

HST 202: History of the United States W14 (Escobar Meta 31101 31100)

Home ► My courses ► Winter 2014 ► HST 202 W14 (Escobar Meta 31101 31100) ► January 27 -

February 2 ► Forum 2 ► Hollywood History & Mythology



Search forums

Forum 2

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

(Editorial Cartoons) Next >



Hollywood History & Mythology

by Joe Escobar - Friday, January 24, 2014, 10:01 PM

This forum thread is for Hollywood History & Mythology posts and replies.

After studying the required materials, address the questions in your posts.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post.

To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Hollywood History & Mythology

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply



Does Call Of Duty Lead To Violence?

by Kenneth Green - Sunday, January 26, 2014, 1:04 AM

The question of mythology creeping into Historical events and data through media, might be jaded by generational viewpoints. (I'm more interested in reading the responses to this Forum question than writing one.) My sons are Millennials and I'm a strong believer in their generation. My generation and friends span from Fast Times At Ridgemont High to Billy Madison and both Jeff Spicoli and Billy are fairly accurate portraits. I love studying History, so even ten years ago this question would have inspired less of a Forum response than a rant. But, information is a click away in 2014. It's hard to manipulate kids these days with mythology. Twitter would blow up. It's why I'm more interested in reading other responses, because the tendency is to disparage our own generation over others. And that's a generational essence I share with my sons. We're post modern, cynical (there is nothing new under the sun save our art & laughter,) and we have smart phones.

However, the question can be explored through a less esoteric and more academic lense. I

offer the link to <http://www.nea.org/home/39060.htm> regarding how the State of Texas basically controls History. Texas buys a lot of textbooks, and the state is home to a lot of Churches. And many of those churches probably even house paintings by the Artist John McNaughton. Here are a few links to a painting of Jesus handing the Constitution to our Founding Fathers (I believe Dr. King is even there) from various sides of the spectrum:

<http://www.citypaper.net/article.php?Jesus-wrote-the-Constitution-according-to-painting-in-weird-press-release-8705>

<http://theamericanjesus.net/?p=3881>

(if it doesn't link just go to JonMcNaughton.com) you can find the painting and get the picture. (I love Jesus, cool cat, treat your neighbor politely? It's Kindergarten.) But the question isn't about religion or even politics, it's about mythology in History spread by media and movies. If Spielberg made a movie of Jesus handing the Constitution to the Founding Fathers (I believe he's Jewish so I don't think he would) he'd be laughed off the planet. The threat is less "media" and more about not letting real Historians do their jobs, based upon personal filters and revisionism.

I sense kids are really smart today and know (based upon our shared post-modern generational sensibilities- and the fact I told at least mine) when they go to a movie? It's a movie. I do agree with Foner from the reading, if you're passing out pamphlets in schools get it right or your just the Texas State School Board. No difference. But Blight's complaint that the Underground Railroad is being revised has less to do with Spielberg than McNaughton. Except in Houston and Austin.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Does Call Of Duty Lead To Violence?



by Timothy Wilson-Haley - Friday, January 31, 2014, 8:42 PM

Yes, I think you are correct to identify other sources of misinformation that we're all exposed to on a daily basis, including the woeful textbook situation. However, I don't think that the existence of Twitter makes it easier to be well informed, rather it increases the amount of misinformation and the quickness with which it spreads. That old saying, "a lie can travel around the world before the truth can even tie its shoes" is just as true today as when it was first coined. Historical ignorance isn't the result of an inability to fact-check, but rather the lack of desire to challenge preconceived notions. People prefer to interact through personal folk-group encounters. Twitter is the latest technological manifestation of informal folk-groups. Jesus bestowing the Constitution is not the result of the painter John McNaughten's lack of access to Twitter where he can easily fact-check. It's his folklore passed to him by his folk-group, through which he views all things. This is what his faith teaches him, which is an excellent example of the things historians must expel. Joseph Smith taught that the American Republic is the result of divine guidance. It's McNaughton's mythology.

