

Research Article | Araştırma Makalesi

# The Representation of War in All Quiet on Western Front Films

## Batı Cephesinde Yeni Bir Şey Yok (All Quiet on Western Front) Filmlerinde Savaşın Temsili

Funda MASDAR (Assoc. Prof. Dr.)



Bitlis Eren University Faculty of Fine Arts  
Bitlis/Türkiye  
fmasdar@gmail.com

Başvuru Tarihi | Date Received: 30.08.2023  
Yayına Kabul Tarihi | Date Accepted: 22.11.2023  
Yayınlanma Tarihi | Date Published: 30.01.2024

Masdar, F. (2024). The Representation of War in All Quiet on Western Front Films. *Erciyes İletişim Dergisi*, 11(1), 81-104 <https://doi.org/10.17680/erciyesiletisim.1352595>

### Abstract

War, which represents power on the one hand and destructiveness on the other, is a form of struggle in the most general sense. This phenomenon, which includes all kinds of diplomatic or armed struggles in which the peace environment is disrupted, is of great importance not only during the war process but also with its post-process effects. Cinema has been interested in war as a social phenomenon since its early years. War cinema, which developed as a sub-genre of Western cinema, has become a genre over time. The history of cinema is full of countless examples of war films. In some of these films, the destructive social phenomenon of war is revealed, while in others war propaganda is made. All Quiet On The Western Front, which was transferred to cinema by different directors almost a hundred years apart from Remarque's autobiographical novel of the same name, is one of the important works of the war film genre. This study compares the versions of this film shot by Lewis Milestone in 1930 and Edward Berger in 2022. This comparison, it is aimed to reveal how war has been evaluated in cinema over the years. For this purpose, the plot and content of both films are analysed by the qualitative content analysis method. With this analysis, it will be explained comparatively how the ideological discourse on war is realised in the films. As a result of the study, it is seen that, as in many examples of war cinema, both films successfully reveal the destructiveness of war, its bitter face, and the destruction and despair it creates.

**Keywords:** All Quiet On The Western Front, War Cinema, Eric Maria Remarque, First World War, Representation of War.

### Öz

Bir taraftan gücü diğer taraftan yıkıcılığı temsil eden savaş, en genel anlamıyla bir mücadele biçimidir. Barış ortamının bozulduğu diplomatik ya da silahlı her türlü mücadeleyi içeren bu olgu, sadece savaş süreci boyunca değil süreç sonrası etkileriyle de büyük önem taşır. Sinema başlangıç yıllarından itibaren toplumsal bir olgu olan savaşla ilgilenmiştir. Western sinemasının bir alt türü olarak gelişen savaş sineması zamanla bir tür haline gelmiştir. Sinema tarihi sayısız savaş filmi örnekleriyle doludur. Bu filmlerin bazılarında savaşın ne kadar yıkıcı bir toplumsal olay olduğu ortaya konulurken, bazı filmlerde de savaş propagandası yapılmıştır. Otobiyografik bir roman olan Remarque'ın aynı adlı eserinden neredeyse yüz yıl arayla farklı yönetmenler tarafından sinemaya aktarılan Batı Cephesinde Yeni Bir Şey Yok filmi, savaş filmi türünün önemli yapıtlarından biridir. Bu çalışma, bu filmin 1930 yılında Lewis Milestone ve 2022 yılında Edward Berger tarafından çekilen versiyonlarını karşılaştırmaktadır. Bu karşılaştırma ile yıllar içerisinde sinemada savaşın nasıl değerlendirildiği ortaya çıkarmak amaçlanmaktadır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda her iki filmin olay örgüsü ve içeriği, nitel içerik analizi yöntemiyle çözümlenmektedir. Bu çözümlenme ile filmlerde savaşa yönelik ideolojik söylemin nasıl gerçekleştirildiği karşılaştırmalı olarak açıklanacaktır. Çalışmanın sonucunda birçok savaş sineması örneğinde olduğu gibi her iki film de savaşın yıkıcılığını, acı yüzünü, yarattığı tahribatı ve çaresizliği ortaya başarıyla koyduğu görülmektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Batı Cephesinde Yeni Bir Şey Yok, Savaş Sineması, Eric Maria Remarque, Birinci Dünya Savaşı, Savaşın Temsili.



## Introduction

Hollywood's *All Quiet on the Western Front* (1930) is considered one of the best examples of classic anti-war movies. The fact that it appeals to art as well as to ideology and history is the main reason for its success. The movie, which has been watched by more than a hundred million people since it was first shown ninety years ago, is considered to be closely related to the widespread perception of the First World War, the disgust for such massacres and, to some extent, anti-war sentiment. Although it has been almost a century, the title of the book and the movie are quite evocative. It has an emotional significance even for those who try to understand the war from the sepia (watercolor) pictures in the history books. Blended in public memory, the novel and movie, with characters such as the young hero, schoolboy-soldier Paul Baumer, have come to symbolize the transformative horror of the Western Front, a horror that remains embedded in the Western consciousness (Chambers, 1994, s. 377).

The movie is adapted from the immensely popular novel of the same name (German: *Im Westen Nichts Neues*) by German author Erich Maria Remarque. Remarque (1898-1970) was born in Westphalia, at the east of the Rhine, known as the "lost angel of the Great War", to a working class Catholic family of four children. (Van Kirk, 2011, s. 2) Although he was accused of being Jewish by the Nazis, it is certain that his family was of French origin. As a matter of fact, when he published the book *All Quiet on the Western Front*, he changed the spelling of his surname from "Remark" to Remarque; Thus, he returned his surname, which his grandfather had changed to Remark in the 19th century, back to its French origin (Chambers, 1994, s. 377). Thus, he made it clear that he preferred his French identity rather than his German identity.

*All Quiet on the Western Front* was part of the movement of anti-war sentiment that emerged in the late 1920s in a series of critical memoirs, novels, paintings, plays, and feature movies. Most of the anti-war works written during this period focused on ordinary soldiers, unlike their predecessors. Its main characters are truly anti-heroes and they draw attention to the alienation and mental and physical pain caused by war. They have little idea of the value of the anti-war worldview they espouse. Rather, they emphasized the pointless and endless massacre and waste, the waste of millions of young people, even those who were not killed in the war. They underlined that war only produces death or suffering (Chambers, 1994, ss. 377-378).

Anti-war works written during this period told the story of young men's transformation through their existence at the front and their psychological alienation from home and family. In these works, which are powered by strong binary oppositions such as war and peace, soldier and civilian, past and present, man and woman, even morality is divided into two due to the "duty" of killing at the front. Young soldiers are disconnected from civilian society and their innocent past. Civilians appear incapable of understanding the changing nature of the world at the front and how brutality, terror and mass murder make even the most vulnerable young men part of the overwhelming military machine. In these accounts, war is incomprehensible to ordinary soldiers. This incomprehensibility is emphasized by Remarque directly in the expressions of the soldiers and the thoughts of the young hero, and indirectly through the fragmented, uncoordinated syntax and the absence of an omniscient narrator. In the destructive new world of mechanical war, citizens have become soldiers, everyone is caught up in the same relentless machine of modern industrialized war. War is presented as a phenomenon that results in the grinding

of endless amounts of ammunition and people, even the earth itself.(Chambers, 1994, s. 378).

The novel is a largely autobiographical work based on Remarque's experiences during his time as a conscript in the German Army. It is a product of the frustration he and many other veterans felt with the war and the resulting postwar displacements. Remarque wrote the book in German in 1927-28, when he was thirty years old, and the first hardcover edition was published in Germany on January 31, 1929. The book, which was published in England and the United States six months after Germany, sold more than two million copies in a year (in the United States, the Book of the Month Club selected the book as the book of the month in June 1929 and the Little Brown publishing house sold 300,000 copies in a year. ). By the end of 1930 it had been translated into twelve languages and sold 3.5 million hardback copies worldwide. Fawcett Crest acquired the paperback rights in 1958, and the first 175,000 copies were sold within a few months. By the time Remarque died in 1970, it had been translated into forty-five languages and almost eight million copies were sold (Chambers, 1994, ss. 377-378). The book continues to be among the best-selling works today.

Remarque's ability to capture the horror of war and to reflect the growing disillusionment with the apparent futility of the World War (perhaps all wars) was immediately recognized, and the readers showed great interest in Remarque's book. The debates that began in Germany after the publication of the book reflect the increasing political polarization regarding the war and the future of the country. While liberals generally applauded the book for its pacifist agenda and ability to speak on behalf of the "lost generation" of 1914-18, both the left and the right criticized it heavily. On the left, German communists and socialists have downplayed Remarque's work for not refusing to directly blame the German ruling classes, describe the social and economic causes of the war, and promote revolutionary consciousness instead of vague philosophy and a sense of individuality. The right, on the other hand, harshly criticizes the work on the grounds that it implicitly condemns the country's traditional political, economic and military institutions and ignores what ultra-nationalists see as legitimate reasons for entering the war and the heroic sacrifices of German soldiers. The Nazis and other right-wing anti-Semites accused Remarque of being a "Jew" (he was actually a Catholic of French descent) and part of a so-called "international Jewish and Bolshevik conspiracy"(Chambers, 1994, s. 379).

