

## ***Brødre vs. Brothers***

### The Transatlantic Remake as Cultural Adaptation

***Lynge Agger Gemzøe***

*External Lecturer at Media Studies, Aarhus University, responsible for courses in media analysis, media history, reception analysis and journalism. His research focuses on cultural exchanges across borders, the transatlantic remake in particular, not only in cinema, but also in remade television series such as The Killing (2011 – 2013) and The Bridge (2013 -).*

#### **Abstract**

Remaking Nordic television series and cinema has become a popular endeavor in the US. This article explores the remake as a category and sheds light on the specific choices that are deemed necessary to make something entirely Danish work in an American context. The article seeks to contribute to the understanding of a remake trend that, on the one hand, is inspired by all things Nordic, but on the other hand, actively engages in removing the Nordic feel from the remade productions. Using Susanne Bier's *Brødre* (2004) and Jim Sheridan's remake *Brothers* (2009) as cases and drawing on Danish and US war movie genre history, the article argues that the comparative analysis of original and remake can be used as a tool for contemporary cultural studies and shows that while stories travel, they might be stripped of humorous lightheartedness, local detail, and moral values in the process.

**Keywords** Transatlantic remakes, cinematic and televisual adaptations.

## Introduction

The transatlantic remake has appeared in various forms throughout film history. Hollywood has remade French cinema as documented by Durham (1998) and Mazdon (2000). While France seemed to be the best place to look for inspiration in times past from Hollywood's point of view, the North is currently rising: *Brothers* (2009), *Let Me In* (2010) and *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo* (2011) are all recent examples of Hollywood remakes based on Scandinavian originals. This trend has also made its way into television as exemplified by the television series, *The Killing* (2011 - 2013) and *The Bridge* (2013 - ). Current research on the success of Nordic cinema primarily adopts a wide, historically based approach on the matter, drawing on many films and discussing production form. In *Transatlantic Cinema in a Global North*, Ib Bondebjerg argues that the Danish cinema, on account of new production forms, among other things, has become a player in an international context (Bondebjerg, 2005, p. 111). Mette Hjort argues that the emergence of strong networks for the circulation of ideas, people, money, and films is a vital key for understanding Nordic globalization today (Hjort, 2005, p. 210-211). While this broad scope has its merits, the trend of remaking Nordic cinema and its techniques are overlooked since there are only a few remake case studies. Constantine Verevis has published and edited books on remakes (2006, 2012). I draw on his works, but with the caveat of his own admission that his studies have their limitations when it comes to the specific cultural contexts: "more and different work needs to be undertaken through comparative studies that reach across other historical monuments, national cultures and cross-cultural transactions" (2006, preface, p. vii-viii).

In this article, I shall revisit one of the few case studies already done on US remakes of Nordic cinema, namely, a comparison of *Brødre* (2004) and *Brothers* (2009) (Shriver-Rice, 2011). The fresh take on this case is warranted because my focus is entirely different from Shriver-Rice's, whose article is an introduction to New Danish Cinema and is primarily concerned with the differences in the Afghanistan part of the movies and the moral dilemmas of the main characters. While Shriver-Rice's article makes convincing points about the aesthetics of the movies, their link to New Danish Cinema, and the psychological differences between their respective protagonists, this

article argues and shows that Shriver-Rice's argument about the difference in the war scenes is somewhat flawed and that comparing other parts of the movies is just as illuminating, if not more so. This article also elaborates on the US history of war movies that the remake has to acknowledge, arguing that the history and culture of the remaking country is essential for understanding the remake process and for exploring what is translated, what is not, as well as why; as Beeden and de Bruin point out: "adaptations work through articulations of national identity and [...] the success of an adaptation may be linked to its ability to reflect and interpret its new context" (2010, p. 5). I begin with a brief outline of *Brødre*, the original movie, followed by an introduction to remaking as a concept, and finally, I intend to delve deeper into the different national and cultural contexts that the movies are a part of.