An interesting point that both Foner and Escobar mentioned is the study manuals for Amistad being pushed for teachers to include in classrooms. One item of Foner's disapproval is how the movie's study guide introduces students to abolitionism through a fictitious character. These are legitimate concerns and criticisms, however, I am

most curious about which specific institution is pushing it all, and which school-boards/administrations think it's a good idea. The problem lies in inadequate funding for schools and public indifference toward curriculums resulting in a general lack of knowledge and critical thinking skills, which is a terrible down-ward spiral.

Not only must historians dispel old myths and legends, they must also prevent new myths from taking hold. This is especially difficult when non-academics perceive the problem in very different ways and respond by appealing to people's desire for a compelling story, subsequently creating new mythologies. To compound this difficulty even more, historians must distinguish between well-meaning mythological appeals seeking to address the problem of mass ignorance, and simplistic creations of propaganda seeking to dispel analysis.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Hopeful but also doubtfull

by Connor McCabe - Sunday, January 26, 2014, 1:06 PM

Just like Mr. Green was saying kids now have information at the touch of their fingers. They have the ability that, if they want to, they can fact check almost anything. From films, to teachers, to friends and family, and the media. Even though people have the ability and means to fact check there are a lot of people who choose to take in everything they hear as fact. 30% of people aged 18-29 get their news from shows like The Daily Show and The Colbert Report saying they "are replacing traditional news outlets,..."
(http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/03/25/young-americans-see-colbe_n_178884.html)

Almost one third choose a Comedy Central show as their source of news. It is true that many people can and will fact check what they hear I am just concerned for the third that choose not to.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



I don't have cable!

by Thomas Stevens - Friday, January 31, 2014, 3:10 PM

How am I supposed to be informed if my news has to be sandwiched between a fart joke and a Metamucil commercial?

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Hollywood History & Mythology

by Melissa Moser - Monday, January 27, 2014, 6:21 PM

Honestly, I think my generation has been conditioned to take Hollywood's Hullabaloo with a grain of salt. At least, I have, as have most of my friends. If others haven't, I'm even more concerned than I was before I started writing this sentence.

The movie industry is rarely out for anything more than financial gain, which tends to warrant a bit of sensationalism and "artistic license". Movie-goers, especially the young

American variety, seem to want something big and exciting out of our films. We want battles of epic proportions and the kind of magnanimous moral uprisings that are filmed facing into the sun with a flare on the lens. Did this event have an incredible impact on history? No? Give it one! Did these people change the course of the country? No? Make it so! These movies stand more to line the pockets of the crew and actors and to simply bring up awareness of the issue or event's existence. If the audience is inspired by or interested in a topic, it's generally expected that we will go ask the Great Gods of Wikipedia for background.

Academically, I think it's an incredible waste of resources, knowing what kind of money is spent on these altered stories of our past. If we spent those funds on educational materials or on research for these topics, the youth of our country might have a firmer grasp on why our country is where it is today, what we should work on, and we just might feel more inspired to do it. ... hmm... maybe I just uncovered the reasoning behind why the money doesn't get funneled down those channels.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



The criticism of your generation

by Thomas Stevens - Friday, January 31, 2014, 3:19 PM

is that you're shallow and unable to go to the library and read a book of which an author might have spent years of their life researching.

Personally, I like dialing up, no wait that's so late 20th century, and logging on to find the answers to burning questions, but old people would criticize me for doing that.

But, truthfully, when I was at U of O doing some of my undergraduate work, I was only allowed to cite online sources when they were peer reviewed, and I was limited to the number of those sources. I think those professors could be called "old school".

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: The criticism of your generation

by Melissa Moser - Friday, January 31, 2014, 6:13 PM

Not at all. I just choose not to spend my money seeing movies that abuse the facts before I go to the library. I am an avid reader and a fantastic for the preservation of our history and what relics we retain from it. It hurts me to see the way we treat significant events in history when movies are made about them. My generation is so spoiled with iThis and eThat, everything at our fingertips, that far too many are bored with the truth. That is why the studios alter them; because the populace has reached a point of finding our own history and foundations "unwatchable".