Remarque left Germany in 1932 due to the oppression he suffered and settled in Switzerland. In 1933, his books were banned and burned by the Nazis. He was deprived of his German citizenship in 1938 and immigrated to the United States in 1939. His sister, Elfriede Scholz, who stayed in Germany, was arrested on charges of making anti-Nazi propaganda, and after the judicial process, she was executed by guillotine in 1943 (Murdoch, 2006, p. 9). Remarque, who was very saddened by his sister's death, wrote a novel titled Spark of Life (Der Funke Leben) dedicated to her in 1952. At a time when discussions about the book continued intensely, American director Lewis Milestone decided to adapt the work to cinema and completed the shooting of the movie in 1930. The movie, which was adapted with the same name, was released after the premiere in Los Angeles and attracted great attention. All Quiet on the Western Front, which was shown in New York for 23 weeks, won the Oscars for best picture and best director. The movie was banned as soon as it was released in Germany, although the German copy was partially censored. The movie, which was accused of insulting German values and

disrupting public order, was banned on the grounds that it harmed German reputation, although it received the approval of the censorship board, and was released much later with certain conditions (Sarisayın, 2020, s. 15). In the following years, the movie was restricted in different ways and shown in various countries, censored in line with the directions of political environments and power holders. All Quiet on the Western Front is considered one of the leading anti-war works of the past century, and the name of the novel is used as a synonym for the meaninglessness of war and the unchanging fate of the little person who lost his life in vain for the sake of the interests of others (Sarisayın, 2020, s. 16).

The novel was adapted to the movie screen for the second time in 2022, 92 years after the first movie, this time as a German production. The movie, shot by Edward Burger, was nominated in many categories at international festivals such as Oscar, Golden Globe and Bafta. It was deemed worthy of many awards such as the Oscars for best foreign language movie, best soundtrack, best production design and best cinematography, as well as BAFTA's best movie, best director, best adapted screenplay and foreign language movie award.

### **Purpose, Importance and Method**

Human history is full of countless wars and destructions. The First World War is seen as the embodiment of the greatest destruction and cruelty. Rather than being an event that concerns or affects those at the front when the war continues, it is an important phenomenon that affects those behind the front and all humanity after the war. The war, which left countless losses, economic, social and psychological damages, has been the subject of numerous works of many disciplines, especially literature and cinema.

Remarque's novel, All Quiet on the Western Front, stands out as a work describing the western front of the First World War, especially experiences of the young soldiers who fought on the western front and who are referred to as a lost generation. The novel is an autobiographical work that is shaped through the memories of a 19-year-old student in his civilian life who went to fight on the Western Front with his classmates and tells all the tragedy of the front, its cruelty and all the meaninglessness of the war. Cinema, which was not indifferent to war like many social events, adapted this novel into a movie twice, almost 100 years apart. The first movie shot by Lewis Milestone in 1930 is an American made movie, while the second movie shot by Edward Berger in 2022 is a German made movie. This study aims to examine two different versions of the novel All Quiet on the Western Front, which is considered one of the masterpieces of anti-war literature, in terms of the representation of war, which were adapted to the cinema almost 100 years apart. For the aforementioned purpose, the movies were analyzed using the qualitative content analysis method, which is one of the qualitative research methods. With this method, the themes of nationalism, anti-war, and volunteerism were analysed within the framework of the concept of representation.

Qualitative research, described as an umbrella concept, is closely related to different disciplines. Concepts such as descriptive, interpretive, natural action research, content, and cultural analysis are concepts that are closely related to qualitative research. Although it is difficult to make a definition that covers all disciplines and features, qualitative research is a research in which qualitative data collection techniques such as observation, interview and document analysis are used and a completely qualitative process is followed to reveal the events and perceptions in a realistic and holistic way (Yıldırım &

Şimşek, 2008, ss. 36-37). In qualitative research, when direct observation or interview is not possible, the researcher can instead include written and visual materials related to the research problem (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008, s. 189). In this context, in this study, the movies *All Quiet on the Western Front*, made in 1930 and 2022, were analyzed comparatively.

Content analysis, which emerged as a method used for the content in mass media, is a social scientific research technique. This method, which is divided into two as qualitative content analysis and quantitative content analysis, conceptually goes long way back. It is seen that Max Weber suggested this method in 1910 to reveal the extent to which newspapers focus on political and social events (Geray, 2017, s. 146). This study examines how the war is represented in the movies *All Quiet on the Western Front*, which were adapted from the same novel with the same name but by two different directors. The concept of representation is one of the uses of content analysis. This concept, which involves evaluating how certain groups in societies are represented, can be in the form of gender, poverty, ethnic identities, or how Muslims are represented in Hollywood movies (Geray, 2017, s. 146).

The first movie, shot shortly after the war, was considered an anti-war movie like the novel, and like its source, the novel, it was censored or banned in the movie theaters in numerous countries. The same situation did not apply to the movie shot in 2022. Revealing the reasons for this will be eye-opening in terms of revealing the transformation of the perspective on war in cinema. Throughout the study, *All Quiet on the Western Front* movies, which were adapted to the cinema in 1930 and 2022 based on Erich Maria Remarque's novel of the same name, were analyzed using the qualitative content analysis method, and the representation of the war in both movies was examined comparatively.

### **Representation of War in Cinema**

Although cinema emerged as a means of entertainment, it quickly turned into an important means of communication and a field of art. Since its inception, it has been both affected and influenced by the social and economic conditions in which it was produced. Important social, economic and political developments and events were, on the one hand, the subject of cinema, and on the other hand, they were influenced by cinema. In other words, there is a mutually reinforcing relationship between cinema and the social, economic and political conditions in which it is produced. For this reason, examining movies gives important clues in understanding the historical period in which they were produced.

War has existed almost since the beginning of human history, and there is almost no society or individual that it has not affected. War, which can be defined as situations in which there is no peace in general, is defined as the state's breaking of diplomatic relations and engaging in armed struggle, according to the Turkish language institution. Again, the Turkish Language Association defines war as a struggle to eliminate or destroy something. (TDK, 2023). Gordon Marshall, on the other hand, sees war as a characteristic feature of modern industrial society under the concept of total war in his sociology dictionary and defines it as the maximum mobilization of a country's social and economic resources for the sake of an armed conflict (Marshall, 1999, s. 772). In the light of these definitions, war in its most general sense paints a picture of an environment that affects the entire society and all individuals in the society in some way and, with its definition including the absence of peace, is actually chaotic and uneasy. Because war is a phenomenon that

concerns the entire society in social, economic and political terms. Although war is a tool aimed at a political goal, it has an important place in the field of cinema as well as academic and political studies, as it is a traumatic phenomenon in which people, including innocent civilians, lose their lives in masses and their living spaces are damaged (Özdemir & Işık, 2019, s. 73).

Cinema, which is a mass art, is the branch of art that is most intertwined with society and interacts with society the most, and naturally affects society the most and is at an important point in terms of both being affected by social value judgments and determining the value judgments of the society. American cinema, which has become an important industry in the history of world cinema, has managed to turn into an industry in the world in a short time, by making the best use of cinema in the context of being a mass art and the importance of meeting the audience, and has continued to this day. Especially for Hollywood cinema, movies, as important propaganda and manipulation tools, have a great function not only in the American society but also in the whole world, and have undertaken a mission.

This function and the accompanying commercial gains had to force the cinema into a genre distinction within itself with the increasing production over time. This separation has become more important in cinema as the number of movies increased by both movie producers, movie audiences and movie critics. While only three basic movie genres were mentioned in the beginning, namely western, musical and horror, countless subgenres were added over time. The concept of genre was born within the cinema industry, and over time, it became established among cinema writers, audiences and critics. The concept of genre, in its most general sense, is defined as a term that covers movies that are similar in terms of subject matter and produced with similar methods, and reduce the risk of harm because similar ones have been produced before (Abisel, 1995, s. 22).