### **Brødre: Context, narrative and reception**

When *Brødre* premiered in 2004, it marked a revival of a Danish movie genre that had not been seen by Danish audiences for many years: The Danish war movie. Denmark had not been in a real war since the German occupation during WW2, and while movies about the Danish resistance were made after the war, only a few appeared in the 70's and 80's, and not one had been made since 1991 (Villadsen, 2000, p. 22). In *Brødre*, the Danish soldier, Michael, lives a gratifying life with Sarah, his pretty and loving wife, adorable, smart kids, and a decent house. He has to leave for the war in Afghanistan, where he is presumed dead after a helicopter crash. In reality, Michael is held captive by an Afghan militia, who forces him to kill a fellow soldier with an iron bar. At home, Michael's misfit brother Jannik assumes the responsibility for his family. He helps fix the house, takes care of his brother's kids, and wins the confidence of Sarah, the presumed widow in the process. However, Michael escapes Afghan imprisonment and returns home. Traumatized by war and driven mad with jealousy of his brother's and Sarah's newfound intimacy, he slowly degenerates before going on a violent rampage, thrashing his house and making his wife force him to face what he did in Afghanistan. *Brødre* was a domestic success<sup>1</sup> and also garnered some international acclaim as it won the audience award at the Sundance Festival 2005 for best dramatic foreign

film and the Film Music Award in Cannes 2006, among other wins and nominations.

### Remakes as category

One could argue that 'remake' is an odd conception because all movies are the same stories told in slightly different ways. Michael Eaton suggests that "there are only two possible premises for stories: The Odd Couple and The Fish Out of Water. . . Although Oedipus, if you think about it, is a bit of both" (Eaton qtd. in Verevis, 2006, p. 10, original ellipsis).<sup>2</sup> While Eaton writes about stories in general, it is possible to categorize and theorize more thoroughly when the scope is narrowed to focus on American movies. 30-year-old accounts like *The Classical Hollywood Cinema* (Bordwell, Staiger and Thompson, 1985) and *Hollywood Genres* (Schatz, 1981)<sup>3</sup> still offer valid theoretical frameworks that can be applied to most Hollywood cinema of today: recent multiple Academy Award-winner *The Fighter* (2011) is still the same old David vs. Goliath story that we have seen many times before. Mazdon remarks, "Since the earliest days of its cinematic production Hollywood has adapted, copied, plagiarised, and been inspired by other works" (Mazdon, 2000, p. 2); and Quentin Tarantino openly admits: "I steal from every single movie made ... If my work has anything it's because I'm taking from this and from that, piecing them together" (Tarantino qtd. in Verevis, 2006, p. 173, original ellipsis). The point here is that Danish *Brødre* also by and large fits into these accounts of *American* movies. It obviously borrows from US war movies and, seen in this light, is a bit of a remake in its own right. I shall elaborate on this ensuing.

Adopting a stricter definition of remaking, one might distinguish between 1) Remaking as Industrial Category; 2) Remaking as Textual Category; and 3) Remaking as Critical Category (Verevis, 2006). Seen from an industrial perspective, a common conception about remaking movies is that "Remakes reflect the conservative nature of the industry; they are motivated by an economic imperative to repeat proven successes" (Stern qtd. in Verevis, 2006, p. 4). But from a producer's point of view, remaking a movie like *Brødre* is not a "sure thing" as far as marketing goes. As Verevis writes: "In a commercial context, remakes are 'pre-sold' to their audience because viewers are assumed to have some prior experience, or at least possess a 'narrative image', of the original story – an earlier film, liter-

ary or other property – before engaging in its particular retelling” (Verevis, 2006, p. 3). Although a quick glance upon the user-made reviews of *Brothers* at IMDb.com actually reveals that many of the users compare *Brothers* to the original,<sup>4</sup> the general American audience of 2009 cannot be expected to have any prior knowledge of a Danish movie made in 2004. Considering that IMDb.com is an international website, in principle all comments on the original could have been written by Danes. Still, *Brødre* was a commercial success in Denmark and to a certain degree also in Europe. The success of the original could be seen as a form of insurance to the producers. The industrial category seems to overlap with the textual category – Verevis discusses the issue of foreign films being stripped of local detail and political content in the remakes to exploit the English-language markets (Verevis, 2006, p. 3). Is this the fate of the Scandinavian cinema as it is remade overseas? The in-depth case study might be able to reveal more about the intercultural dynamics of remakes. Accordingly, I examine the narrative in *Brødre* to show how it works – and how its dynamics mimic those of several US war movies, as mentioned previously.

