MILITANCY AND WAR VIOLENCE IN SELECT FILMS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Chibuike Abunike, *PhD*
Tracie Utoh-Ezeajugh, *PhD*
Department of Theatre and Film Studies,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Abstract

Militancy and war are two of the many aggressive models of insurrection adopted by a marginalised group of people against social institutions over perceived long-term structural violence against them. The implication of adopting these extremely violent approaches as a means of seeking redress is that physical violence which has a more direct and immediate negative effect on human lives becomes the ultimate means of attaining social justice. This study looks at the representation of militancy and war violence in two selected films, namely; David Attwood's *Blood and Oil* (2010) and Kriv Stenders' *Danger Close* (2019) to compare how militancy and war violence influence social injustice and justice in the society. The study is qualitative research that hinged on the interpretation and analyses of the selected films on Content Analysis approach of qualitative research method. However, Johan Galtung's Structural theory of violence is applied to interrogate the dynamics of violence in the films and how they impact society. Findings revealed that structural violence is a major factor that influences the use of militancy and war by exploited social groups to defend their lives and demand justice. Consequently, the study recommends the devolution of militancy and war as a means of seeking restitution because of the various negative effects on the human and social lives of the people. In conclusion, the study notes that film as a medium of representation can be used to deemphasise the use of war and militant approaches in society.

Introduction

Militancy and war are extremely violent means of addressing underlying serious economic, political and socio-cultural conditions in society. They are two of the many aggressive models of insurrection adopted by a marginalised group of people against social institutions over perceived long-term structural violence against them by such social institutions, especially the government. The implication of adopting these extremely violent approaches as a means of seeking redress is that physical violence which has a more direct and immediate negative effect on human lives becomes the ultimate means of attaining social justice.

Militancy by its nomenclature is a violent activity that threatens the organic unity and existential commonness in society. As the fallout of economic and political exclusion of an aggrieved group by a hegemonic force, proponents of militancy adopt it as a means of agitating for inclusion in the share of collective dividends. Caroline Ifeka writing on the development of militancy in Nigeria affirms that:

> The principal cause of growing youth militancy mobilising around ethnicity and Islamic reformism is the ruling class's failure to 'share' the 'dividends of democracy' — e.g. rental incomes from 'traditional' community-owned strategic resources as oil, gas, gold, bauxite, uranium, water — according to subaltern clients' expectations. (30)

Unfortunately, the exclusion of a section or group in the sharing of proceeds of the common resources often results in violent agitations by such groups against the oppressive ruling class, as seen in the over fifty years of armed struggle by youths in the Niger Delta. Militancy is, therefore, a product of oppressive social conditions that affect the populace which as a consequence, results in the use of violence as a reactionary tool for survival and emancipation. To Matthew Croombs, militancy "...is characterized by the recurrence of a prognostic desire to apprehend fragments of emancipation" (77) from economic and political oppression and

social exclusion. With the lingering exclusion of people from economic and political benefits, especially when it pertains to inequitable distribution of resources, Joshua Gooch contends that "militancy acts as a process of confronting and remoulding the world (2) even when its process appears to be more deleterious to both the exploited and the exploiters, and can potentially degenerate to war situation if issues are left unattended.

Relatively, war involves the use of arms in an organised conflict of interest between nations, and ethnic or tribal groups within or beyond a given territory. It mostly involves the full use of military forces, intelligence and machinery, and in some cases, involves also "militias and armed civilians with little discipline and with ill-defined chains of command" (Armed Conflict 203). Like militancy, war is motivated by political and economic oppressions. Hence, "some conditions that increase the probability of war include the inability of Governments to provide basic good governance and protection for their population" (Armed Conflict 204), as in the case of the Nigerian Civil War. Upeniece V. Notes that "generally... war is regarded negatively, as a phenomenon that destroys peaceful life of the society and dramatically changes people's lives" (1), with serious impacts on household welfare, social networks, political institutions (Justino 4), and general economic operations of societies involved. Scott Gates, Havard Mokleive Nygard Havard Hegre and Havard Strand their polemic study argue that "war is a development issue. War kills, but the consequences extend far beyond these direct deaths" to include "forced migration, refugee flows, capital flight, and the destruction of societies' infrastructure" (1713). The consequences of both militancy and war are thus wholistically damaging to the overall social development.