Drawing attention to the concept of genre with similar features, Bordwell and Thompson state that themes have an important function when defining movie genres. Like science fiction is presented with technology, western with life on the edge, gangster movies with crime, musicals with singing and dancing elements. Similarly, a decisive factor is discussed in the context of the emotional impact it causes, such as the expectation that comedies will entertain and thrillers will raise the tension (Bordwell & Kristin, 2012, s. 328). In this sense, in the light of the comments of Abisel, Bordwell and Thompson, it is the nature of cinema that war movies, which are an important genre of cinema, are designed as a genre in which conflict, armed struggle and diplomatic crises are common, and can cause excitement, anxiety and fear in the audience. It is also inevitable that cinema, which is an industry, represents power, image, love of homeland, unity and solidarity through war movies.

World history is full of countless wars, and the history of cinema, which is not a stranger to world history, has also produced countless war movies. In particular, the two Great World Wars, which affected the entire world history, have found wide coverage in cinema and have been the subject of countless movies in terms of their causes, processes, impact areas and results. Today, it is seen that the increase in war and local conflicts increases the popularity of war in cinema (Işık & Özdemir, 2017, s. 128). Despite the destruction and pain they cause in these movies, wars tend to prove the justification of real wars, often in an aestheticized way. In the words of Yılmaz, negative concepts such as the use

of violence, destruction and death are aestheticized by making use of the perception and expression power of cinema.(Yılmaz, 1990, s. 17).

World cinema, especially Hollywood cinema, is full of countless examples of war movies. Many movies about war have been shot, such as 1915's *The Birth of a Nation*, 1926's *The End of St. Petersburg*, 1931's *Tell England*, 1942's *Across the Pacific*, 1939's *Gone With The Wind*, 1942's *Casablanca*, 1957's *Paths of Glory*, 1979's *Apocalypse Now*, 1989's *Casualties of War*, 1987's *Full Metal Jacket*, 1999's *Three Kings*, 2003's *Tears of the Sun*, 1998's *Saving Private Ryan* and *The Thin Red Line* and the 2017's *Dunkirk*, and many of these movies have discussed war within the framework of concepts such as armed struggle, diplomatic form, civil wars, anti-war or pro-war.

Made by Universal Studios as the first sound movie about the First World War, *All Quiet on the Western Front* has a special importance in the history of cinema, both for its use of sound effects in the early stages of sound technology and as a surprising movie with its peaceful message and the absence of heroes.(Hayward, 2012, s. 513) Similar to *Tell England* (1931), since it was shot while the traces of the war were still fresh, it is also a source for many movies produced by world cinema.(Eşitti & Işık, 2022, s. 4). It is worth examining with these features.

### **Plot of Milestone's (1930) All Quiet on the Western Front**

Lewis Milestone, who made the first adaptation a year after the book was published, is an American director of Russian origin. Milestone won the Oscar for best director for *Two Arabian Knights* (1927) and *All Quiet on the Western Front* (1930). In his movie, the director draws attention to the meaninglessness of war, as the author of the book underlines, and demonstrates this very successfully.

*All Quiet on the Western Front* begins with a text that appears on the screen and a voice-over: "This Story is neither an accusation nor a confession and least of all an adventure for death is not an adventure to these who stand face to face with it. It will try simply to tell of a generation of men who even though they may have escaped its shells were destroyed by the war." The voiceover made simultaneously with this image appearing on the screen is as follows. "This Story is neither an accusation nor a confession. and least of all an adventure for death is not an adventure to these who stand face to face with it. It will try simply to tell of a generation of men who even though they may have escaped its shells were destroyed by the war." We see the same expression in the author's own words at the beginning of his work. "This book is neither a complaint nor a confession. It's just an attempt that wants to tell about a generation that could not escape the destruction of war, even if it survived its bullets..." (Remarque, 1971).

The movie continues with a dialogue that reveals the painful balance of the war. "30,000 French prisoners, more taken from Russians every day". The movie then continues with the image and dialogue of Himmelstoss, whom we will encounter at the front, in civilian life. While delivering the mail, Himmelstoss, a postal worker, says that what he has is the last mail he will distribute and that he will join the army the next day. The movie proceeds with the civilians in the streets enthusiastically saying goodbye to the soldiers who went to the front. Meanwhile, the teacher gives a speech to Paul and his classmates, who will join the front. The aim is to ensure that young people go to the front as volunteers. Speech; "Don't you ever forget! We are not the only ones experiencing these difficulties. I've seen them all before. This is just a war in which we protect our freedom. That's why all of our

people have to continue their fight to the end without getting tired. It is the primary duty of all of us to help defend our country with all our heart and soul, and people outside defend our homeland and country with sacrifices. Now, my dear students, what we need to do is this: Attack with all our strength. To use every ounce of strength to achieve victory before the year ends.”

The teacher continues his speech with the following words and questions that will encourage them to enlist in the military, in order to reduce the possibility that what he says will not be accepted and that the students will not accept to enlist voluntarily in the military due to the guidance of those around them:

“The issue I want to raise again is the issue of reluctance. You, children, mean the survival of the homeland, you are the iron men of Germany. You are the heroes to repel the enemy, when you are called to do so. It is not my job to stand here and say that you must participate in the defense of the country. As a matter of fact, I’m wondering if you’ve even thought of such a thing. I know that in one of the schools, the children in the class stood up and enlisted in the army in mass; But surely if something like this happens here, you won’t blame me for being proud. Maybe some people will tell you that you shouldn’t be allowed to go, that you are too young; they will tell you that you have a home, a mother and a father, and that you should not change your life. Are your fathers more negligent than you are to allow the country to be devastated? Are your mothers too weak to send their children to protect the country that gave them their children? And also, is a little experience a bad thing for a young man? Is the dignity of wearing a uniform something we should avoid? And is it something to be ashamed of if our young ladies are proud of those who wear uniforms? “

The teacher does not allow the questions to be answered differently and answers himself. Then, he talks about the virtues of making sacrifices for the country and dying when necessary, and emphasizes that the country needs their service and invites them to battlefields:

“I know, yes I know, you never wanted hero flattery. I have never taught you such a thing. We have always tried to do what suits you without caring about the applause, but being at the forefront of war is a virtue, not smallness. I believe it will be a quick war with very few casualties. But if we have to suffer losses, let us never forget, my friends, the Latin expression that must have been on the lips of many Romans when fighting in a foreign country: ‘It is good and befits us to die for the homeland.’ Some of you may have ambitions. I know someone who has beautiful words worthy of a writer. He wrote the first act of a beautiful tragedy worthy of a master. And I think he dreams of following Goethe and Schiller. I think he will achieve this. But now our country is calling, the country needs leaders. Personal ambitions should simply be put aside as we make a great sacrifice for the sake of our country. Here begins a glorious period in your lives. The square of honor is calling you! Why are we still here? You Kropp, what’s holding you back? Don’t you, Müller, know how much you are needed? Oh, I know you look at your leader. So I’m looking at you, Paul Baumer. And I wonder what you will do.”

Paul is the first to respond to this passionate speech and says he will go. Then the other students stand up one by one and answer: “I want to go”, “count me in”, “I’m ready too”, “I won’t stay at home either”. Let’s go! In the accompaniment of the words “Let’s fight!”, there is enthusiasm in the classroom, the teacher is very happy. He says to the children, “follow me, now is the time to enlist, no straying”. Although one of his classmates is reluctant

about this, Paul and his friends convince him. And the young people leave the classroom singing songs.

This nationalist propaganda and patriotic speech by the teacher becomes an incentive for the entire class to enlist in the military, and the whole class decides to go to war. The movie continues with the training scenes of the young people in the camp who will go to the front. Young people are told by more experienced soldiers that even basic needs cannot be met under war conditions, that the only canteen at the front is to go out to look for food, and that the front is not the right place to be appetent. In this scene, we meet Katczinsky (Kat), who will be next to our main character Paul for the rest of the movie.

Kat conveys his thoughts on war and volunteering with the words, "One day I will pick up one of these volunteers and ask why they left school and joined the army." Kat, who is talented in finding food, shares young people with the pigs he hunts, and in return he makes up for their shortcomings by receiving supplies such as soap, tobacco and cigars from the young. When Kat, who needs to go to build a wire fence for the trench, is suggested to form a team of new arrivals, he says that the new arrivals are babies and they will die right there. But he is sent to the front with the young people. To young people who are anxious and afraid, Kat tells them what to do and tells them not to be afraid. They return to their positions from the front and the soldiers are now in the ward. Cards are played in the ward under intense bombardment sounds. Excessive noise causes serious pressure and fear, especially on newly arrived young people. One of the young soldiers has a nightmare; first he talks about his dead friend and then his own death. They warn the awakened young person that the place they are in is already bad enough and that they should not experience any additional fear.

