



HELSINKI JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

A Scientific Publication of Helsinki University, Finland.

Volume: 9 Issue: 2 April, 2025

Pages: 42-54, 2025; Publication No: HJSSH.49074

ISSN: 3442-3567

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

[RE] PERIPHERALIZATION, [RE] INCORPORATION, FRONTIERS AND NON-STATE SOCIETIES: DEPICTIONS OF TERRORISM IN AMERICAN (HOLLYWOOD) MOVIES

Madugu Alexander Jang PhD

Department of History and International Studies,
University of Jos, Nigeria.

maduguaj@gmail.com, maduguaj@unjos.edu.ng

Okey Ibezim PhD

Department of History and International Studies,
University of Jos, Nigeria.

ibezimemma41@yahoo.com

Gerald Bawa

Department of History and International Studies,
University of Jos, Nigeria.

gbawa331@gmail.com

Abstract

While vulnerability, uncertainty and insecurity in the life of people are not new, what is new is that their causes and manifestations have multiplied and changed profoundly over the last decade. Examples include civil strife and the proliferation of conflicts, growing inequalities within and among countries further accentuated by globalization, mixed outcomes of poverty reduction efforts, increased mobility of populations and changes in family structures. One of the most important changes associated with the information revolution is a dramatic increase in the interconnectedness of people around the world. In the realm of security, the information revolution brings both good news and bad news, speeding the accumulation of information and slowing the pace of decision making. Rapid change always has winners and losers. For, if the information revolution label means anything, it is an attempt to find some term that can express fundamental shifts in power, in social structures and even in cultural sensibilities that are impacting on all our lives. While they use the term to mean an untruth, it may be more positively understood as meaning the foundational story of a culture or civilisation which explains fundamental natural or social phenomena and is usually invested with a deeper religious or transcendent significance. On the other hand, inequality of power amongst major players was widely viewed as the most fundamental issue on the traditional gender of national security. On the other hand, increasing inequality of condition amongst individuals, groups, and communities is seen as central to the new expanded agenda of new security studies. The methodology of study is that of a multi-disciplinary approach, involving the

fields of history, linguistic, conflict and peace studies. This paper uses as its sources various categories of published and unpublished written materials. Its writing style combines the two basic historical skills of descriptive/narrative and analytical/critical historical writing.

Keywords: Terrorism, Movies, Hollywood/Nollywood, Violence and Hijack.

INTRODUCTION

Terrorism has assumed an unprecedented notoriety as a global phenomenon. The collapse of communism in 1989 has thrown the entire world into a flux with the emergence of international pressure groups and civil society organizations with influences well beyond the bounds of the state. Kufuor ¹ maintained that, protest groups of all sorts have gained ascendancy to such an extent as a challenge the constituted authority of the states in which they operate and beyond. Consequently, the post – cold war era did not usher in a new lease of peace and end of terroristic history as suggested by Fukuyama ² . But terrorism has continued to manifest in dimensions and forms perpetuated by state and non – state actors like the transnational violent groups whose ideologies, networks and interest stretch across national boundaries. Globalization as argued by Kiras ³ has amplified and emboldened terrorist groups to be more sophisticated. Thus, the regular security enforcement agencies of state, including the mightiest, are constantly frustrated in identifying and clamping them down. The acts of terror has continued to inflict pain and suffering on people’s lives all over the world with devastating effects. Terrorism in all its forms and manifestations constitutes a serious threat to global peace and security. Africa, south of the Sahara is not left out in this wave of global terrorism. It has become a hideout and home to some notorious terrorist groups like the Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) and its affiliates operating in Northern Mali and stretching into Algeria, such as al-shabab whose base is in Somali and occasionally launches attacks in Kenya, as well as Boko Haram in North Eastern Nigeria with spheres of influence spanning across the borders into cameroon, Chad and Niger. They are believed to be connected to other terrorist organizations on the continent and beyond. Years of neglect, marginalization, poverty, crumbling infrastructure, ignorance, high unemployment rate and unpatriotic leadership (elites) have made north – eastern Nigeria (the main base of Boko Haram) a flashpoint susceptible to insurgency and enclave for terror wielding groups. Its geo-strategic locations susceptible to insurgency and enclave for terror wielding groups. Its geo-strategic location susceptible to insurgency and enclave for terror wielding groups. Its geo-strategic locations as the only region that shares international boundaries with three countries makes it an epicenter of strategic activities in terms of arms procurement (smuggling), planning for attacks and reception centre for foreign mercenaries and insurgents. It is also a busy hub for attacks and reception centre for

¹ . Kufuor, J. A (2006). Global Security: Our shared Responsibilities- Abuja:National War College, Nigeria. Distinguished lectureseries no.7.