Militancy and war are part of the thematic preoccupations in most film industries in the world. As socio-political and economic issues affect human relationships, filmmakers tend to leverage the aesthetics of violence in representing social realism

using film technology. Hence, across major film industries like Nollywood and Hollywood, the use of cinema has proved potent in providing the basis for assessing the different aspects of violence in the respective cultural societies. For example, the representation of militancy in Nollywood films is an indication that Nigerian filmmakers are in tune with the current socio-economic deprivations of certain groups, and are giving visual exposition to these issues for possible solutions. Therefore, this study examines militancy and war violence in David Attwood's Blood and Oil, and Kriv Stenders's *Danger Close* to identifying the underlying factors that engender the use of militancy and war violence as means to an end.

Structural Violence Theory

The theory of structural violence or indirect violence was proposed by Johan Galtung in his 1969 article "Violence, Peace and Peace Research." This theory infers that structural violence is institutionally driven to forestall or harm people by preventing them from meeting their basic needs. An online article on structural violence defines it further as "a permanent state of violence, which is embedded in the social, political and economic structures that make a society" and this violence is regarded as indirect because of "the absence of concrete person and its camouflaged nature" (Unit-5 66). Supporting the above assertion, George Kent in his analysis of violence notes that "violence refers to insults to basic human interests in survival, sustenance and wellbeing, freedom, and a sense of meaning" (132) and that violence comes in four ways namely, physical, economic, cultural and political. However, he argues that while physical violence deals with direct attacks on people, cultural, economic and political violence are forms of structural violence (133). Some of the examples of structural violence highlighted by Galtung include institutionalised racism, sexism, classism, gender-based violence, hate crimes, police

brutality, state violence, terrorism, and war. He notes that the mechanisms that drive this type of violence are:

1. Exploitation: the unjust economic and social relations between the oppressed and the oppressors.
2. Penetration: the implantation of agents of the powerful within the collective space of the exploited section of society
3. Segmentation: hem-lining and obscuring the reality of the exploited and their relationship with their oppressor.
4. Marginalisation and fragmentation: the process of balkanising and forcing the exploited to the edge of society, condemning them as insignificant, and keeping them away from each other (Structural Violence 66).

However, Galtung proffers a solution to ending structural violence by opining that it can be "contained through granting rewards and not simply by giving punishments" (Unit-5 66). Unfortunately, violence based on social structure is often in the favour of hegemonic social institutions like government and its agents against the collective will of the people resulting as it were collective social deviance and violent civil unrest in the affected societies as will be seen in the analyses of the selected films.

Militancy and Violence in David Attwood's *Blood and Oil*

Blood and Oil tells the story of the abduction of four staff of Krielsen International Oil Company operating in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. These four men: Stephen Woodly, Philip Edbrook, Mark Unwin, and a personal security guard, Lucky Karima are abducted by the Movement for the Emancipation of the Niger Delta (MEND) at one of the company's onshore facilities. While negotiations are made for their release, Woodly, Edbrook and Unwin are mysteriously killed and hung before the negotiation team can reach the agreed rendezvous for the release of the hostages, while Lucky is nowhere to be found. Alice Omuka (Naomie Harris), the

company's Public Relations Executive, issues a press release at the instance of Krielsen International accusing MEND of the killings and disappearance of Lucky. The subterfuges and intrigues surrounding the politics of militancy in the Niger Delta lead Alice and Claire Unwin (Johdi May), the wife of the deceased; Mark to Keme Tobodo (David Oyelowo) a renowned activist and the leader of the negotiation team who consequently leads them to the camp of MEND in the creek. The search for truth in the creek reveals that the Joint Task Force headed by Tunde Tayo killed the hostages as bait to further blacklist the revolutionary struggles of MEND.

Blood and Oil portrays militancy and violence as a lucrative and liberating enterprise in the existential struggle for survival in the Niger Delta. Attwood uses the film to examine the four dimensions of violence, physical, political, economic and cultural violence that define the life of militancy and civil unrest in the troubled oil region. The central crux of this film is the singular reportage of militancy as a violent and immoral means to an end perpetuated by the youths of the Niger Delta. This singular narrative favours multinationals operating in the region, the governments and money bags, who commit the worst atrocities in the Niger Delta through exploitation, penetration, segmentation, fragmentation and marginalisation of the indigenes of the Niger Delta because of oil explorations while disfavouring the oppressed youths who are arrested and killed as rebels in their homeland due to their radical and violent means of seeking restitution and normalcy in the equitable distribution of resources.