A soldier named Kemmerich, frightened by the sounds of fire, comes out of the trench and is shot while trying to escape. At that moment, one of the young men in the trench begins to question the war: "We will fight, but why will we fight? Why don't we think about this? You can go crazy by staying here." In fact, this sentence is to draw attention to the meaninglessness of war. When a command whistle sounds, everyone takes their weapons, moves towards the trench, and stands ready to fight. The sound of the bombardment has stopped, but after a while the explosions start again. Enemy soldiers are approaching the trenches under intense bombardment and the conflict continues. It is almost a hand-to-hand fight with the enemy soldiers who reach the trench. The eyes of the soldiers in the trench are full of fear and anxiety, the conflict continues for a long time. The constant loss of life on the screen and the sounds of intense fire reveal the destructiveness of war. The dialogues between the soldiers in the lunch queue reflect the ambivalent mood of the loss of life in the other soldiers. The meal made for 150 will be distributed to the remaining soldiers due to the losses, which is almost double the meal for every soldier. Because only half of the 150 people remained. During the meal, the war is questioned. The discussion, which started with the sentence that the French deserved to be punished for starting this war, continues with sentences such as the uncertainty of who started the war, the wars started with the countries getting angry with each other, how the two countries got angry with each other, and the ones who got angry are not the countries but the people. Why they are there even though they are not one of these sides refers to the fact that their opinions about the war do not matter to anyone. While drawing attention to the fact that someone wanted war, it is emphasized why nations that never see each other have to kill each other. "I don't want to shoot an Englishman. I had never seen an Englishman before coming here. I think most of them had never seen a German until they came here.

The sentence “No, I’m sure they were not asked about this issue either” summarizes this situation. As conversations continue about who benefits from war, it is pointed out that even if they have everything, emperors may want war to spread their glory, generals may want war, and manufacturers may want war to make money. The conversation concludes with Kat’s new depiction of war: “When a big war approaches, you close a large area and when the big day comes you gather all the kings and their generals and lay them in the middle in their underwear. You let them fight with your men. The best country wins”.

After the speech, they go to the infirmary to see their friend Kemmerich. Kemmerich’s leg is amputated. An argument breaks out between Paul and Müller over Kemmerich’s boot. The fact that even the boot of a dying soldier whose leg has been amputated becomes a matter of discussion among his friends shows how war condemns people to poverty and despair, how this situation eliminates all virtues, and therefore war is not a virtuous struggle at all. Even though everyone leaves Kemmerich, Paul stays with him and calls the physician to examine his friend. He explains his friend’s situation and asks for help. The answer given by the physician is in a way that expresses how great the losses were in the war. When Paul describes his friend to the physician as the soldier who had his leg amputated, the physician says that he amputates a dozen legs a day. Another infirmary employee stated that this number would reach 20 until the morning when 16 people died during the day, which summarizes the results of the war. Finally, he comes to the shelter with Paul Kemmerich’s boots, tells his feelings, and the opposition between death and life finds its expression in Paul’s feelings. Müller goes to the front with the joy of new boots and is injured during the conflict; Then the boot is on another soldier’s foot. He too dies. Here, the constant changing of feet of the boots is an indication of why losses occur so quickly.

During the ongoing conflict, Paul gets trapped in a pit and kills the enemy soldier who falls next to him with a knife. He feels remorse for having to kill a person he doesn’t know. It is shown in detail that he struggled to keep him alive when he was injured, he made him drink water and apologized many times. Paul even says ““You are dead, you are in a better condition than me” next to the the enemy soldier he killed. This sentence sums up the fact that the psychological pressure and remorse caused by the war on the fighting parties, especially the soldiers, is worse than death. Searching the pockets of the soldier he killed, Paul sees the photo of his wife and daughter and asks for forgiveness many times.

Later, we see the soldiers having fun together in the camp. Paul and Albert look at the picture of a woman on a demonstration poster they stand in front of, and in their conversation, they express that they miss the civilian life and that the front is not the place they should be, that they are too young to be in the war. Later, we see this group bathing in the stream. They first argue with a group of women in the section where civilians live on the opposite side of the camp, that is, on the other side of the stream, and then make an agreement to meet. They swim to the other shore at night and go to the women. The fact that women want food from them is an important indicator of the poverty and helplessness that the war cause for everyone. Women talk about not eating for a long time. Meanwhile, one of the women starts to talk to Paul. From this dialogue, we understand how aware Paul is that he will die. We see the soldiers marching in groups, and new coffins appear on the screen during this march and drill. While Kat and Paul are looking at these new coffins, an air raid begins and Paul is hit. Paul and Albert are now in the field hospital. The death room in the field hospital is a room where wounded

soldiers who lose hope are transported and put to draw their last breath. Albert Kropp's leg is amputated in the field hospital, and Paul is taken to the death room because he is hopeless; But he comes back to life as the only soldier to return from the death room to the infirmary.

Like every wounded soldier, Paul is given a sick leave. Going home, Paul learns that his mother is sick. He then goes out and drinks with a group of civilians, receiving lots of praise and listening to tactics about the war. In the face of these praises and tactics, Paul, who is aware of the difference between what is spoken and what is experienced, gets bored and leaves them. While walking on the street, he sees his teacher giving a speech the class. He enters the classroom and the teacher is trying to persuade the class to go to war. He asks Paul to tell about the war. The teacher's desire is to encourage his current students and send them to war, just as he persuaded Paul and his friends and included them in the volunteers. He asks Paul to give a speech to encourage the young people, but unfortunately the speech Paul gives is not what the teacher expects. In fact, this speech is like a summary of the whole movie.

In his speech, Paul states that the war that his teachers convinced and sent them is not at all as described, that to die for his country is not as he thought, in fact, all they did was trying to survive. He says that they realized everything with the first bombardment and that dying for their country is a dirty and painful thing. Stating to go and fight is easier to talk about, Paul states that unfortunately, those who are much younger will be sent to the front and they will all die. Paul, who also states that he should not come on leave, states that at least they either live or die at the front, they cannot fool anyone, they are wasted there, they are destroyed even if they lived or died. In short, he says that even if they survived, they would never be the same as they were before, and that their lives are ruined because the people who speak cannot solve the problem between them.

Deciding to go back without using his remaining time of leave, Paul talks to his mother on the night of his return. What he says during this speech showed that he undergoes a great transformation at the front, that he lost all hope, that he is no longer a young man with dreams and expectations. In other words, the war took away all the dreams, hopes and joy of life of the young man who joined the army at a young age and made him a living dead. Paul sets out the next day and returns to the front, but cannot find his company at the front. They were replaced by much younger children. He chats with the soldier at the door and his old friend inside and learns what happened while he was on leave. He asks about Kat and goes to him.

Kat is out to collect food, they meet and talk. Paul talks about the things that bother him while on leave, and Kat talks about what happened at the front. While they are walking, a bomb is dropped and Kat is injured. Taking Kat, who was injured in her leg, on his back, Paul carries him to the shelter. When he reaches the company, he sees that Kat is dead. Meanwhile, the soldiers are busy draining the water from the trench. Paul sees a butterfly behind the trench, has to rise from the trench to reach the butterfly, and is shot and killed by the enemy soldier without touching the butterfly. The movie ends with the military enlistment scene combined with the cemetery scene. On the way to the army, a cemetery scene with many dead lies under the image of soldiers looking backwards, lined up one after the other, is reflected on the screen.

### **Plot of Edward Berger's (2022) All Quiet on the Western Front**

Edward Berger's movie *All Quiet on the Western Front* (2022) starts with the image of an empty space covered with the corpses of soldiers. There are soldiers' corpses everywhere and a solemn silence prevails. The movie continues with suddenly rising action, gunshots and conflict scenes. The name of the movie is reflected on the darkened screen, and then the corpses of the soldiers, stacked on top of each other, are unloaded from the vehicle and their uniforms and boots are removed. On the one hand, the bodies placed in coffins are placed side by side and on top of each other in large pits dug with lime poured on them, while on the other hand, wounded soldiers are tried to be treated between wagons. The uniforms taken off the dead soldiers are washed in the laundry, and the bloody water coming out of the washed uniforms is specifically reflected on the screen. Then, the tears and rips are repaired in a workshop-like environment where women are at the sewing machines. At that time, the text "North Germany/Spring/1917/3rd Year of the War" is displayed on the screen.

Paul is on the street with his friends, they appear to be talking about military service and parental leave. He signs the consent form that his parents did not sign. A speech is given to young people who will go to the military. The speech is within the framework that young people are Germany's iron men, that they should be brave, and that they should be honored to be soldiers. It is said that the future of Germany is the generation of young people, and that they must go to war for the emperor, for God and for the country. The speech was listened to with great enthusiasm, and after this speech, young people lined up to get their uniforms. We hear from the dialogues during the uniform distribution that some of the soldiers were born in 1899. This shows that the average age is 17-18. Paul and his friends proudly take their uniforms, dress up and arm themselves, and march towards the camp, singing songs.