² . see also, Onuaha, F. C. “The IslamicChallenge: Nigeria’s Boko Haram crisisexplained” African Security Review. 19(2), 54-67

³. Kiras, J. D. (2014) Terrorism and Globalization. In Bsylys J., Smith, S. and Owens, P., (6th ed.) .The Globalization of World Politics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

foreign mercenaries and insurgents. However, these international borders are largely unmanned and porous, with many illegal entry and exit points, giving impetus to criminals and terrorist groups to operate with ease. Thus, arms from war-torn countries like Libya, Mali, Sudan and the Central African Republic, find their way into Nigeria through these borders. Consequently, the region has at different times witnessed the emergence of terror wielding groups like Maitatsine –the Nigerian version of the Taliban which metamorphosed into the Boko Haram. The terror campaign by these groups affects mainly the Lake Chad region, comprising north – east Nigeria, the western flanks of northern Cameroon, southern Chad and south-eastern Niger.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE AND DISCUSSIONS

The Marxist political economy approach through materialism provides an insightful explanation. Because any discourse on terrorism that isolates its class nature and the socio-economic conditions that gave rise to it will not only be parochial but lame. The political economy approach can also be applied internationally as international political Economy (IPE). Wood 4 noted that “most obvious and painful manifestations of the crisis of capitalism are not only economic but those phenomena that affect their personal lives at the most sensitive and emotional points: the breakdown of the family, the epidemic of crime and violence, the collapse of the old values and morality with nothing to put in their place, and the constant outbreak of wars—all of these give rise to a sense of instability, a lack of faith in the present or the future. Nnoli 5 argues that social life including politics determined primarily by this relation of production. What is produced, who produces it and how what is produced is distributed. Thus, there is a sustained struggle between those who want to maintain their grip or control of societal resources including the means of production and political structures on one hand, those who want to join the structures and those who are victims of the system and want to change the status-quo completely on another hand. Capitalism is based on the private ownership of property. Personal gain rather than collective well-being is encouraged. Being a competitive system, mutual aid and cooperation for the betterment of all are discouraged in favour of individual achievement at the expense of others. Competition breeds aggression, hostility and particularly for the losers, frustration.

We wish to address one problematic, but potentially very fruitful, subtopic: what are the processes leading to incorporation of new areas and peoples into a world-system and what are the consequences of the absorption of new peoples and/or new areas into a world-system for both the areas or peoples incorporated and the world-system that incorporates them? Italian novelist Umberto Eco once claimed that 70 percent of our knowledge derives from watching Hollywood movies. Could this also be true for our perception of terrorism? It can be argued that for a large part of its audience, American cinema, besides television (the substantial role of TV is not

⁴ . Kiras, J. D. (2014) *Terrorism and Globalization*. In Bsylys J., Smith, S. and Owens, P., (6th ed.) .*The Globalization of World Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

⁵ . see also, Onuaha, F. C. “The Islamic Challenge: Nigeria’s Boko Haram crisis explained” *African Security Review*. 19(2), 54-67



explored in this article), is one of the primary sources of information. The perception of what terrorism means, how it can be understood, is shaped by cinematic images. This is also of importance on a political front as mass cultural representations of terrorism tend to be often stereotypical and ideologically biased. Cinema generally affirms the political and cultural status quo from which it originates: movies reproduce, charge, and disseminate interpretations, ideologies, and world views in contemporary society by constructing and filling an imaginary space, where the hegemonic constants of the public discourse come to life. Terrorism, often described as the “scourge of our times”, is one of them and a reoccurring theme of American movies since the 1970s.