The film opens in a typical kidnap fashion as seen in most films that treat the issue of militancy and violence in the Niger Delta, and depicts the process leading to the abduction of Mark Unwin and his colleagues by MEND as one fuelled with sabotage. The tension around the scene of abduction instigated by the arrival of MEND at the Oil Company facility produces fear among the indigenes whose fishing business and social lives are put to an abrupt end. The outcome during abductions of potential victims by

militants is extremely violent and often leads to the death of many people including the indigenes. The damages (material and nonmaterial) caused by forceful abduction are attributed to the sporadic shootings aimed at deterring any reprisals from security operatives and guards as seen in the film. Hence the call by the old man who serves as the community's whistle-blower informing the people that *the boys don come* speaks a lot about the negative effects of militancy in society, especially as it affects human and social security.

Violence is a preferred means adopted by militants in their agitations for equity and justice. As such, it is considered by the oppressed youths an apt response to the lingering structural violence through the marginalization and exploitation of the people of Niger Delta by multinationals, the people's representatives, and the government who have absolute control over the production and distribution of the resources that come from the region. This is the theme of the militants' jubilant song after they had abducted Mark and his colleagues and were making their way back to the creeks.

> We we we   wa wa wa
> We no go gree   wuruwuruwuru
> Na my land be this
> You no go fit take my life
> Na dey thing wey I dey say
> All of us wan live in peace

The song is a reflection of the root cause of violent agitations in the region that have created a warlike situation in the area. Regrettably, the quest for justice and equity by these militants is misconstrued by the Nigerian government and its Western allies to suit their capitalist interests. Structural violence is premised on the capitalist inclination that further creates a class divide in society. Most times, these capitalists make use of the media to submerge the actual reality of tragic events in society in their favour. The news report

105

following the abduction of these workers by foreign media sheds more light on the politics of media coverage and propaganda that conceals the actual problems that lead to extremist activities in crisis-prone areas like the Niger Delta, and the underdevelopment of African States in general.

Voice from the TV:	we own the oil. The thieves are the politicians in Abuja
Reporter:	in a militant attack to an extent that the oil companies are quick to close 60% of operations

This selective revelation and underreporting of the activities of militant groups and their agitations besmirch the militants' true intentions toward the struggle and ultimately puts the agitators in a bad light before the global community. The conversation Alice has with Daly; Krielsen's director in Nigeria further reveals that such selective reportage by the Western-influenced media houses is deliberate and intended to conceal the truth and cause a rupture in the psychological frame of the struggle.

Daly:	how much have they told you about MEND?
Alice:	they are responsible for the kidnappings, more political than the other groups, well-armed, becoming more effective...
Daly:	we are not putting this out but there are a lot more. They are getting close to shutting down our operations here for good. We have already lost 50% of the facilities, and 2/3 of production. But this is just the beginning. My assessment, this is the most dangerous crisis since the Biafran war 40 years ago that cost a million lives.
Alice:	And your assessment is not to be reported

> **Daly**: No, but you need to know. So you see we have all the conditions now for civil war, a disaster for us, for Nigeria, for the whole of Africa...

Sadly, Daly's disposition and assessment of the tragic situation rocking the Niger Delta shows the underlying cause of underdevelopment in the region, and regrettably the government's indifference toward the outcry for help by the Niger Deltans and the militants. To people like Daly, it is about the "Benjamins", the security of western oil facilities, and the exploration of oil against the poverty, hunger, unemployment, biodegradation, and associated risks that are injurious to the lives of the Niger Deltans. Therefore, a perpetual underreporting of the evil befalling the people who are exploited daily and rendered poor and homeless continues to mar the people's agitation for justice. To this oppressed majority, the use of physical violence through militant activities like kidnapping for ransom, destruction of oil company facilities, and killings are perceived as alternative approaches to addressing their concerns.