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Re: Hollywood History & Mythology



by Danny Lopez - Friday, January 31, 2014, 4:21 PM

I totally agree with you that this generation is use to watch big blockbuster movies with lots of action and fighting, etc. When it comes to historic movies we don't want to watch it because its too boring, or too long to watch. I think its important that hollywood does history movies with actual facts, and not this action packed movies with a lot of nonsense that does not connect with that event. I also agree with you about how Hollywood use in money in these movies which is a crazy amount just get more revenue out of it.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Financial Gain Rather Than Informing People

by Anthony Consolo - Monday, January 27, 2014, 11:42 PM

I know that whenever I have gone to see a film with historical truth to it, I normally leave with lots of questions. Most of them revolving around the credibility that the film can be given and whether or not the directors and producers tweaked details to make the film more interesting. When I see these things and have these types of questions, it makes me wonder if the event is really worth making into a movie anyway. If the story has to be changed in order to add excitement or interest, whether the changes be big or small, is it really worth making into a movie? For example, the movie Friday Night Lights. The movie highlights a true story of a high school football team in Texas in the year 1988. The team has a winning record, while losing two or three games during the season. The story ends with them losing in the state championship game to a team that was far superior to them. When I take a step back and look at the story in perspective, it makes me wonder how significant the team and it's story really was. To the average person, you see a slightly-above-average football team that loses in the playoffs. What's all the fuss about? It seems to me that it would be better if you made a movie about a team that went undefeated and won the championship. I later found out that the producer changed a lot of details of the real story to make it more compelling to viewers. If details are changed in "true" stories, why put the phrase "Based on a True Story" in the opening credits? FOR MONEY. Producers are so worried about their wallet that they essentially lie to their audience to give them more of a thrill. If the truth and the facts have to be tweaked and twisted in order to gain the interest of an audience, the movie may not be worth making at all...

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Financial Gain Rather Than Informing People

by Kenneth Green - Wednesday, January 29, 2014, 7:08 PM

Anthony I know I wont get any points for this, but that ending was awful! Why make movies about teams that lose the Championship game? (The best part of Hoosiers is the end when we realize the movie is about a long forgotten championship photo hanging in the gym.) But your point is well taken. Perhaps the words "Based Upon A True" story certainly relate to Amistad and maybe that's the point Foner is making. (Especially if they are passing out literature in schools to promote the movie.) Well

said!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Financial Gain Rather Than Informing People



by Brian Davis - Thursday, January 30, 2014, 8:46 PM

The answer to your question of whether or not the movie was worth making is answered in the fact that you bought a ticket, so it was worth it to somebody. The term "based on a true story" means exactly that, it's based on it, which means minor details were tweaked to make it more interesting so they could sell tickets. They make these kinds of movies because a lot of time real life drama is more exciting than anything a writer can come up with. But parts of that event are going to be kind of boring. It may have been one thing that happened that lasted a few minutes (assassination of JFK) but they need to fill a two hour time slot, so it needs to be spiced up a bit to draw in an audience. There is a reason most documentaries aren't shown in theaters, they aren't ticket sellers. So you're right, for them it's all about the money, but you can't really blame them because that is their job, they're storytellers.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Don't blame Spielberg



by Timothy Wilson-Haley - Tuesday, January 28, 2014, 8:10 AM

I would like to have heard Professor Blight discuss how humans have always made mythology out of our past. We create folklore and legends and myths. The formal academic discipline of History exists in part to dispel this habit and address the more serious grievances this causes. He was doing his job in the interview, but I think he could have been more clear. Instead, he made it seem as if this is a contemporary problem. I agree that romanticizing historical events distorts meanings and inhibits our ability to learn and move our civilization forward. Hollywood participates in these cultural activities for sure, but I'm left confused about the target of Professor Foner's criticisms. He argues that the \$75 million dollar movie budget would have been better spent on public schools. When did it become Hollywood's and Spielberg's job to fund-raise for public education? As stated in another post, the inadequate textbooks and teaching methods identified by Foner are not the creation of Hollywood. His criticisms could be more productively aimed at the political process that has failed to provide adequate education.

