ført stafetten

videre med nye storsælgende film." (Lasse Skytt i https://faktalink.dk/star-wars; lesedato 23.04.21)

George Lucas' film *The Phantom Menace* (1999), en *Star Wars*-film, inneholder "a great deal of crude cultural stereotyping. The Gungans are presented generally as a cowardly and lackadaisical group. This might be acceptable as a fictional characterisation if not for the fact that they are given clearly Afro-Caribbean traits. Jar Jar Binks, the amiable but rather stupid and naïve comic fop, is voiced by a black American actor in a classic transcription of the racist caricature of the 'Coon', a stereotype that has served for many decades to excuse or justify racial inequality [...]. On Tatooine, the grasping spare parts entrepreneur Watto is grossly caricatured as a hook-nosed bug, an apparent case of anti-semitism. The Neimoidian trade viceroys who betray the inhabitants of Naboo to the Sith, meanwhile, are given Japanese-style costumes and accents. While the federation of intergalactic nations ostensibly speaks out against the tyranny of Nazi-like regimentation, the films risks alienating potential audience groups often for the sake of a cheap laugh." (King og Krzywinska 2002 s. 110)

Star Wars har inspirert til en offisiell religion. "Religionen til Star Wars kalles for jediisme og har [i 2015] 250.000 medlemmer. [...] George Lucas har laget filmene. Han ønsket at filmene skulle vekke en tro på Gud. Men han hadde aldri trodd at fansen skulle lage en egen religion. [...] Jediistene tror på kraften. Dette er en energi som flyter gjennom hele universet. Den er den sentrale drivkraften til filmenes hovedpersoner. Den første Star Wars-filmen ble lansert i 1977. Her møter vi Luke Skywalker. Han oppdager at han har kontakt med kraften. Luke er utvalgt til å lede kampen mot de onde maktene. Church of Jediism har 250.000 medlemmer. De sier de får rundt tusen nye medlemmer om dagen. Det skriver den britiske avisen The Telegraph." (Ane B. Tjellaug i https://www.klartale.no/kultur/ 2015/12/15/for-noen-er-star-wars-en-religion/; lesedato 22.11.21)

Den sørafrikansk-kanadiske regissøren Neill Blomkamps dystopiske film *Elysium* (2013) foregår i Los Angeles i år 2154, når hele byen er preget av overbefolkning og fattigdom. Hovedpersonen Max prøver å overleve ved å komme inn på en helsestasjon på den luksuriøse romstasjonen Elysium, og filmen handler om sosiale problemer både i framtida og i dag.

"For some alien-conspiracy theories, science fiction cinema itself is a prime ingredient in campaigns of misinformation. One widely circulated rumour is that the US government formed an alliance with the aliens that has subsequently broken down. The conspiracy theory suggests that the series of films featuring 'nice' aliens in the early 1980s was made at the time of the alliance as part of a government strategy to prepare people for the future revelation of extra-terrestrial contact. The harsher portrayal of aliens that has followed in many films is interpreted as post-alliance preparation of potential confrontation (see Dean 1998). Bruce Rux (1997) suggests, mock-seriously, that the silliness of many 1950s science fiction films was

part of a deliberate misinformation strategy in which aspects of 'real' UFO-encounter information were associated with daft plots in order to discredit the whole area of alien contact." (King og Krzywinska 2002 s. 37)

"På 1990-tallet arbeidet Alex Jones for forskjellige lokale radiostasjoner, der han fikk ry for å blande harde angrep på politikere med advarsler om en kommende unntakstilstand. Noen uker før terrorangrepene 11. september 2001 kom han med en av sine vanlige dommedagstaler, der han tilsynelatende forutsa et fingert terrorangrep innenfor USAs grenser der skylden ville bli lagt på Osama bin Laden og brukt til å opprette en politistat. Terrorangrepene ble hans store gjennombrudd: Nå kunne han si "hva var det jeg sa?". Forutsigelsen blir litt mindre imponerende om man ser på Jones' virksomhet både før og siden – det er nemlig knapt en eneste militærøvelse som han ikke har utropt til statskupp eller evakueringsøvelse som ikke er blitt til en øvelse i å internere amerikanske borgere. […] I Norge er Jones kanskje mest kjent fra science fiction-filmen *A Scanner Darkly* (2006) der han spiller seg selv." (*Dagbladet* 16. januar 2016 s. 42)

Tong Enzheng var en kinesisk arkeolog, antropolog og forfatter som skrev science fiction. En av hans fortellinger fra 1978 fikk på engelsk tittelen "Death Ray on a Coral Island" (i *Science Fiction From China*, 1989) og "represented the peak of Tong's popularity, a Technothriller in which a Mad Scientist is thwarted not only by Chinese heroes, but by a foreign-born Chinese protagonist, who has returned to the motherland in search of the fulfilment that cannot be his in the degenerate capitalist West. Understandably, this ticked a number of boxes with Party scrutineers, and was subsequently adapted by the Shanghai Film Studio into China's first sf film, *Shanhu Dao Shang de Siguang* (1980)." (http://www.sf-encyclopedia.com/entry/tong_enzheng; lesedato 14.05.21)

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

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