Any responsible government takes charge of situations that are inimical to its sovereignty. Unfortunately, Attwood portrays the Nigerian government and its Western allies as chief oppressors and instigators of militancy and violence in the Niger Delta. This is because, rather than pay attention to the remote causes of militant agitations to address them, the resolve of the government is to exterminate the militants. Alice is bewildered by this sense of irresponsibility by the government against the people it should protect, and thus struggles to understand "why on earth will the government set out to kill(ing) them (militants)"? The only logical reason for such brutality and betrayal as Tobodo reasons is that "it is the justification the government needs to wipe them out without attracting unwelcome attention from the rest of the world". Tobodo's enlightenment campaign for a civil society throws light

on the role of government in engendering militant operations in the Niger Delta.

> **Tobodo**: ...We have all the riches in the world right here under our feet... look how poor we are. We haven't even got our water. This is what happens when corruption sips into the very soul of our country. There comes a moment in history when a government is so painful to its people, so hurtful to the very soul of the people that it reaches the moment of destiny and from every village, a cry goes up and I hear it o... where is the person who will take us out of this politics of violence and corruption? But am not offering you guns, I'm not offering you ammunition, I'm not offering you charm for revenge or a way to get rid of your hurt, or your anger, or your frustration. If you want that, you go and join the militants in the creeks. Revenge is not in my language. What I offer to you is dignity and pride in yourself as a good person.

Tobodo can be aptly described as the voice in the wilderness crying for a change in the living conditions of his people and more so, a change in the approach toward seeking justice, where rewards for dignity and pride are supreme over punishments and killings. He blames the government for moral and social decadences that have made violence a deadly but profitable venture for both the government and the militants and also bemoans the politics of violence and corruption that has taken over the weft and warp of the Niger Delta. Therefore, he abhors entirely militancy and the use of violence in the struggle for emancipation while proposing the establishment of a functional civil society that can bring lasting peace and progressive change in society.

As situations unravel in the film, we are confronted with the dreadful life in the creeks, weaved in secrecy and codified language

to delineate any form of threat and attack against the militants in their hideout when Tobodo, Alice, and Claire go to meet Ebi and his gang of militants to uncover the mystery behind the death of the expatriate workers and disappearance of Lucky. Activities in the creeks reveal the dependence on tools of violence like firearms, ammunition, explosives and charms by militants for protection and survival. However, Ebi, the leader of MEND is disgusted to know that Claire is British. His disgust stems from the fact that the British government is the most beneficiary of the wealth that comes from the Niger Delta but fails to support the fight against corruption and violence that undermine the development of the Niger Delta. He tags the British as "wicked people conniving with our government... and waging a fifty-year war against us, which is stealing our oil", a type of violence that has radically ruptured the existential reality of people in the Niger Delta. Ebi justifies the development of militancy in the Niger Delta and claims that the kidnap of expatriate Oil staff for ransom and the vandalisation of oil pipelines and other facilities are aimed at fighting against the governments and its allies for the psychological, physical, and sociological violence they have endured for over five decades. He assures Claire that these activities will continue to thrive until their three-point agenda, which are; the localization of the control of the Delta oil, reparation by the national government for the pollution of the creeks and a total demilitarization of the Niger land are addressed by the government and the multinationals. Ebi portrays the character of a rascal who is on a suicide mission. This is because, while his intentions are germane toward the devolution of militancy and violence in the Niger Delta, waging war against a national government is tantamount to taking an uninsurable risk that may yield no progressive result in the long run. Unfortunately for the militants, the war against militancy by the national government is supported by other national governments in the Western and Eastern blocs who perceive militancy as serious violence capable of challenging both national and global security.

War and Violence in Kriv Stenders' *Danger Close*

 Danger Close starts with mortar attacks by Northern Vietnamese against the Nui Dat First Australian Task Force Base Camp. The operation commander Brigadier Oliver David Jackson (Richard Roxburgh) in a reprisal against the Northern Vietnam Army at Long Tan assigns his commanding officer Lt. Colonel Colin Townsend (Anthony Hayes) to mobilize soldiers for the mission nicknamed "Operation Vendetta". Lt. Colonel Colin Townsend (Anthony Hayes) assigns team Bravo to lead the reprisal against Major Harry Smith's (Travis Fimmel) suggestion to use his Delta team which consists of a hundred and nine-foot soldiers. While Team Bravo was unsuccessful in locating the camp of the enemy, the mission was reassigned to the Delta team, allowing Major Harry Smith to lead the Delta team to the rubber plantation at Lang Tan against North Vietnam. However, his highhandedness toward the young and inexperienced officers under his command cost him their respect and support. More so, pride and insubordination get over him during a terrible offensive attack from the Northern Vietnam soldiers, leading to the loss of all the members of Platoon Eleven. Afraid that the battle will be lost, Brigadier Oliver orders a retreat to enable them to re-strategize, but Major Harry Smith flouts the order, rebuilds the confidence and trust of his team members, and urges them to fight on. This consequently encouraged the young soldiers to give it their all to recover the lost platoon eleven, and through the help of Colonel Colin Townsend, the battle is won amid the loss of lives.