I would be interested to know Foner's opinion on William Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, which we read in my high-school Western Civ. class. Shakespeare condensed time frames, combined battles, invented dialogue, and so forth. Some literary scholars argue that the play has more to do with the Elizabethan era in England than it does Rome, just like the stories we tell today. No, *Amistad* should not be shown in a history class, but it does belong in a literature class. I think it is nothing short of ridiculous to complain about the woeful state of American education without criticizing the political system that has created that situation and instead attack something that gets far more attention but has less to do with it.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: showing films in schools that are historically incorrect

by Samuel Tapfer - Tuesday, January 28, 2014, 9:19 AM

When finding out that the film *Amistad* was not completely true to historical events I was not upset. This film was made to make money and used some history to do that. Changing the historical truth is something I come to expect from Hollywood films. To have a big box office selling film you need to make sure you can get people in the seats. The director has a vision they want to make come alive and will use some parts of historical truth to do that. At the same time they will bend the truth and also will use false historical events to be more appealing to movie goers. This film is "historically based" around slavery. It is up to the film makers to decide how much of that truth they want in their films. The problem that I have is with schools that use this film to teach students. If the teacher says that the film is historically correct then there is a problem there with the school and teacher, not with the filmmakers. I could see where a teacher would use parts of the film to teach with, but should also state that the whole film does have some false historical events.

As I get farther into my education I realize certain historical events that I have learned are false. I do get upset when finding out I had been given false information. At the same time I believe certain historical events are about more than what they teach you in earlier years of education. Maybe the students are not old enough to comprehend every single historical fact so they wait until an older age to reeducate you on the subject. I do believe that some historical truths can be kept from us, but at the same time have the ability to go out and find out the truth on our own. There are lots of resources to get the truth from so that you can have your own opinion on the historical matter.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Its Hollywood

by Haden Peterson - Tuesday, January 28, 2014, 12:23 PM

Personally I'm not surprised by the way Hollywood portrayed this time in history. Just like any other movie based on history, they're not going to include everything (in this case key events including the under ground railroad) and they'll add some things to make it a little more interesting. I haven't seen the film but based on all the reviews it doesn't seem to be worth the watch.

Academically this film would not be a reliable source. Like I said before there are some moments in the film that are probably close to what actually happened but the majority of the film seems to be a little off. I wouldn't use this movie as a source, in this case I would know to just go from the textbook. It doesn't concern me too much that Hollywood is "hiding the truth" what do you expect, its Hollywood

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Action packed vs. A true history movie



by Danny Lopez - Tuesday, January 28, 2014, 9:13 PM

Every time I hear that they are making a movie over a historical event which makes think that movie ain't going to follow the exactly what happened in that event, and add in their on own twisted story, and sometimes forget to add the true facts, but that is hollywood. Like the Amistad film was all true, and they only care about the money instead of teaching the youth with true facts over american history, and leave teens with questions, and more if you had read over the Amistad, so it just confuses them. In the article of "The Amistad Case in Fact and Film" by Eric Foner how they changing things around like, "Amistad's problems go far deeper than such anachronisms as President Martin Van Buren campaigning for reelection on a whistle-stop train tour (in 1840, candidates did not campaign), or people constantly talking about the coming Civil War, which lay twenty years in the future. Despite the filmmakers' orgy of self-congratulation for rescuing black heroes from oblivion, the main characters of Amistad are white, not black." (Foner)

I am concerned with film makers in how they confuse the viewer, and more if its a student because they are not displaying the historical truth, and they bring that into their studies with the wrong answers of the dilm makers mythology. It does make angry that a producer would rather make millions off a action pack movie instead of showing a great history movie with the truth facts

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Hollywood Rewriting History

by Evan Lawrence - Wednesday, January 29, 2014, 11:42 AM

Personally, I don't care that Hollywood rewrites certain parts of history as long as there is a basis in history and things we can prove actually happened. Whenever I see a movie that was "based on historical events" or "on a true story" I always assume that the only things that are true are the characters, era and settings. But when people start to take that movie as historical fact, I get worried.

On an academic level it really bugs me when Hollywood does things like people speaking English with an accent, or putting people in situations they would never be in. Like in *Amistad* there is a scene where Martin Van Buren meets with one of the slaves that was on La Amistad, that never happened. While in office Van Buren did not own slaves, he did earlier in his life and probably saw these slaves as he saw his own, as property not people.