The 1990s: Action Films and New Threats

Invasion U.S.A, Delta Force, and later Die Hard (1988) were trendsetters for a whole genre of action movies in which a lone hero has to defeat single-handedly numerous terrorist enemies in a spectacular action showdown: Die Hard II (1992), Red Alert (1992), Passenger 57 (1992), Speed (1995), Sudden Death (1995), Die Hard III (1995), The Rock (1996), Operation Broken Arrow (1997), or Air Force One (1997). The plot line of these movies stays basically the same: first the terrorists succeed in securing control over public places (skyscrapers, banks, airplanes, trains, ships, prisons, and buses), taking hostages, and defeating any countermeasures by the authorities. But their triumph lasts only for a short time as their nemesis, whether it is the policeman John McClane (Bruce Willis in Die Hard), Ex-US Navy Seal Casey Ryback (Steven Segal in Red Alert) or Ex-fireman Daren McCord (Jean Claude Vandamme in Sudden Death), is already in their midst – most often simply out of coincidence. The lone hero has then to engage one opponent after the other, until the spectacular killing of the terrorist ringleader releases the built up tension. With regard to their background, the featured villains mirror the climate of political correctness in the first post-Cold War period: a decadent British aristocrat (Passenger 57), a group of “homeless” Stasi agents (Die Hard III), or corrupt Russian military figures in alliance with resentful Bosnian Serbs (The Peacemaker, 1997). But most of them are “home grown”: disgruntled former employees of law enforcement agencies (Speed) or renegade soldiers (Die Hard II, Operation Broken Arrow, The Rock). What unites most of them is the simple fact that they kill and maim mainly for money. They are depicted as ordinary criminals hiding behind a political ideology. For instance in Die Hard I, the “Volksfrei”-movement, a West German leftwing terrorist group, attacks a party at the headquarters of a Japanese cooperation in Los Angeles and takes the guests hostage. Their declared aim is to force the liberation of “revolutionary brothers and sisters” from prison. However, this turns out to be only a diversion; the group real aim is to rob 640 million dollars from a safe. Another telling example is the disgruntled ex-policeman Howard Payne in Speed. He informs his opponent via mobile phone about the sole motivation of his blackmail scheme: “Well, I want money, Jack. I wish that I had some loftier purpose, but I’m afraid in the end, it’s all about the money”. Yet there is also a new threat emerging in 1990s cinema that has nothing to do with those apolitical gangsters – in response to renewed public interest sparked by the (largely unsuccessful) bombing of New York’s World Trade Center in 1993, the radical Islamist terrorist was introduced on the movie screen with True Lies (1994), Executive Decision (1996),

and *The Siege* (1999). These three films depict jihadists as backward lunatics and potential mass murderers whose onslaught had to be fought by all means necessary.

In *True Lies*, a group called “Crimson Jihad” has smuggled nuclear weapons out of the former Soviet republic Kazakhstan and attempts to blackmail the US government. To demonstrate their seriousness they detonate the first bomb on an uninhabited island of the Florida Keys. The “pillar of holy fire” that rises at this place threatens a nuclear holocaust. Spymaster Trilby (Charlton Heston) urges his troops to locate ringleader Aziz (Art Malik) and his men before “somebody parks a car in front of the White House with a nuclear bomb in the trunk.” This job is effectively done by Harry Tasker (Arnold Schwarzenegger), agent of the “Omega Sector”, a clandestine unit specializing in counter-proliferation. *Executive Decision* features Arabs hijacking a Boeing 747 with the intention of blowing up the plane, and smuggle enough nerve gas on board to wipe out the entire East Coast of the US. When a US senator, who happens to be on board, wants to negotiate to advance his own career interests, he receives a “punishing” bullet in the head. Instead *Executive Decision* aims straight for a climatic shoot-out at the very last moment a Special Forces team that had slipped into the belly of the plane in mid-flight via a “decompression tunnel” intervenes and shoots all hijackers.

The enemy within and the reaction of the American public in the face of terrorist violence are the main concern in *The Siege*. To force the US government to release a terrorist leader - he had been kidnapped by American forces - several terrorist cells undertake suicide missions in New York. When the crisis reaches its peak, the president declares martial law and all able-bodied Muslims who do not cooperate, are detained behind barbed wire. Liberal FBI investigator Frank Hubbard (Denzel Washington), who managed the investigation before the army was called in, is the exact opposite of commanding General William Deveraux (Bruce Willis). While the latter uses his troops like a “broadsword”, Hubbard “plays by the book” and upholds constitutional rights. In the end he arrests not only Deveraux for murdering a prisoner, but disposes of the last attacker, who exclaims both defiant and threatening: “There will never be a last cell!”

After 9/11: The Changing Face of Terrorism

In the immediate period after 9/11, Hollywood indeed shunned away from the subject of terrorism, focusing instead on fantastical escapism, Science Fiction and family entertainment. Tellingly, the Twin Towers were edited out of most movies in the production line that showed the New York skyline.