 The film examines the enormity of violence in the theatre of war and the implications of war violence on military officers and the nation they defend. War is one example of structural violence against people who are determined to defend their territory from undue exploitation, penetration, segmentation, fragmentation and marginalisation by marginal forces and allies. The purpose of war is usually economic, political and cultural through direct physical

violence on both the military and civilians. Historically the Vietnam War was a bitter battle over resource control by power blocs in the West and East. While Northern Vietnam relied on military support from the French and other communist countries in Asia to defend their territory, Southern Vietnam relied on support and military assistance from the US. However, the US military had other allies like Australia and New Zealand who offered military assistance to help repress the offensive attacks coming from the north. This led to the mobilization of over 2500 Australian and New Zealander youths inexperienced in warfare to camp at Nui Dat Task Force Base Camp in Phuoc Toy, led by Brigadier Oliver David Jackson. As their camp came under intense violent attack from Northern Vietnam soldiers, the need to reorganize a defence nay offensive and also to identify the enemy territory became a burden weighing on Colonel Colin Townsend and his subordinates. War is an organised violence that is ideological in formation, and national in outlook. Such organised violence aims to have an edge and dominance over a common enemy and to have an undue influence over the resources of the people. Achieving this depends on a swift and effective defence strategy that can break the ranks of the opposing forces. Hence, the Australian force's response to the physically violent attack from the Northern army is to first "take cover" "get your weapons" and "man your position". The essence of the command is to make it possible for the soldiers to "find the enemy" and "direct the artillery unto them". This chain of command from Major Smith and Sgt. Bob to the inexperienced young soldiers on a battlefield suggests a sense of urgency to the enormity of their precarious situation. This is because war violence is hinged on the ideology of survival, and in this regard, the best form of defence is to launch an attack on the enemy, thus justifying the morality of violence in war situations. The ideological perception of violence as a counteroffensive strategy in war is emphasised when Colonel Colin addressed his Unit commanders on the need to be strategic in their operation.

Colonel Colin:	The enemy knows exactly what he is doing. He is targeting our camps and our Task Force Headquarters. The count is one dead, and 23 wounded. However, our artilleries have driven him back and we are going after him. One company will move out beyond the water and patrol east into the rubber plantation at Long Tan where the enemy mortar came from. We are calling it Operation Vendetta.

War violence most often ends in taking forceful possession or occupying a territory. Such a forceful takeover of territory requires special operations by the military forces involved in the war. Every military operation goes by a code name and requires a special force to lead the operation. Hence, Operation Vendetta is a code name for the counteroffensive mission against the enemy from the North. Operation Vendetta aims to trail the enemy to their camp to weaken their arsenal and take control of their base. However, the challenge of leading such an offensive attack is hinged on trust and tactical superiority which Major Smith thinks his Delta team has over the Bravo team that Colonel Colin assigned for the mission. He unleashes his anger and frustration on the young officers under him. To him, trust is an essential ingredient in warfare, more important than killing the enemy. He feels that the inability of his commander, Colonel Colin to trust him with the responsibility of leading the attack against the enemy is a letdown on his pedigree. Hence in his characteristic bullying mannerism of instructing his subordinates, he unleashes both physical and psychological violence on PTE Paul Large over his failure to identify the place of trust in the military.

Major Smith:	what do you think is the most important element in firefighting?
PTE Paul:	Killing the enemy, Sir
Major Smith:	Trust. You have to trust the man beside you and he has to trust you.