I think David Blight makes a really good point about the Underground Railroad, which I remember learning about in elementary school as a way for slaves to escape to the North. It was presented to me, as Blight said, like "a tightly knit network" of farmers, escaped slaves and abolitionists working together with stations everywhere for slaves to eat and sleep. Then I took a class that focused on this era my 8th grade year, and learned that it was in fact the opposite. The truth, Blight says is that a "loosely connected network, sometimes a network". But we uphold this myth that it was a large network of white and

black people working together to overcome this terrible institution of slavery.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Hollywood Rewriting History

by Melissa Moser - Thursday, January 30, 2014, 9:14 AM

In regards to the accents, I'm always bothered by the fact that Hollywood depicts nearly all Europeans have having British accents. That's why I wound up having an appreciation for "Inglorious Basterds" [sic] -- they at least started in the correct languages with subtitles and then switched to English for ease. However, that is certainly another movie that was loosely based in history (Yes, we did have a WWII...), but you wouldn't want to take as a historically accurate account of the events. Academically, I'm just bothered that so many movies are shown to us in the early years of our schooling about events, and we review and study them as though they were documentaries. I watched The Patriot in middle school and then answered questions about the Revolutionary War based on the movie, for instance. I'm pretty sure I'm not going to be coming across those events in my textbook anytime soon.

We also learned about the Underground Railroad the same way. It was described as very similar to the networks used by the Jews to hide and escape occupied parts of Europe during WWII -- tight knit, with practically its own code language used to communicate between the plentiful and closely tied members of the group. Because of this, I had to chuckle at Blight's statement about how if everywhere that says they were on the Underground Railroad actually -was-, slavery wouldn't have even been an issue. The world really is a much different place than we teach our children or see on movie screens -- we can only hope that enough people have an interest in the truth to keep that knowledge commonplace.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Fact vs. Viction

by Jesse Nichols - Thursday, January 30, 2014, 6:32 PM

The reality is the movie industry is out for monetary gain and nothing else, they do not care about being historically accurate, they just want to fill their pockets. Movies based off of an historical event twist the truth to spark more interest. Film makers are also allowed to slap the title "based on a true story" on their films even though they change so many details that it ends up not being true at all. Luckily most of us are intelligent enough to realize this and we don't buy the stories Hollywood tries to sell us, we watch movies strictly for entertainment. As far as Amistad goes, it doesn't bother me that Spielberg made this movie "based on historical events", but I do find it concerning that it has made its way into classrooms where it doesn't belong. It is so far off from the actual events that occurred and it gives off the completely wrong idea of how our country viewed slavery at that time, that I can't see it having any real education value.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Fact vs. Viction

by Danny Lopez - Friday, January 31, 2014, 4:28 PM

I agree with you that Hollywood is interested in getting peoples attention to come buy a ticket to watch their action packed movie, and try to get as much revenue back, and knowing they spend so much money to make this movie. They don't want to add every single detailed thing that happened in that historical event because it will become a long dry movie with no action, and they are afraid that putting so much money into it they won't get that money back with a boring history movie. The sad thing is that most teachers in grade school show these fiction history movies to their students, and students are probably going to believe the facts that are shown. Might as well stick with history movies in they history channel.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Not a Documentary

by Brian Davis - Thursday, January 30, 2014, 8:26 PM

I personally am not upset by a movie like Amistad not being historically accurate. Almost all of those movies will say at some point either in the beginning or the end that it was *based* on a true story. When I see or hear that I know to not believe most of what happens. If the story peaks my interest I will wiki it and find out what actually happened that way. These movies are not, nor do they present themselves as, documentaries. If a documentary was blatantly false then I would take issue. These people's job is to make a movie that draws people to it and equates to dollars for those involved.