Then we see the phrase "La Malmaison, Northern France, 25 Kilometers to the Western Front" on the screen, young people are transported to the front by military vehicles. Weapons checks are also made during the transfer, which is an indication that the young people who will go to war and experience a hand-to-hand fight actually have no experience. We understand that we have reached the point of hot war with the sentence "Welcome to the 78th Infantry Regiment. We are now on the Western Front". At this time, they are exposed to a gas bomb thrown, and they wear gas masks with the warning. Soldiers arrive at the shelters under the sounds of intense fire. Meanwhile, there is an intense water discharge work in the trench and a serious struggle is given under the rain. Paul helps his friends and tries to drain the water. His hands are almost frozen in the water and the young people begin to complain about the situation they find themselves in.

The enemy is approaching, fear and mess are increasing, especially among young people. Conflicts continue to increase. With the first light of the morning, the hustle and bustle at the front increased and Paul, who was stuck under the wooden planks, was found. Everywhere is full of wounded and dead soldiers. Paul is given the duty of collecting the dog tags of the dead soldiers. Paul first finds his friend Albert Kropp's glasses and then his body. After crying for a while, he continues to collect the dog tags. The collected tags appear collectively on a table with the text "18 Months Later" reflected on the screen. One of the soldiers in the room reads the tags and the other records them. A high-level official who witnesses this scene says that this is enough and leaves the room with the file he takes. On the screen, we see the inscription "General Staff, November 7, 1918". The senior soldier gives the file to Erzberger, the foreign minister of the time, and says, "We

lost over 40 thousand soldiers last week alone, this should be enough to convince the general staff." Erzberger says, "I think he is aware that it is over, we are all aware." And he is called to the meeting room by a soldier entering. Erzberger enters the hall where the high-ranking soldiers are and the door is closed.

Champagne, "French Occupation Zone" appears on the screen. Paul and Kat are in search of food. They enter the garden of a house, and when the owner of the house shoots, they run away with the goose in their hands and leave the garden of the house they entered. We see the soldiers cooking the goose and eating it together. Later, the same team appears on screen peeling potatoes and onions and chatting. Just then, a horse carriage and women passing by attract their attention. Franz Müller goes to the women, chats with them and continues walking with them. Letters come to the front, everyone tries to get their letter in confusion. Paul and Kat sit in a secluded place among the trees, Kat gives his letter to Paul. Paul reads the letter, it came from Kat's wife. The conversation between the two reflects their mood very well. They say that if they return one day, they will be a visitor from the past where they return.

The next day, the image of military vehicles and dignitaries arriving at the camp accompanied by trumpets is displayed, as well as the image of the dead being buried in mass graves, with or without coffins. Kat, Paul and a group of soldiers with them are looking for the missing 60-man troop. They search everywhere in the headquarters, in a warehouse-like place, Paul finds all the soldiers dead. Kat says, "Our kids took off their masks early, Germany will get empty." With this sentence from Kat, we understand that the soldiers died from the gas released. Kat, who said that Germany will be evacuated based on such an intense mass death and the deaths they saw at the front, actually reveals how bad the situation is. On the screen, we see the train moving on the rails and the text "Compiègne, France 8 November 1918". Minister Erzberger gets up from his bed in the compartment and writes something. Meanwhile, a soldier comes to the General Staff and informs the general about the war. Although he says that their situation is bad, the commander says that they will continue the war and sent a delegation to the French.

The senior soldier wakes up Paul and his friends and tells them to get ready, and the dressed soldiers are transported to the front by vehicles. The German delegation coming to Compiègne gets off the train and goes to meet with the French marshal, while the soldiers are waiting in the trench. Erzberger demands a ceasefire on behalf of the German committee. The Marshall presents the file containing the ceasefire conditions to the committee and gives 72 hours. Unfortunately, the ceasefire negotiations between the parties under the intense fire sound are not very encouraging, especially for the Germans. With the news coming to the front, an attack order is given, and the German army advances, suffering serious losses. The footage of the conflict lasts with horrifying minutes. Kropp is dead, Paul is in shock, and they retreat with whatever ammunition they can gather. After a while, ceasefire conditions are discussed again, the German delegation has 72 hours and is expected to sign the agreement within this period. The German delegation is aware that their losses will increase within 72 hours, but they are also aware that if they sign the expected signature, they will surrender Germany to France in every sense. Meanwhile, the fights continue, and Paul kills an enemy soldier in the pit he fell into.

When Paul arrives at headquarters, he finds the soldiers cheering over, hearing rumors that there will be negotiations. He asks about the infirmary, finds Paul Tjaden who came to the infirmary, he was shot in the knee and says that he does not want his leg to be

amputated. Paul finds Kat in the crowd. They get food together and go to Tjaden's. They bring him food, and Tjaden stabs his throat repeatedly with the fork they give him and kills himself. Paul tells Kat that his mother doesn't want him to go to war and that she has expectations for him. He cries and talks about his friends who died. Kat screams and says "at least we are alive". And it means that no one actually wants to come to where they are, but that half of the world is there and they are killing each other. And he compares himself to a pair of boots with rifles. Meanwhile, the sides of the war come together again, and the German side says that the Kaiser has resigned. He tries to explain the situation Germany is in. Although the Germans find the terms of the ceasefire severe, they sign the agreement and it is stated that the ceasefire will come into effect at the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month, that is, 6 hours after the signing. The general and the commander talk about the ceasefire, but the commander is against the ceasefire and does not want to accept defeat.

Kat tells Paul, who wakes up at that moment, that the war is over and he is hungry, and they go out to look for food. The two friends, who are happy to return home, also talk about their post-war dreams. While they are trying to get something to eat and leave a house they entered, the little boy of the house sees them. They escape to a woodland and Kat makes his way into the forest. Hearing the gunshot, Paul runs up to Kat. The boy who saw them in the house they entered shot Kat. Kat falls to the ground and is shot in the stomach. Paul leans Kat on himself for a while, then takes him on his back and brings him to the camp. The medic says that Kat is dead. Meanwhile, soldiers are walking outside shouting "we are going home". The general is on the balcony of the camp and gives a speech to the soldiers. He says the ceasefire is a betrayal and asks the soldiers to take the area they are in by 11 and gain victory if they want to be remembered as heroes. Although there is a very short time left for the ceasefire to begin, he sends the soldiers to the front once again, and forces those who do not want to go, by using violence. 15 minutes before the ceasefire begins, German soldiers attack again. At that time, the French celebrate the ceasefire, an intense conflict begins again and Paul falls to the ground with a bayonet stroke to his heart at the hour of the ceasefire; As he falls, cries of joy are heard about the ceasefire.

### **Representation of War in Lewis Milestone's (1930) All Quiet on the Western Front**

In Lewis Milestone's All Quiet on the Western Front, the war is represented in all its destruction and suffering. The sentences that appear on the screen at the beginning of the movie and also in the preface of the work it is adapted from, reveal the entire reality of the war. The movie, just like the novel, was actually dedicated to young soldiers who lost their lives at the front or who could no longer adapt to civilian life even if they survived. Remarque interprets his work as follows: "This book is neither a complaint nor a confession, It's just an attempt that wants to tell about a generation that could not escape the destruction of war, even if it survived its bullets...". The text on the screen, which also appeared in the 1930 movie by Milestone, reads: "This story is neither an accusation nor a confession; and least of all an adventure for death is not an adventure to these who stand face to face with it. It will try simply to tell of a generation of men who even though they may have escaped its shells were destroyed by the war."

The movie deals with the war mostly from the perspective of those who lived it personally and reflects the lives of these people both on the way to the front, at the front, and after the front. In this sense, the expectations, dreams and lives of the young generation, who are still in high school and whose ages vary between 17-19, in civilian life, as well

as the difficulties and helplessness they face in the front they suddenly find themselves in, have been tried to be revealed through all the behaviors, attitudes and words of the individuals. The number of French prisoners given in the dialogue among the civilians in the first scenes of the movie gives information about how many Russians died, and the daily or nightly casualty numbers frequently repeated in the movie are a direct reference to the severe results of the war.

The long speech about nationalism and patriotism that the teacher gives in the classroom to the young people who will go to the front has a central place in the movie. This speech is especially important in terms of the relationship between those who go to war and those who send them. The teacher's speech, especially within the framework of concepts such as defense of the country, victory, the future of Germany, the sanctity of the uniform, the honor of fighting at the front, the importance of dying for the homeland, is a summary of the basic dynamics of war propaganda. As a matter of fact, at the end of this speech, the entire class voluntarily enlisted in the military, thinking that they would gain success and honor. In the dialogues between soldiers throughout the movie, it is stated that younger volunteers are coming to the front every day. Thus, a reference is made to the deadliness of war. Particularly, the sentence of Kat, who is one of the main protagonists of the movie, "I will take one of these volunteers one day and ask them why they left school and joined the army", opens up a serious discussion about volunteering. Again, Kat's statement that the newcomers to the front are babies and they will be killed immediately at the front, is an indication of how young and inexperienced the soldiers who were taken into the war were.