One of the first movies to address terrorism after 9/11, *The Sum of all Fears* (2002), featured the destruction of Baltimore by an atomic bomb. Overall the film was considered as out of touch with the post 9/11 reality since the story focuses on the ensuing escalating tensions between the US and Russia. With terrorism more or less out of the picture, threats were depicted as extraterrestrial (*War of the Worlds*, 2005), in the form of disease (*I am Legend*, 2007) or as a result of rapid climate change (*The Day after Tomorrow*, 2005). Besides commercial considerations with regard to a weary public, both domestic and international, but also because previous scenarios considered fantastic and purely entertaining had been so “brutally realized” on 11 September 2001, the subject of terrorism was not addressed in a major way for some years in Hollywood’s production studios.

The War Within (2005) was one of the earliest examples of movies addressing the situation in post 9/11 America: it focuses on Hassan (Ayad Akhtar), a Pakistani engineer, who was wrongly suspected of terrorist activities and tortured in prison. The violent experience transforms Hassan into a radical who seeks revenge for the injustice done to him. He connects with a terrorist cell that is in the middle of planning an attack on the Grand Central Station in New York. But his logic is put under severe pressure by contradictions and conflicting emotions: the war, in which he sees himself, is fought “within” – in his own psyche. The search for answers also motivates *Syriana*, a 2005 movie that is partly based on the memoirs of Ex-CIA agent Robert Baer. It explores the political, economic, legal, and social effects of the oil business, and how its mechanisms breed terrorism. The main character, elderly CIA agent Bob Barnes (George Clooney), is embedded in a network of power relations connecting mighty Washingtonian law firms, Texan oil business, the US government, and the corrupt elites of a Middle Eastern sheikdom. In the script, this “system” uses all means necessary to advance its political-economic interests and produces terrorism as a form of blowback. A sub-plot illustrates this on the basis of the radicalization of two Pakistani oil workers, who simply want to improve their lives and are prevented from doing so. Stephen Spielberg addressed the conflict via historical analogy in *Munich* (2005). His adaptation of a novel on the Israeli revenge for the massacre of its athletes during the 1972 Olympics was also a critical exploration of the cycle of violence engulfing the Middle East and, indirectly, a “prayer for peace”.

It took more than five years for the entertainment industry to tackle 9/11 directly. In *United 93* (2006), Paul Greengrass retold the story of the hijacked flight that did not reach its intended target on September 11th. Instead it crashed into a field in Pennsylvania, supposedly because the passengers revolted against the hijackers. The director offers only a distanced portrait of the hijackers – although the first scene in the movie, a prayer ritual in the morning hours of September 11th, 2001, depicts them as devout Muslims on a mission. But since *United 93* is all about the heroic actions of the passengers and their sacrifice, the motivation and personal background of the terrorists remain rather obscure to the moviegoer. Oliver Stone’s *World Trade Center* (2006) did not even show the planes hitting the towers. Instead, Stone concentrated on a human interest story based on the miraculous rescue of two survivors from Ground Zero.

With growing distance, movie makers began to focus on the War on Terror, its progress and implications, both domestic and international. In *Body of Lies* (2008), CIA agent Roger Ferris (Leonardo Di Caprio) sets up a fictitious terror group, equips it with fake bank accounts, and plants messages in fundamentalist chat rooms. A staged attack on a US Army base in Turkey aims to flush out a jealous Al Qaeda mastermind - the Syrian born, American educated Al-Sameen (Alon Aboutboul). The plan works although the situation becomes desperate for the agent. He has to endure torture when caught by Al-Sameen and is about to be executed on video when Jordanian intelligence agents burst into the room and kill all terrorists. It turns out that Ferris's principal ally, the deceptive spymaster Hani Salaam (Mark Strong), is a far more effective manipulator than previously assumed, making the most of a partnership of convenience.

Finally, *The Kingdom* (2007) can be read as an alternative scenario to the real life War on Terror in its depiction of successful counterterrorism as the result of cooperation between Western and Middle Eastern police forces. A team of FBI investigators works closely with the Saudi police Colonel Al Ghazi (Ashraf Barhom) to hunt down Abu Hamza, a mid-level al-Qaeda operative, who is responsible for a bombing attack on an American compound in Saudi-Arabia. Overall the film offers a “utopian spectacle of wounded Americans heading home, mission accomplished,” as Jim Hoberman remarked.