While Major Smith's refusal to accept that his position is vicarious to Colonel Colin's leadership, his team member suffers at his hands through punitive training and sarcastic teachings aimed at ridiculing their inexperience and capacity to be in a theatre of war like the Vietnam War. His highhandedness and bullish attitude towards his subordinates becloud his sense of logic to know that violence is not always physical like their war against the Northern Vietnamese but is psychological also. Ironically, in war, the psyche of a soldier is what is most required in winning the war, especially when there is a shortage of firepower and personnel. Unfortunately, Smith's insensitivity causes him to lose the respect and trust of his team members which he ironically preaches but refuses to practice., and later becomes his albatross mid-way in the war causing him to lose several members of the Delta team.

Comparative Approaches in the Representations of Militant and War Violence in Nollywood and Hollywood Film Cultures

Film provides important insights into the psychological, socio-political, and ideological make-up of a specific society at a given point in history. Hollywood and Nollywood are two film industries that are recognized internationally for their in-depth treatment of the many problems in different societies, cultures and continents. Some of these problems are violent. Hence, the selected films dwell on the use of violence for the collective survival of the people.

Blood and Oil focuses remotely on the militant crisis in the Niger Delta caused by the exploitation, marginalization, penetration, segmentation and fragmentation of the people of the

region following the discovery and exploration of oil in the region by Western Multinational Oil Cooperation whose activities cause environmental hazards that affect the lives of the people who respond to the problems affecting their lives through extreme revolutionary movements by youths in the region. The film thus treats violence as a product of frustration, exploitation, and underdevelopment that have crippled the economic, social, cultural, and political lives of the people of that region, especially those in the rural communities where oil mining activities are carried out in the creeks. Historically, the Niger Delta crisis is as old as the discovery of oil in the region. Agitation about who controls oil proceeds is paramount in the region, creating a bitter rivalry between the youths, their representatives, and the government which is often violent. David Attwood presents a triangulated struggle for the control of oil between the people through the illegal activities of MEND armed Militia group and civil activism, the government, and multinationals. The problem of resource control is not peculiar to Africa nay Niger Delta. It is a global problem that has caused many civil and global wars. Resource and territorial control are evident in *Danger Close*. This Hollywood film centres on the civil war in Vietnam between the North and South. The battle between these regions is not unconnected with the scrambling of territories by the communist West in the North and the American liberalists in the South. The essence of this war is for the respective interest power blocs to exert their political, cultural and economic powers in their respective region of interest, and to control the resources in those regions. Kriv Stenders uses the doggedness amid insubordination and pride of Major Smith in taking the war to the enemy's territory to depict the tussle for territorial control in Vietnam in *Danger Close*.

The effect of these struggles for both resource and territorial control caused extreme physical violence and several other disasters for the people of these regions as captured in the films. In the Niger Delta, the prevalent effects are militancy,

kidnapping, extortion, vandalism and oil bunkering, displacement of the natives affected by inhabitable environment occasioned by oil spillage, poverty, biodegradations and ecological disasters. In the case of Vietnam, we see the depletion of the population size of the country as a result of protracted war, hunger, starvation and death, and the destruction of infrastructures. All these point to the negative effects of extreme violence like militancy and war in the life of a people, race, and nation.

One fundamental aspect in the treatment of militancy and war violence that cuts across the films is the depiction of the marginalized and exploited as the actual enemy in the struggle for economic and political control. Militant agitations in the Niger Delta are tailored towards the emancipation of the people from poverty, exploitation, greed and other institutionalized social structures that undermine human and capital development of the region. However, while these issues are highlighted as factors instigating restiveness in the area, the militants are depicted as the enemy of the indigenous people, and national and international governments through selective reportage in favour of the hegemonic forces. Generally, militants are seen as a threat to national security and because of the nature of their operation, they are perceived as the common enemy of the government, Oil Companies, and the people. Pertinently, in *Blood and Oil*, MEND is seen as treacherous, and destructive to the progress of the Oil Company and the government. By and large, they are seen as the enemy of the government that can be exterminated through the special operation of the Joint Task Force and media to frame the agitations of the militants as baseless and inconsequential. Relatively, Hollywood's treatment of the Vietnam War presupposes that the Vietnamese depending on the divide are the enemy. Hence in *Danger Close*, the Northern Vietnam people are consistently referred to as the enemy by the South and their allies from America, while Southern Vietnam sees the North and their communist allies as the enemy that must be defeated. However,

unlike *Blood and Oil* which highlights the real problems of the Niger Delta that birthed violence through militancy, *Danger Close* is silent on the political and social problems in Vietnam that resulted in the use of War as a violent means of survival.