Soldiers who come to the front have nightmares, have crises and cry under the poor living conditions and intense sounds of conflict they see at the front. This is another important indicator of their young age and inexperience. In the movie, one of the young soldiers says, "We will fight, but what will we fight for?" Why don't we think about this? His speeches such as "You can go crazy by staying here" also express the meaninglessness of the war. The fact that the number of people eating a daily meal suddenly decreased by half is another indicator of how fast and how serious the losses are. At this point, the movie underlines the contradiction caused by the tragedy of the failure of half of the soldiers to attend the dinner for 150 people: the contradiction between the pain experienced due to the death of their friends on the front and the joy experienced due to the increase in the amount of food per person, where hunger is very common. This contradiction clearly reveals the defeat of virtues in the face of hunger.

In a conversation between soldiers, in an argument started when it was said that the French should be punished for starting the War, the comments such that they cannot decide who started the war, the fact that the war started due to the anger of countries or individuals with each other, the situation of those fighting at the front, and have messages on how meaningless the war is. In this respect, one of the important dialogues is about people killing people they do not know in war. In the comment made about why young people of nations who have never seen each other before have to kill each other, it is questioned why an Englishman has to kill a German, or a German has to kill an Englishman, even though they do not know each other. In another dialogue made to show how multi-dimensional the war actually is, it is questioned who benefits from the war, and the comments continue by saying that the war is a matter of fame for the emperors and profit for the manufacturers.

The desperation and poverty caused by war is an important element frequently emphasized in the movie. The boots of soldiers whose legs were amputated were immediately taken by other soldiers and the frequent replacement of these boots reflects both the number of injured and dead soldiers and the extent of poverty suffered in the war. Paul's statement in his dialogue with the physician that he amputated more than a dozen legs during the day is one of the most important indicators of the magnitude of the death and destruction experienced. Not only the soldiers at the front, but also the people in civilian life suffer from this poverty and destruction. The fact that young women in the regions where the young soldiers are located are with these soldiers only in exchange for food and that they have not been able to eat for days is also reflected as the image of the back front of the war. The fact that women were with soldiers in exchange for food appeared as another important factor indicating that the war was not actually a virtuous one at all.

One of the important indicators of the young soldiers' inability to accept the situation they are in and their inability to understand why they are fighting is reflected through the dialogue Paul had with an enemy soldier with whom he stayed in a pit. Paul, who had to kill the enemy soldier in the pit, while crying on his chest for hours and soul-searching to save his conscience, on the other hand, he says to the dead soldier, "You are dead, you are in a better situation than me." With these and similar expressions, the message is given that war is an activity that takes the lives of the defeated and causes the winners to feel remorse. Throughout the movie, it is shown that the soldiers on the front in the war either die or are in a worse situation than dying. The comments they make about a poster they see and the photograph of a woman in this poster actually express how much the soldiers long for civilian life. It is emphasized that the place of these young people, who can be considered children, should not be on the front. The coffins that constantly arrive at the camp, and the death rooms in the field hospital where the wounded, who have given up hope for themselves, are placed to draw their last breaths, convey the brutal face of war to the audience.

Paul, who was on leave for a while, compares the way war is interpreted in civilian life with his own moments and sees how big the difference between what is said and what is actually experienced is. Just for this reason, he gets bored with civilian life and wants to return to the front. Similarly, the fact that the teacher who encouraged them to go to war calls Paul, while on leave, to give a similar speech to new students is an important indicator of the continuity of volunteering. Although the teacher expects Paul to give an encouraging speech to young people in the light of patriotic and nationalist discourses like himself, Paul does the exact opposite. Paul's speech here is almost a summary of the movie's anti-war discourse. Paul states that war is not at all as his teachers told him, that dying for one's country is not what was thought, and that in fact, all they do at the front is try to survive. He says that dying for their country is a dirty and painful thing, that it is much easier to say it than to go and fight, and that each time the younger ones are always sent to the front and they also die. He also states that the civilian administrators are deceiving themselves, that the reality is at the front and that this reality is being injured, dying or killing young people like themselves. He also draws attention to the fact that if someone had the opportunity to solve problems by talking, their lives would not be ruined. He points out that those who decided to fight instead of solving problems that could be solved by talking are responsible for himself and those who fought like him and whose lives were ruined.

Returning to the front, Paul learns that he has lost almost all of his old friends. Younger volunteers have taken their place. The war, like a killing machine, has swallowed thousands of young people and is preparing to swallow more. The movie ends with Paul being killed as he was about to touch a butterfly he saw in the trench. Thus, a reference is made to the fact that the war first took the dreams, hopes and life energy of Paul and young people like Paul, and then their lives. Especially at the end of the movie, the images of young soldiers walking while looking back one by one are presented with the image of an empty field with countless graves, once again emphasizing how war makes life and death similar and makes death ordinary.

### **Representation of War in Edward Berger's (2022) All Quiet on the Western Front**

The 2022 movie All Quiet on the Western Front is a movie that, like the first one, manages to reflect the meaninglessness and destructiveness of war. References are made to the destructiveness of war, starting from the images of corpses everywhere in the first frame of the movie, to continuing images with the corpses of soldiers stacked on top of each other, and the bloody water coming out of washed uniforms. Again, the fact that the uniforms of the dead soldiers are taken off, washed, repaired and given to new soldiers indicates the speed and high number in this cycle of death. This is also an indication of how brutal the war continues. Just like in the 1930 movie, speeches are made here to encourage young people to join the military; It is said that especially young people are the future of Germany and should fight for their homeland and God. This is again a discourse about what kind of meaning the war should have for the civilian population or the soldiers who will go to the front. The inexperience of the young people who were given the uniforms of the dead soldiers while going to the front is shown by the image of them receiving training during the transfer. How bad the conditions they are in at the front are constantly displayed on the screen with the water filling the trenches and the rats reaching their food. Again, the increase in the fear and mess of young people during conflicts also appear as important images that reflect the mood of the soldiers who will fight. In the scene where Paul finds his friend's body, he continues collecting the dog tags after crying for a while, which is an important image of the brutality of war. Because there is no time to wait and the environment is one where there is a struggle for survival.

Unlike the 1930 movie, we witness a diplomatic struggle in the background in the 2022's All Quiet on the Western Front. Senior commanders and ministers are aware of Germany's losses. Although there are those who think that the war should continue, there are also those who think that the losses are at a very serious amount and that a ceasefire should be made as soon as possible. In fact, in a dialogue in the movie, it is emphasized that the general staff must be convinced of the ceasefire due to the losses suffered. Just like the 1930's movie, countless coffin images, corpses buried on top of each other, soldiers with their arms and legs cut off, bloody images that we encounter in field hospitals are important details that show the real side of the war. Again, the discovery of a lost troop dead in mass reveals the cruelty in another way. In the movie, the negotiations between the German delegation and the French delegation for a ceasefire are displayed. Despite the intense demands of the French, a ceasefire is not accepted in the first place, but a ceasefire is achieved later on.

The movie reveals that the endless losses were actually given for the sake of not surrendering to the French for the future of Germany. In this sense, while there is a discourse about the brutality of war, on the other hand, the necessity of war is also represented. Although there are high-ranking officials who turn the war into an ambition,

we also see the existence of high-ranking officials who are aware of the losses and who want to have a ceasefire and are disturbed by all these losses. The dialogue between Paul and his friend Kat after they lose their friends in the field hospital gives clues about the soldiers and their comments on wars. Kat says, "At least we're alive" and states that no one actually wants to come to where they are, but half the world is there and slaughtering each other. With such dialogues, the thoughts of many young people, who were sent to war unconsciously or through some conscious manipulation, like Kat, about the war, are reflected. References are made to how worthless and unimportant the soldiers at the front are in their environment and how meaningless what they are doing.

In the face of losses, although the conditions are severe for Germany, a ceasefire is accepted. But there are also commanders who do not accept the ceasefire. The young people who were sent to the front for the last time enter the fight again and Paul is killed just as the ceasefire begins. The movie actually managed to reveal the brutality and destructiveness of the war, but on the other hand, it acquitted the administrators and high-ranking commanders with the ceasefire attempts outside the war. In this respect, it can be said that the second movie does not have the criticism of the first. As a matter of fact, while the first movie, shot in 1930, was censored in almost every country where it was shown and caused significant controversy, the same cannot be said for the second one.