The 1970s: Hijackers and “Lone Wolves”

When reviewing Hollywood’s output on terrorism, it is obvious that it correlates with the waves and historical development of political violence: previously sporadic encounters with terrorism in Hollywood cinema, like Alfred Hitchcock’s *Saboteur* (1942), became more frequent in the 1970s, at a time when international terrorism and especially hijackings of jetliners orchestrated by Libya – under Late Gad made headlines and featured in newsreels. Thus, the Arab gunman, who threatens innocent passengers and strikes at Western installations, became a typical Hollywood villain: John Frankenheimer’s *Black Sunday* (1976) depicted seductive terrorist Dahilalyad (Marthe Keller) of German-Palestinian background enlisting an alienated Vietnam veteran Michael Lander (Bruce Dern). Together they plan an attack on the Super Bowl finale in Miami: a Goodyear blimp loaded with scrap metal is launched as a cluster bomb attack aimed to kill thousands of sport fans, including President Jimmy Carter.

During the 1970s major acts of terrorism had not yet struck the US homeland. Therefore the entertainment industry mainly looked abroad for inspiration and major foreign events were dramatized for the silver screen: William A. Graham staged the Munich hostage massacre of 1972 four years later in *21 hours at Munich*. Only five months after the real event Marvin J. Chomsky re-enacted the spectacular Entebbe rescue mission in the studio, featuring a big star cast, including Burt Lancaster as defence minister Shimon Peres, Anthony Hopkins as Yitzhak Rabin, and Liz Taylor as a relative of a hostage (*Victory at Entebbe*, 1976). The story was also adapted for TV in *Raid on Entebbe* (1977), starring Charles Bronson. The formula for these movies is basically the same: high-ranking politicians in crisis centres make daring decisions, while elite commandos’ first train meticulously for their mission and then free the hostages in a climactic shoot-out sequence. It is a triumphant celebration of the commando’s capacity to dare and win – a myth to which Israel contributed by commissioning its own cinematic version of the events in *Operation Thunderball* (1979).

Home-grown terrorism is almost exclusively the work of lunatics and psychotic types with little political background: in *Airport* (1970) a self-made bomb explodes on board of a Boeing 707 bound for Rome. Responsibility rests with demolition expert D. O. Guerrero (Van Heflin), a desperate man with a long history of mental illness who wants his wife to benefit from a life insurance he just purchased. The damage caused by the mid-air explosion in the hull of the plane results in Guerrero being sucked out of the jetliner, which the pilots manage to land safely. In *Skyjacked* (1972) it is the suicidal Vietnam veteran Jerome K. Weber (James Brolin), who takes command of a domestic flight and directs it via Anchorage to Moscow, where the

plane is surrounded by aggressive Soviet troops. The would-be defector is finally challenged by the heroic Captain Henry O'Hara (Charlton Heston) and shot by the soldiers.

The Taking of Pelham 1-2-3 (1974) is one of the first examples outlining a scenario of urban terrorism that is financially motivated: a gang led by a British mercenary kidnaps a New York subway train in order to extort a one million dollar ransom. This storyline of a threatened public is repeated in the thrillers Two Minute Warning (1976) and Rollercoaster (1977), where anonymous blackmailers target popular American institutions – a football stadium and an amusement park, respectively – in horrific schemes with a potential for mass casualties. Political motives, no matter how twisted, appear to be reserved for traumatized war veterans only: in Twilight's Last Gleaming (1977) an Air Force General, who was court-martialled for his anti-war stance, takes control over a Titan rocket silo and threatens to start World War III unless the US government releases all the real facts about the background of the Vietnam War. This demand is met by declassifying a top secret memo, which defines the war in South East-Asia as a means to enhance American credibility vis-a-vis the Soviet Union's.

Since the US experienced sporadic acts of domestic terrorism by left-wing radicals from the Weather Underground or the Symbionese Liberation Army during the 1970s, the urban guerrilla is featured as a potential danger lurking at home. As a consequence, Clint Eastwood's vigilante cop Dirty Harry has to eliminate a fictitious "People Revolutionary Strike Force" (The Enforcer, 1976). The kidnapping of big money heiress Patty Hearst in 1975 – the most visible act of 70s left-wing terrorism – was adopted for the screen in all kind of ways: ranging from the infamous exploitation pieces Patty (1976) and Tanya: Sex Queen of the SLA (1976) - where "SLA" stood for "Sexual Liberation Army" - to a classic true crime story made for TV (The Ordeal of Patty Hearst, 1979). In 1988 Paul Schrader revisited the case in Patty Hearst (1988); however his presentation of the events (terrorist victim apparently becomes perpetrator) in a deliberately detached style received only limited release.