### The narrative in *Brødre*

Most of the Western cinema is built upon well-known story-telling techniques that can be traced back to traditional fairy tales and Greek tragedies. Above I mentioned *The Odd Couple* and *Fish Out of Water*. To this, we might add the *three-act structure* – a development from *set-up* to *conflict* to *resolution* – and from *ordinary world* to *special world* and back to *ordinary world* (Breum, 2004, p. 133), along with the idea that the characters function as dramatic devices that move the narrative forward (Breum, 2004, p. 49).

Behind every movie is an idea, and this idea, for the most part, is conveyed through the change of central protagonists (Breum, 2004, p. 49; Harms Larsen, 2003, p. 29). When Michael and Nick in *The Deer Hunter* (1978) are changed by the terrors of war, their transformations reflect the movie’s message: War does terrible things to human beings in both the short and the long run, and the United States has paid a tremendously high price for the Vietnam War.

Both *Brødre* and *The Deer Hunter* follow this three-act structure and work their way from the ordinary world (home) to a special world (war) and back again. Moreover, the idea in *Brødre* is also

somewhat similar to that of *The Deer Hunter*: That war will change a man. This is reflected in the change of Michael, the protagonist in *Brødre*. In the beginning of the movie, he is in complete control of his life. War makes him paranoid, awkward in social situations, violent, and a liar. But while *The Deer Hunter* offers no real way out for the emotionally scarred men, *Brødre* leaves them with an opportunity: Confession is the key to salvation. If you are willing to talk about your wrongdoings, and if you repent, you can be forgiven, and perhaps move on. Michael is transformed by war, but his brother Jannik is also “damaged goods.” Jannik is a convicted felon accustomed to the shady parts of life. He recently got out of prison, he drinks, and he is a constant disappointment to his dad. Jannik learns that you have to shape up if you want anything worth having in this world. The movie ends with Michael’s confession, without which he would lose his wife and kids, but this is, in fact, preceded by his brother Jannik’s confession: he has also confessed his crimes and apologized to the banker he assaulted. Thus both brothers take responsibility for their actions, confess their sins, and presumably get back on track.

One could argue that this theme of main characters undergoing change is to be expected; for example, the same change is made by Simba in the *Lion King* (1994), Derek in *American History X* (1999), and Phil in *Groundhog Day* (1992): In the beginning of these movies, they are all cowards in their own way, running away from commitment and responsibility. However, in the end of the movies, they all shape up and assume responsibility for their actions and lives – quite a conventional point to make in American cinema. But while the changes are the same, *the way they change* is different, and this is what makes “remakes” of the same moral stories interesting.

Through different stages in *Brødre*, different characters can be seen as antagonists. In the first act of the movie, Jannik and his father are antagonists. Their conflict threatens the otherwise stable environment. The enemies in Afghanistan are antagonists in the second act – and their inhumanity and harsh ways are internalized in Michael, who becomes the antagonist in the third and final act. *Brødre* does little to explain the psychology of the Afghan militia. Its members are depicted as hateful and ruthless brutes, whose idea of a good time is to watch Western soldiers beat each other to death with an iron bar.