### **Conclusion and Evaluation**

The two movies named All Quiet on the Western Front, which were adapted into a movie almost a century apart from the work of the same name by different country productions and different directors, represent war and are examples of war cinema. Like many examples of war cinema, both movies succeed in revealing the destructiveness of war, its bitter side, the destruction and the despair it causes. Although both movies contain discourses about the meaninglessness of war, the 1930 movie managed to develop an anti-war discourse in accordance with the characteristics of the novel. Throughout the movie, heavy criticism is made especially against the volunteering institution and military and civilian administrators, and the meaninglessness of the war is underlined.

In both movies, it is seen that the main reason for the volunteering of the soldiers fighting is the concepts such as nationalist ideology and patriotism instilled in them. While this situation was underlined in more detail with long speeches in the 1930 movie, critical dialogues about nationalist discourse and the war were shortened in the 2022 movie. Another important difference between the two movies is the view of the civilian and military administrators who decided on the war. By including pro-peace civilian and military administrators in the second movie, criticism towards the level of government that decided on war is reduced. In the 1930 movie, there was a sharp contrast between those who fought on the front and the high-ranking commanders and civilian administrators, while this contrast was softened in the second movie.

We can say that periodical political and economic differences were also effective as the main reasons for the differences between the two films. Although we talk about Hollywood cinema in the 1930s, it is often not possible to talk about a clear Hollywood point of view as today. In particular, it is possible to say that many production companies emerged as a result of the independent experiments of different producers who came together or united against large companies. This made it possible to make films with

opposing discourses as of the period. Therefore, we can say that the film by Milestone was made under freer conditions.

Especially after the Second World War, the use of cinema as an ideological tool made it possible to look at the two films in a healthier way. The first film, made in 1930, stands out critically. The criticisms made against the rulers and the bad face of the war are quite weak in the production made in 2022. Hollywood cinema, one of the biggest carriers of American ideology, has fulfilled its duty in the 2022 production. In its early years, Hollywood cinema emphasised the industrialisation of the industry rather than using cinema as an ideological device. This industrialisation and monopoly competition between companies left the reflection of ideology on cinema in the background. We can also see this situation in the realisation of the 1930 film by adhering to the original book.

The changing economic structure after the two World Wars changed the perspective on war along with the country's policies. Especially economic-based wars are handled within the framework of power representation rather than the destructive aspect. Power representation has been interpreted in this way in many films. Although there are similarities in the interpretation of the two films, these reasons have also caused differences.

The First World War was reflected in both movies with its most painful aspect. In both movies, it is reflected how much the losses are, how dangerous the front is and how desperation prevails. Also, in both movies, it was emphasized how young the soldiers who went to the front were, how inexperienced they were, and that there were individuals who could not make sense of many things about the war. The audience was made aware of how worthless individual soldiers were seen in the war, through images of conflict on the front and plans displayed from field hospitals.

It can be said that Berger's 2022 movie, *All Quiet on the Western Front* better reflects the war visually, using make-up, music and effects, using the opportunities of developing cinema technology. Although the 1930 movie was shot 92 years before the second movie, it has the same effect and stands out as the first anti-war movie in the history of cinema. Although both movies are movies of the same genre adapted from the same work, it is considered that the 1930 movie directed by Milestone is a much more critical and effective anti-war movie compared to the 2022 movie, with the way it represents the war.

Milestone's 1930 movie has a much stronger anti-war discourse than the 2022 movie, with its criticism of volunteering and its emphasis on the meaninglessness of war. The text projected on the screen in the very first frame of the 1930 movie gives the message to the audience that they are faced with an anti-war work from the first minutes of the movie. In the 2022 movie, such quotes from the novel from which it was adapted are not included. In the 2022 movie, the teacher's speech to encourage the class to voluntarily enlist in the military and the speech Paul gave upon the teacher's request when he came on leave were not included. The 2022 movie contains a very short dialogue encouraging young people to join the military, and it is quite ordinary. However, in the 1930 movie, the teacher's speech to the class appears as a very long scene, and the speech is nationalistic and manipulative enough to convince the entire class without hesitation. The speech Paul gives to young people who will go to war while he is on leave is not included in the 2022 movie. However, this speech shows the meaninglessness of war and that the war is very different from the speeches made by the people who send them to war. The 1930 movie seriously criticizes volunteering with this scene.

In the 1930 movie, references were made to how unfamiliar the soldiers were to the situation they were in through the dialogues between the soldiers. Such dialogues are not included in the 2022 movie. Although the 2022 movie All Quiet on the Western Front tries to reflect the brutality of the war, especially from the perspective of the wounded and dead, and the desperation, it cannot be said to be as successful as the 1930 movie.

The movie, directed by Milestone, does not reflect a diplomatic struggle on the back front in any way. We can say that it is a struggle to better express the opposition to war and to focus only on the front by not giving it away. In addition, heavy criticism was brought to the military and civilian administrators for not preventing the war, although they could have prevented it by negotiating. On the other hand, the 2022 movie allocates a great deal of space to the diplomatic side of the war. Although this situation reflects the brutality of war on the one hand, on the other hand it refers that war is an undesirable situation and that diplomacy is not the one that starts the war, but the side that struggles to end it. Thus, the responsibility for the war was taken from politicians and high-ranking soldiers and spread to the general public, thus damaging the criticising side of the source work. However, individual soldiers have no significant impact on either the emergence or the ending of the war. As Clausewitz stated, war is the continuation of politics by other means.

As a result of the analyzes, it was concluded that Milestone's All Quiet on the Western Front movie, despite being adapted from the same novel, is a more critical production than Berger's 2022 production movie. While in Millstone's movie the contrast between the administrators and those fighting on the front was reflected more deeply and sharply, in Berger's movie this contrast was softened by including high-ranking military and civilian administrators fighting for peace. Berger's movie was shot with a more populist approach and tried to reveal the necessity of war for countries, their images and existence although it is brutal and destructive. In Milestone's 1930 movie, war is a phenomenon that is rejected, criticized and must be opposed for whatever reason.

## References

- Abisel, N. (1995). *Popüler sinema ve türler*. Alan Yayıncılık.
- Bordwell, D., & Kristin, T. (2012). *Film sanatı* (E. Yılmaz, Çev.). De-ki Yayınları.
- Chambers, J. W. (1994). All Quiet on the Western Front'(1930): The antiwar film and the image of the first world war. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 14(4), 377-411.
- Eşitti, Ş., & Işık, M. (2022). Çanakkale muharebeleri'ni konu alan İlk İngiliz filmi Tell England'ın kültürel bellek inşası bağlamında incelenmesi. İçinde G. Pınarbaşı (Ed.), *İletişim Perspektifinden Çanakkale'nin Değerleri*. Kriter Yayınları.
- Geray, H. (2017). *Toplumsal araştırmalarda nicel ve nitel yöntemlere giriş*. Ütopya Yayınları.
- Hayward, S. (2012). *Sinemanın temel kavramları*. Es Yayınları.
- Işık, M., & Özdemir, E. (2017). *Türk sineması'nda Kore Savaşı'nı konu alan filmlerde İdeoloji ve özne*. 127-132.
- Marshall, G. (1999). *Sosyoloji sözlüğü* (O. Akınhay & D. Kömürcü, Çev.). Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Özdemir, E., & Işık, M. (2019). Savaş, propaganda ve sinema ilişkisi üzerine bir inceleme: Kore Savaşı'nın Türk sineması'ndaki yeri. İçinde E. Doğan (Ed.), *Turkish Cinema Researches Vol* (ss. 71-94). IJOPEC Publication Limited.

- Remarque, E. M. (1971). *Garp cephesinde yeni bir şey yok*. Varlık Yayınları.
- Sarısayın, A. (2020). Önsöz. İçinde E. M. Remarque (Ed.), *Garp cephesinde yeni bir şey yok*. Everest Yayınları.
- TDK. (2023). *TDK*. <https://sozluk.gov.tr/>
- Van Kirk, S. (2011). *CliffsNotes on remarque's all quiet on the western Front*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yılmaz, E. (1990). *Amerikan sinemasında savaş ve Vietnam filmleri* [Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi.

## Batı Cephesinde Yeni Bir Şey Yok (All Quiet on Western Front) Filmlerinde Savaşın Temsili

Funda MASDAR (Assoc. Prof. Dr.)