The 1980s: Enter Religious Fanatics and Red Infiltrators

This more or less distanced perspective on terrorism changed abruptly once the US was directly confronted with major acts of terrorism abroad: the 444 days long Iranian hostage crisis (1979), the American involvement in the Lebanese civil war (1983), and the resulting confrontation with Shi'ite extremism. Terrorism rapidly acquired an extraordinary salience in American public opinion.

In Nighthawks (1981) – one of the first films to address the media fixation of modern terrorism – the international terrorist mastermind Wulfgar (Rutger Hauer) brags: "There is no security". His network of Palestinian, German, and Irish activists spreads terror in New York until policeman DaSilva (Sylvester Stallone) is finally prepared to absorb the lessons of his British counterterrorism mentor: terrorism has to be fought outside of the law. This is the logic of "lesser evil": in order to keep a fragile democratic system safe from its enemies one has to forget democratic niceties and the rule of law. Such emphasis on extra-legal counter-terrorism became a key motif in many movies to come: it is as if the agonizing inefficacy of the US in Ronald Reagan's actual poor handling of terrorism had to be compensated in the sphere of imagination. One of the most intriguing examples is Delta Force (1986).

The film sets off with a portrayal of the 1985 skyjacking of TWA 847 by the Shiite Islamic Jihad. While this hostage scenario was ended following secret negotiations, Delta Force gives free rein to a military solution inspired by Israeli Entebbe strategy to achieve “victories over terrorism”. In the film the counter-terrorist elite force is dispatched to liberate the hostages, who in the meantime have been taken from the airliner to the urban jungle of Beirut where they are dispersed in underground dungeons. The rescuers blast their way through the city, kill scores of enemy fighters, and lead the American hostages back to safety. The numerous enemies are portrait as Shiite Muslims with a clear connection to the Iranian regime. When the terrorists are first introduced, they are shown in an extreme low angle shot, which further distorts their already shabby appearance with their loosened ties, unkempt hair, and maniacal stare. Their savage “otherness” is a mixture of ethnicity and psychosis – most evident in the manic outbursts of their leader Abdul (Robert Foster) towards the hostages.

Most films of this genre in the 1980s did not address actual events like Delta Force, but drew ever more alarming pictures of the terrorist threat, especially in the B-movie genre (Hostage, 1986; Death before Dishonor, 1987; Terror in Beverly Hills, 1988). Corresponding with the aggressive stance first taken by the Reagan administration towards the Soviet Union, the spectre of Red Terror was particularly prominent in Invasion U.S.A. (1985). It depicted a mixed force of Cubans, East Germans, and Russians, led by the maniac psychopath Major Rostov (Richard Lynch), whose team secretly lands on a peaceful Florida beach to spread chaos and violence. Since ordinary law enforcement is helpless against this onslaught, the government re-activates retired CIA-counterterrorism specialist Matt Hunter (Chuck Norris). He understands the mindset of the terrorists and devises a trap in which the enemy is consequently tricked into.

Comparing Depictions of Terrorism: 1970s – 2000s

In order to clarify the relationship between context and cultural output, the four ten year periods are put in comparison with each other. This analysis highlights how the differing depiction of terrorism indicates shifts in the public’s understanding – in line with the specific political and social “Zeitgeist” of the decade, or in reference to hegemonic ideas about the interpretation of Terrorism in the public discourse.

In 1970s cinema terrorism was escapist entertainment with little basis in reality. Nevertheless it featured many characteristics like air piracy, attacks on vital city infrastructures and mass gatherings. Fitting the Cold War framework the enemy “other” consisted of left-wingers, Third World guerrillas, as well as “home-grown” radicals and “lone wolfs”. Where Middle Eastern terrorists appeared, their background was primarily secular, national liberation on their agenda. What unites this diverse lot is the more or less subjective motivation: the real driving forces for the perpetrators are not political, but hatred of society, psychosis, or simply greed.

This mode of representation changed during the 1980s – greatly influenced by the engagement of the US in the Middle East and the experience of devastating attacks like those in Beirut in 1983. The terrorist”” was finally established as a sworn public enemy of everything America stands for: - be he a Communist infiltrator or a Shiite extremist. Against this threat the whole arsenal of military might is mobilized’. To fight fire with fire is depicted by many movies as the most effective way to deal

with terrorism (Nighthawks, Invasion U.S.A, Delta Force). Terrorism is now no longer the brainchild of twisted minds, but a form of proxy warfare – organized, equipped, and paid for in secret by rogue states like the Soviet Union or Iran. The message is that terrorism cannot claim any “true” political underpinning or legitimate causes – it’s either the product of “loony” fanaticism or of a criminal enterprise orchestrated by its secret paymasters.