More so, militancy and war are treated as global security problems that affect the safety of lives and property of people in the affected areas, and when left unattended, can exterminate a race. These acts of violence are treated from a multicultural perspective to underscore their potential threat to human existence. In *Blood and Oil*, we see the effects of militancy as a global security problem affecting nations, businesses, and bilateral and human relationships within and beyond the African continent. *Danger Close* shows the adverse effects of war and its implications for global and national security. The War between the North and South and the involvement of the various allies from Europe, communist Asian countries, the US, New Zealand, and Australia is a pointer to the seriousness of war on national and global security.

As a historical depiction of events that happened in these continents by these two film industries, a careful attempt was made by the directors to shoot these films in cities and communities where most of these events happened in real life. In *Blood and Oil*, the locations were selected to show the subjective realism of sites like the creeks, oil exploration sites, and rural communities of Abonema and Port Harcourt in Rivers State. In the *Danger Close* the choice of Phuoc Tuy as the setting of the major dramatic actions is evident in projecting these historical locations as national sites development.

More so, the multicultural nature and thematic preoccupation of these films required the adoption of a transnational approach in the production process. Therefore, the collaboration of cast and crew from different multicultural and national societies, shooting in multiple locations across the continents, and other multicultural elements like language,

costume, make-up, and props, deepened role interpretation and the general understanding of the ideological treatments in the films.

Conclusion

Militancy and war are nothing short of reactionary tendencies toward the lingering crises of exclusion that bother economic, political, and cultural oppressions perpetuated by a hegemonic force against a disadvantaged sect in society. However, the implication of adopting these approaches as defence mechanisms in seeking redress is deleterious to the parties involved despite the justification for the adoptions as can be seen through the analyses of the selected films. Film has a major role to play in deemphasising the use of violence both as a means of oppression, like in the case of structural violence by social institutions and as a means of reprisal through militancy and war. Therefore, the Nollywood and Hollywood film industries have the responsibility of using the film medium to expose and address issues that have serious implications for social and cultural harmony while advocating the use of nonviolent approaches to conflict resolution in contemporary society.

Works Cited

Chapter, XV. *Armed Conflicts and their Consequences*. Accessed 08/12/2022.https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/rwss/docs.200 1/ 15%20Armed%20Coflict.pdf pp 203-208

Blood & Oil. Dir. David Attwood. Lagos: ABC Signature, 2010.

Croombs, Matthew. "In the Wake of Militant Cinema: Challenges for Film Studies." *Discourse*. 41.1. Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 2019. pp68–89.

Danger Close. Dir. Kriv Stenders. Australia: Transmission Films, 2019.

Gates, Scott, Havard Mokleiv Nygard Havard-Hegre and Havard Strand. "Development Consequences of Armed Conflict." *World Development*. 40.9 (2012):1713-1722. Accessed

08/12/2022. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2012.04.031

Gooch, Joshua. "Militants and Cinema: Digital Attempts to Make the Multitude in *Hunger*, *Che*, and *Public Enemies*." *Wide Screen*. Vol. 3, No.1. Leeds: Subaltern Media, 2011. 1-36

Ifeka, Caroline. War on 'terror': Africom, the kleptocratic state and under-class militancy in West Africa-Nigeria. Concerned Africa Scholars Bulletin 85 (2010):30-49. Accessed 10/03/2022.https://citeseerx.ist.pus.edu/viewdoc/download?

Justino, Patricia. "The Impact of Armed Civil Conflict on Household Welfare and Policy." *Institute of Development Studies*. Vol. 2011 No. 384. Brighton: HCN, 2011. Pp 1-38.

Kent, George. *Structural Violence*. Accessed 8/12/2022. http://www2.hawaii.eu/~kent/StructuralViolenceFestschrift.pdf pp.131-140

Unit-5 *Structural Violence*. Accessed 08/12/2022. https://egyankosh.ac.in/bitstream/12/3456789/63422/2/Unit-5.pdf pp. 1-12

Upeniece, V. "War and Society." *Society, Health, Welfare*. 30.9(2016):1-5. Accessed 08/12/2022. https://www.she-conferences.org/articles/shsconf/pdf/2016/09/shsconf_shw2016_00009.pdf