It is the sign of a responsible individual to fact check information they hear. I don't expect small children to do this, so it falls on the parents and in some cases the teachers to educate them on the historical accuracy (or lack thereof) of a film. In our society I see all too often where people will just post whatever nonsense they see on their news feeds without taking the 30 seconds it takes to google it and see if it is truth or not.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Romanticized History

by Michelle Coming - Thursday, January 30, 2014, 11:25 PM

Personally I am not surprised by the exaggeration/falsehoods in Hollywood movies. The main purpose of these movies is simply to entertain. When that line between entertaining and teaching is crossed that's when things get a bit messy. Movies such as Amistad or Saving Private Ryan are used in the class room as a tool to teach about that specific event in history. I can understand how they might be used to gain the interest of indifferent adolescents or to bring a little entertainment to what might have been a dull subject to most school age children. However, the use of worksheets and study guides that are passed out with the viewing of these movies is a bit disheartening. These historically based movies should be taught to be taken with a grain of salt, and not as a crutch for a lazy teacher to lean on (as I have so often experienced). I myself have only recently learned to question

the validity of facts presented to me, perhaps that should be the true lesson in showing such films in class.

It is a bit concerning to see the difference in how history is told as I grow older. I remember when I was little I had always thought that the underground railroad was an actual railroad, now in the second video I am hearing that it was mostly a myth, an idea, that was pumped up and romanticized. It is very concerning that we can't just teach our children about our history (savory or not) without adding that Hollywood flair to keep interest.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Romanticized History



by Danny Lopez - Friday, January 31, 2014, 4:35 PM

I agree with you that hollywood is about the money, and they want people to buy into their false historic movies. This true people in this generation are more into the most entertaining movie out there, and no one is going to spend money on a boring history movie when they can just watch that in the history channel. Just the Amistad believing that the was going to be true facts resulted in false scenes in the movie that didn't make since if someone knows history. Children in elementary schools are made to watch these false historic movies, and they are learning false facts, and hopefully someone can change that, but I don't see because students would fall asleep in these types of movies.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Trying to make that dollar



by Matt Blackshear - Friday, January 31, 2014, 5:54 PM

I think movies basing their themes around historical events is a good thing. If used properly it can be a good tool to teach children with; however like many of you have said it needs to be taken "with a grain of salt."

There's a difference between exaggerations and completely altering the history. For example making a few extra explosions, fist fights, or things like that is fine exaggerations to me. In Foner's review he talks about how the Amistad case revolved around the Atlantic slave trade as opposed to slavery as a domestic institution. Which seems like a big thing to leave out if you want to make it truthfully historical.

Teachers when using film in class need to choose videos carefully and make sure the movies are actually correct cause after all Hollywood is just a big business trying to make money. They will do what they need to to make that dollar.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Reality or Script?



by Anthony Consolo - Saturday, February 1, 2014, 7:31 PM



Another point that this brings up is documentaries vs. Hollywood films. What differentiates a documentary from a film? Well, I think there could be several factors that affect that. Mainly, whether a film's main purpose is strictly informational or for entertainment. The only documentary that I can think of are those showed during the famous "Shark Week" on the Discovery Channel. Now, I do think that some of the reenactments are accurate, but who's to say that directors don't sensationalize those too? Shark Week has become such a popular event every year that it would seem easy to want to increase the amount of action in reenactments for the excitement of dedicated viewers. Is Shark Week turning into an annual source of wild entertainment when it used to be completely informative and educational? While this does not directly relate to the history of the United States, it is still an interesting debate. Although, does that mean that we shouldn't watch in order to educate ourselves? I don't think so.

This also relates to all kinds of reality television shows that I see being watched today. They're almost treated like a drama TV show series or a movie. There are interesting characters, enticing plot twists, and there is usually some kind of ending that evokes emotions out of viewers. Is this TRULY reality TV? Or is it partially scripted in order to keep people interested?

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Sometimes you just have to look harder



by Bart Golden - Saturday, February 1, 2014, 11:53 PM

I can understand the frustration I hear when reading many of the posts on this forum. I think perhaps people are being a little hard on Hollywood, I myself can name many movies (maybe not huge productions) that are not only historically correct but very entertaining. The Right Stuff, the Miracles and more recently Ten Years a Slave or Lone Survivor all are accurate accounts of historical events presented in entertaining even exciting or moving manner you just have to look past the big blockbuster movies to find them

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

(Editorial Cartoons) Next >

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

Moodle Docs for this page