### Genişletilmiş Özet

Dünya tarihi sayısız savaşla doludur. Bir taraftan gücü diğer taraftan yıkıcılığı temsil eden savaş, en genel anlamıyla bir mücadele biçimidir. Genel anlamda barış ortamının yokluğu olarak tarif edilen savaş toplumları en çok etkileyen olaydır. Toplumsal hiçbir olaya uzak kalmayan sinema doğası gereği savaşı da ilk yıllarından itibaren filmlere konu etmiş hatta bir alt tür olarak savaş sinemasının oluşmasını da beraberinde getirmiştir. Sinema endüstrisini elinde tutan Hollywood bir tür olarak savaş filmleri üretme konusunda da oldukça başarı göstermiş hatta Amerika Birleşik Devletleri adeta Pentagon ve Hollywood iş birliğini bir politikaya dönüştürmüştür. Dünya sinema tarihi sayısız savaş filmi ile doludur. 1915 yapımı Bir Ulusun Doğuşu (The Birth of a Nation), 1942 yapımı Pasifik Kahramanı (Across the Pacific), 1939 yapımı Rüzgar Gibi Geçti (Gone With The Wind), 1942 yapımı Kazablanka (Casablanca), 1957 yapımı Zafer Yolları (Paths of Glory), 1979 yapımı Kıyamet (Apocalypse Now), 1989 yapım Savaş Günahları (Casualties of War), 1987 yapımı Full Metal Jacket, 1999 yapımı 3 Kral (Three Kings), 2003 yapımı Güneşin Gözyaşları (Tears of the Sun), 1998 yapımı Er Ryan'ı Kurtarmak (Saving Private Ryan) ve 2017 yapımı Dunkirk gibi birçok savaşı temsil eden film yapılmış bu filmlerin birçoğu savaşı silahlı mücadele biçimi, diplomatik savaş, iç savaş, soğuk savaş, savaş karşıtlığı ya da savaş yanlılığı gibi kavramlar çerçevesinde ele almıştır. Özellikle iki büyük dünya savaşı tüm insanlığı etkilemekle kalmamış savaş sinemasının temel iki temasını da oluşturmuştur. Otobiyografik bir roman olan Remarque'ın aynı adlı eserinden neredeyse yüz yıl arayla farklı yönetmenler tarafından sinemaya aktarılan Batı Cephesinde Yeni Bir Şey Yok, savaş sineması türünün önemli yapıtlarındandır. Batı Cephesinde Yeni Bir Şey Yok (Im Westen Nichts Neues) Erich Maria Remarque'nın yazdığı, savaşın korkunçluğunu ve anlamsızlığını ele alan bir romandır. Roman ilk kez Almanya'da 1929 yılında yayımlanır ve Almanya'nın yasaklı kitapları arasında yer alır. Günümüze kadar 50 ayrı dile tercüme edilip, büyük başarı elde eden roman, savaşın acı tecrübelerini okuyucu ile doğrudan paylaşan bir yöntemle yazılmış ve ana temasını kayıp kuşaktan oluşturmuştur. Bu çalışmada romanın 1930 yılında Lewis Milestone ve 2022 Edward Berger tarafından beyaz perdeye aktarılan versiyonları karşılaştırılarak yıllar içerisinde sinemada savaşa bakışın dönüşümü ortaya konulmaya çalışılmıştır. Remarque'ın Batı Cephesinde Yeni Bir Şey Yok adlı romanı da Birinci Dünya Savaşının batı cephesini, özellikle de batı cephesinde mücadele veren ve kayıp bir kuşak olarak adlandırılan genç askerlerin yaşadıklarını anlatan bir eser olarak öne çıkar. Roman 19 yaşında sivil hayatta bir öğrenciyken sınıf arkadaşlarıyla Batı Cephesi'ne savaşmak için giden bir gencin anıları üzerinden şekillenerek cephenin bütün trajedisini, acımasızlığını ve savaşın bütün anlamsızlığını anlatan bir eserdir. Çalışma nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden biri olan içerik analizi yöntemini kullanarak oluşturulmuştur. Bu bağlamda çalışma için çalışmaya konu olan her iki film izlenmiş analiz edilmiş ve filmlerin kaynağı olan roman okunmuş analiz edilmiştir. Bununla birlikte çalışmanın tamamını oluşturan konu başlıklarına dair içerik analizleri, yazarın hayatı, romana ve filme konu olan Birinci Dünya Savaşı üzerine yazılmış kaynaklar ve savaş sineması üzerine yazılı olan kaynaklar incelenerek veriler toplanmıştır. İzlenen filmler ve okunan kaynaklarla elde edilen veriler sentezlenerek

filmler savaşı temsil ediş biçimleriyle karşılaştırılmıştır. Aynı adlı eserden farklı ülke yapımları ve farklı yönetmenler tarafından neredeyse yüzyıl arayla beyaz perdeye uyarlanan Batı Cephesinde Yeni Bir Şey Yok adlı iki film de savaşı temsil eden savaş sineması türünün birer örneğidir. Birçok savaş sineması örneği gibi her iki film de savaşın yıkıcılığını, acı yüzünü, yarattığı tahribatı ve çaresizliği ortaya koymayı başarmıştır. Her iki filmde de savaşın anlamsızlığına dair söylemler bulunmasına rağmen 1930 yapımı film romanın karakteristiğine uygun olarak savaş karşıtı bir söylem geliştirmeyi başarmıştır.

Her iki filmde de savaşa karar verenler savaşı bir güç temsili olarak görenler ile birebir sıcak çatışma içinde olanlar arasındaki duygu durumu farkları her fırsatta ekrana yansıtılsa da bu durum yine 1930 yapımı filmde daha açık ve eleştirel bir biçimde sunulmuştur. İki filmde de savaşan askerlerin gönüllü olmalarının temel nedeninin, kendilerine aşılana milliyetçi söylemler vatanseverlik gibi kavramlar olduğu görülmektedir. 1930 yapımı filmde bu tarz konuşmalar daha uzun ve daha detaylı verilmiş adeta bu durum eleştirilmişken 2022 yapımı filmde bir savaş sineması uylaşımı olarak kalmıştır. Her iki filmin aynı eserden uyarlanmış aynı türe ait filmler olmasına rağmen 1930 yapımı Milestone imzalı film savaşı temsil etme biçimiyle 2022 yapımı filme göre çok daha eleştirel çok daha savaş karşıtı bir filmidir. Gerek gönüllülüğe dair yaptığı eleştiriler gerekse savaşın anlamsızlığına dair yaptığı eleştiriler adeta bütün filme yansıtılmıştır. 1930 yapımı filmin daha ilk karesinde ekrana yansıtılan yazı zaten savaş karşıtı bir söylemi ifade eder. 2022 yapımı filmde kitapta da yer alan yazara ait bu cümlelere hiç değinilmemiştir. 2022 yapımı filme göre 1930 yapımı filmde gerek öğretmenin sınıfı gönüllü olarak askere gitmeye teşvik etmek için yaptığı konuşma gerekse Paul'un sonradan bir sonraki sınıflardan birine yaptığı konuşma 2022 yapımı filmde yoktur. Her ne kadar 2022 yapımı Batı Cephesinde Yeni Bir Şey Yok filminde savaşın acımasızlığı özellikle yaralılar ve ölümler cephesinden ve içinde bulunulan çaresizlikle yansıtılmaya çalışılsa da bu konuda 1930 yapımı film kadar net olmadığı açıktır. Milestone imzalı film hiçbir şekilde arka cephede bir diplomatik mücadeleyi yansıtmamıştır. Adeta bunu vermeyerek sadece cepheye odaklanması savaş karşıtlığını daha iyi ifade edebilmek adına verilmiş bir mücadeledir diyebiliriz. Diğer taraftan 2022 yapımı film ciddi bir diplomatik mücadele de ortaya koyar. Bu da bir taraftan savaşın acımasızlığını yansıtsa da diğer taraftan diplomasinin savaşı başlatan değil de bitirmek için mücadele eden bir taraf olduğunu yansıtır. Bu anlamda 1930 yapımı Batı Cephesinde Yeni Bir Şey Yok filmi 2022 yapımı filme göre yazarın romanı da göz önünde bulundurursak savaş karşıtı söylem oluşturma ve savaş karşıtı bir film olma bağlamında ciddi biçimde eleştirel ve keskin karşıtlıkların olduğu bir filmidir diyebiliriz.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Batı Cephesinde Yeni Bir Şey Yok*, Savaş Sineması, Eric Maria Remarque, Birinci Dünya Savaşı, Savaşın Temsili.

Bu makale **intihal tespit yazılımlarıyla** taranmıştır. İntihal tespit edilmemiştir.

This article has been scanned by **plagiarism detection softwares**. No plagiarism detected.

Bu çalışmada “**Yükseköğretim Kurumları Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Yönergesi**” kapsamında uyulması belirtilen kurallara uyulmuştur.

In this study, the rules stated in the “**Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive**” were followed.

Araştırma tek bir yazar tarafından yürütülmüştür.

The research was conducted by a single author.

Çalışma kapsamında herhangi bir kurum veya kişi ile **çıkar çatışması** bulunmamaktadır.

There is no **conflict of interest** with any institution or person within the scope of the study.