changes because doing so saves them millions in production costs. If film-makers do not agree to alterations, assistance is withheld" (Cambell).

At the center of this debate is the protected First Amendment right of speech. Filmmaking, along with a host of other forms of expression, is protected from government regulation; however when the government openly decides to support one film over another, and in turn give out resources to the film it supports, it is violating a basic tenant of American constitutional law (*Rosenberger v. University of Virginia,* 1995). This statement is not sufficient alone. Seeking to understand a deeper meaning of this debate, one must look past the constitutionality of the process and more at its consistency and confliction with fundamental democratic principles.

David Robb completes this idea in *Operation Hollywood*. While arguing that the Pentagon's power over the motion picture industry is unconstitutional, Robb also conveys the message that the process is "unconscionable" (Robb 365). Throughout his work, Robb remains discouraged by what he views as the surrender of principles and rights by filmmakers in exchange for monetary gain (Hilton). Robb makes a connection between the Hollywood-Pentagon relationship and communist North Korea. He also suggests that the military-themed film culture has strongly influenced America's world views on war (Robb 365-366). Jean-Michel Valentin, in *Hollywood, the Pentagon and Washington*, creates a contrasting view. It is easy to see a parallel in Robb's and Valentin's writing, however careful inspection reveals where Valentin branches off and forms his case, one where the Hollywood films regarding the military and national security are shaped by the threats of the time.

> National security cinema takes into account that reality and comments upon it through on-screen dramas that can be fables about the often harsh burdens of responsibility, or even true stories exploring the use and abuse of armed force. National security films also participate in this game by taking sides with the support of the American public for or against certain prevailing ideas or official positions (Valentin xi).

There are others, however, that continue to show dissatisfaction of the criticisms of the Pentagon's small control over Hollywood. "Robb does not mention that the Pentagon can justify its control by pointing out the alternative: Hollywood leftists would produce films showing the military in the worst possible light, thus doing a disservice to the nation" (Hilton). This argument does little to fuel the claims that the process conflicts with fundamental democratic principles, however. Claiming that open creativity in regards to film and the military would be a disservice is opinionated, at best, and the claim remains further diluted when one introduces a fundamental democratic principle: freedom.

The assistance of the Pentagon to Hollywood for military-themed films is a product of open-market capitalism. However, this form of market capitalism is unique. There are no companies that own aircraft carriers or fighter jets.

Hollywood is simply going wherever it needs to go to obtain military hardware: the military. This is where capitalism ends and where monopolistic control begins. Not only is the government the sole place to acquire the necessary hardware, at the same time, it restricts others from possessing military weaponry. This is how the nexus between Hollywood and the Pentagon becomes a contradictory relationship. The principles of capitalism and monopolistic control are waging an internal battle inside this relationship, and the Pentagon's monopolistic control of weaponry is winning the war. There is no alternative for film studios whose scripts do not meet military standards. This control over the medium will continue to give the Pentagon's monopolistic control the edge. It is also what makes the process of making military-themed films more political than the messages conveyed in the films.

This can be examined further by focusing on *From Art to Politics* by Murray Edelman. Edelman raises significant questions regarding art, particularly film, and how it can shape the politics of the observer. This is especially relevant when addressing the comparison of the relationships between Hollywood and the Pentagon, and Hollywood and its audience. Edelman takes a very abstract position on art and politics, and does so by providing clear examples and a great deal of evidence to support his theories. Two basic points remain strong throughout *From Art to Politics*: Edelman explains that the process of observing is not without bias, and that all art, either directly or indirectly, has political connotations (Edelman 1). Edelman argues that one can be politically influenced without being aware of the manipulation, believing that there exists a need to interpret information that is coming in from all avenues (1). Two people observing the same thing will produce thoughts that will be created from the former influences of the individual. Edelman creates that notion that there exists no collective belief (2). Art influences how everyone sees events and is therefore the reason that the same event will bring individuals to different conclusions. Present throughout Edelman's key points is his definition of art. He believes that "its crucial feature is that it supplies images that construct the worlds in which we act" (3). According to Edelman, the response to art cannot be controlled, even by the artist. This is why the process of seeking to obtain permission to utilize military weaponry and venues is inherently more political than any message a script-writer can create. This point becomes solidified when the Pentagon has changed a script due to that process.

The concerns that the Hollywood-Pentagon relationship is undemocratic, such as the ones that Robb portrays in *Operation Hollywood*, are genuine. The relationship between the industry and the military is not a fair one, and it conflicts with two fundamental democratic principles in particular: freedom and capitalism. The relationship conflicts with freedom by hindering the creativity of filmmakers and the government-sponsored activity of manipulating art. Filmmakers are free to create that art; however that freedom becomes restricted once the success of their art depends on adhering to the Pentagon's policies. The democratic principle of