The 1990s were both a time of easing and one of heightening awareness of new threats: since the ideological struggle of the Cold War had ended, the former stereotypical villains lost much of their symbolic value. They kept appearing, like the East-Germans in *Die Hard*, but had morphed into a criminal syndicate. At the same time 90s cinema envisioned a crumbling world order with failing state power, the emergence of asymmetric threats, and new players in the form of transnational networks. In doing so, the movies captured the phenomenon of decentralized local initiatives replacing the old-fashioned state sponsored terrorism of the 1970s and 1980s quite accurately. Films like *The Siege* or *Executive Decision* made it clear that the mode of operation had changed as well. The first attack on the World Trade Center in 1993 and the Embassy bombings of 1998 in East Africa had demonstrated that the “new Jackals” aimed to achieve spectacular violence against highly symbolic targets while also inflicting mass casualties. Prior to that, terrorist groups had observed some limits of violence since it would have weakened their base of popular support. The terrorist cells in *The Siege* and in *Executive Decision* act according to this *modus operandi*: they orchestrate suicide bombings, rely on the media to broadcast their message, and intend to set off a chain reaction of escalating violence.

More recent movies deliberately aim to capture the phenomenon even more realistically. To utilize politically agenda-free terrorist figures as opponents would not fit the post 9/11 environment. Yet while terrorism is the prime subject of several popular TV series – e.g. *24*, *The Unit*, or *Sleeper Cell* - it was picked up only reluctantly by the Hollywood movie industry after 2001. The commercial failure of *Body of Lies* or *The Kingdom* had apparently put a lid – at least temporarily – on terrorism-related movies.

The Relationship between Real and (Movie) Reel Terrorism

Since the public’s understanding of terrorism is clearly affected by the latter’s mass cultural representation, the question remains if this can also be applied to terrorists themselves? There is indeed some evidence that terrorists picked ideas from movie scenarios or imitated what they saw on the screen. Gillo Pontecorvo’s *The Battle of Algiers* (1965), a dramatization of the real life conflict between Algerian FLN rebels and the French army, inspired many left-wing revolutionary groups as well as terrorists: it is said that the IRA, the Tamil Tigers, and the Black Panthers screened it to their members for training purposes since *The Battle of Algiers* quite authentically depicts the inner workings and dynamics of an insurgent struggle and the alleged effectiveness of urban terrorism. In Western Germany, the leader of the Red Army Faction (RAF), Andreas Baader, was an keen student of Pontecorvo’s pseudo-documentary. According to his biographers Klaus Stern and Jörg Herrmann, Baader modelled the “Dreierschlag” of 1970 – the simultaneous robbing of three banks in West Berlin – after a key scene in his favourite movie. A more recent

example was used as evidence in a British trial of an Al Qaeda sympathizer in 2006. When investigators played a video he owned – Die Hard with a Vengeance (1995) – the tape abruptly ended after 60 minutes and instead began to show pictures of New York landmarks, while a voice in the background imitated explosion sounds.

In regard to 9/11, several commentators like Tom Engelhardt even assumed that the terrorists had modelled their plot after a Hollywood scenario: “What if those pre-existing frameworks hadn’t been quite so well primed to emerge in no time at all? What if we (and our enemies as well) hadn’t been at the movies all those years?, they asked” To claim that terrorism is simply a form of copy cat crime is of course far-fetched – even in the case of The Battle of Algiers it is very difficult to determine if there was any direct nexus between viewing it and the practical application of insurrectionary tactics depicted therein. What is certain is that the movie’s inspirational force roused passions, made people identify with the cause of anti-colonialism and international struggles that were in full swing at that time. What can be assumed is that violent extremists tend to get inspiration and ideas from popular culture like everyone else, but for different reasons and motives.

CONCLUSION

For Hollywood movies terrorism was first of all a thrilling piece of entertainment: the plots are all but spectacular, the villains mostly represent archetypes of “evil”, and ultimately the threat is averted by righteous forces. Although as exaggerated and deformed Hollywood’s interpretation of terrorism may be, the movies can be “read” in an insightful way: as a sort of “snapshot” of the cultural context from which they originate, the cinematic texts tell us about prevailing mass fears, fantasies, and projections about terrorism. They represent the status quo of the public discourse at that time, reproducing hegemonic ideas promoted by many politicians, the media, or think tank experts. Thus, both the meaning of terrorism and what is projected into it cannot be understood, without paying close attention to what is happening on the cinema screen. This “mirror(ed) image” of terrorism is revealing because ultimately it expresses certain dimensions we prepare to confront in real life: the spectre of unspeakable atrocities, the notion of extra-legal violence to be employed against terrorists, or the establishment of a “state of siege” ending all civil liberties.

Of course there are also risks associated with this: the review of relevant movies demonstrates that the mass culture representation of terrorism is problematic due to the highly suggestive effect of imaginary combined with ideological subtext. In Hollywood movies terrorism is essentialized – that is, often presented as de-politicized and merely pathological or criminal. Its cinematic representation generates a high degree of assurance in the effectiveness of simple, quick solutions to highly complex problems. It also legitimizes extra-legal and military approaches while denouncing compromise and negotiations as appeasement. In short, it tends to reduce reality’s complexity to a simple dichotomy of good and evil. The result is a kind of false conscience that hampers a better understanding of terrorism and political violence in regard to its causes, intentions, and the spectrum of possibilities for counteraction. There can be little doubt that cinema and popular culture in general can provide valuable insight into shifting political and ideological trends, re-



arrangements of frameworks beyond the obvious public fascination with the subject of terrorism

REFERENCES

- Alfred. O. Scott, (2007).** FBI agents solve the terrorist problem. The New York Times, 28 Sept.
- Carl Bogs, Tom Pollard. (2007).** The Hollywood War Machine. U.S. Militarism and Popular Culture, Boulder, Colo.
- Dana Stevens,** Glossy Torture. Slate, 10 May, 2021.
- Edgar O’Balance, Language of Violence. (1979).** The Blood Politics of Terrorism, San Rafael.
- 4’ Eric Lichtenfeld, Action speaks louder. (2004).** Violence, spectacle, and the American action movie, Westport.
- Etienne Auge, (2002).** Hollywood Movies: Terrorism 101, Cercles, 5.
- Hill, Jonathan D., ed. (1996).** History, Power, and Identity: Ethnogenesis in the Americas, 1492–1992. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- Hollis, Shirley. (2005).** ‘Contact, incorporation, and the North American southeast’. Journal of World-Systems Research 11(1): 95–130.
- Jack Shaheen, (2001).** Reel Bad Arabs. How Hollywood Vilifies a People, New York.
- John Harrison, (2003).** Patty Hearst and the SLA, in: Jack Sargeant (Ed.), Guns, Death, Terror. 1960s & 1970s Revolutionaries, Urban Guerrillas and Terrorists.
- John Harrison, (2003).** Patty Hearst and the SLA, in: Jack Sargeant (Ed.), Guns, Death, Terror. 1960s & 1970s Revolutionaries, Urban Guerrillas and Terrorists.
- Klaus Stern, Jörg Herrmann, Andreas Baader. (2007).** Das LebeneinesStaatsfeindes. München.
- Melani McAlister, (2005).** Iran, Islam, and the Terrorist Threat, 1979-1989, in: J. David Slocum (Ed.), Terrorism, Media, Liberation, London.
- Michael Selzer, (1979).** Terrorist Chic. An Exploration of Violence in the Seventies, New York.
- Ned Martel, (2005).** The Path from Injustice to Jihad. The New York Times, 30 Sept.
- Sebastian Borger, (2006).** Hollywood-Film wird zum Terrorbeweis. Spiegel Online, 7 Nov.
- Syriana Scriptit,** <http://wbads-01.vo.llnwd.net>, <http://wbads-01.vo.llnwd.net/e1/wbmovies/syriana/site/med/Syriana-Screenplay.pdf>> (13 June 2021).
- Thomas Riegler,** Gillo Pontecorvo’s, dictatorship of the truth’– a legacy. Studies in European Cinema, Vol.6, No. 1.

- Tom Engelhardt, (2006).** 9/11 in a movie-made world. *The Nation*, 25. Sept.
- True Lies Script,** <http://www.awesomefilm.com>,
<<http://www.awesomefilm.com/script/truelies.txt>> (15/5/ 2021).
- Turchin, Peter. (2003a).** *Historical Dynamics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . (2003b). 'Evolution in population dynamics'. *Nature* 424 (17): 257–8.
- “Twilight’s Last Gleaming”: No star. (1977).** *The New York Times*, 10 February.
- Vincent Canby, (1985).** *Invasion U.S.A*, in: *The New York Times*, 27. Sept.
- William Palmer, (1995).** *The Films of the Eighties. A Social History*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Press.