Michael's change raises many moral and political questions: Would you kill an innocent man to save your own life? How far are we willing to go to save ourselves? What does war do to soldiers? As a society, are we willing to pay the economic and emotional tolls that (this) war exacts on us? We have seen such themes explored in American war movies before, but it was a fairly new theme in Danish cinema in 2004. Denmark simply does not have the war history that the US boasts – especially the Cold War and the Vietnam War have been sources of inspiration to Hollywood. And where movies like *Platoon* (1986) and *Born on the Fourth of July* (1989) are quite unanimous and clear in their message that the Vietnam War was too expensive in lives and suffering, *Brødre* has a more ambiguous response to the issue. On the one hand, Michael's post-war collapse tells us that our soldiers pay an extremely high emotional price for our warmongering. On the other hand, the enemy is depicted as brutes worth fighting against – the audience can probably imagine how rebuilding a country can prove difficult if paramilitary fanatics with bazookas set the agenda. This analysis so far shows how *Brødre* is massively inspired by existing US war movies and by traditional ways of telling stories, placing itself somewhere between the Danish Occupation film tradition waging that the Liberation Movement did the right thing (cf. Villadsen, 2000), and the American critical attitude. Ironically, the comparison with the remake will show how it is also inherently Danish in its mood and feel.

### ***Brothers* as a cultural adaptation**

In the critical category, the American remake *Brothers* (2009) by Jim Sheridan was nominated for two Golden Globes and grossed \$43,318,349 worldwide,<sup>5</sup> which is decent for a Hollywood movie, albeit not impressive.<sup>6</sup> In the taxonomies of Greenberg, *Brothers* is somewhere between “the acknowledged, close remake,” in which “the original film is replicated with little or no change to the narrative” and “the acknowledged, transformed remake” with “substantial transformations of character, time and setting” (Verevis, 2006, p. 9). On the one hand, there is very little change to the fundamentals of the original narrative. On the other hand, the change in setting is substantial, as I aim to demonstrate in the following where the remake as a textual category is explored.

As stated above, the war themes explored in *Brødre* are partly inspired by American cinema. I have already mentioned *The Deer Hunter*, *Platoon*, and *Born on the Fourth of July*, but the list is longer and can be expanded to include *Full Metal Jacket* (1987), *Apocalypse Now* (1979), and so forth. The remake has to account for these somewhat similar movies by, on the one hand, acknowledging its predecessors and on the other hand, by bringing something new to the table. A quick glance at the war movie classics above reveals that they are all about the Vietnam War. Movies about the war in Afghanistan are fewer, even though the US still has many troops deployed in Afghanistan. Furthermore, *Brothers* also has to account for the political situation in the US about the war in Afghanistan, which is no small task – presently the Wikipedia-article on the opposition against the war in Afghanistan is 36 pages long.<sup>7</sup>

*Brothers* adopts the Danish take on the war in many – but not all – ways. In both versions, the war is questioned in the beginning of the narrative. In the American version, Isabelle states: “They only shoot the bad guys,” and Tommy asks: “Who are the bad guys?” No one is able to explain this to the kids, so Maggie’s stereotype answer is accepted: “The ones with the beards” (*Brothers*, 8 min, 22 sec). Ironically this proves to be true as all the inhumane Afghan captors sprout impressive beards. And they *are* inhumane and sadistic in both movies, but in *Brothers* they also have more of an agenda: They want the Americans out of Afghanistan. American soldier Joe Willis is tortured and forced to denounce the American presence in the country. Furthermore, his death is recorded on camera and is presumably seen as a weapon of war: In the 2009-version, the Afghan militia has become aware of the media. Whether this makes them appear better or worse is open for debate. Shriver-Rice (2011, p. 15) argues that the camera adds an “element of torturous intentionality and humiliation.” One might also argue that the camera sheds some light on their motives – letting one enemy execute another with an iron bar is terrible by any standard, but in *Brothers*, at least, it serves more of a purpose: the media war; which contrasts with *Brødre*, in which the execution might just seem a cruel form of amusement, challenging the moral values of the captives and breaking their spirits. In general, my reading of the war scenes is different from Shriver-Rice, who argues that “In contrast with the Hollywood version, it is not precisely defined or conclu-

sive that Michael would have no other choice but to murder his fellow soldier. Had he taken another course of action or had any patience, other options may have presented themselves" (Shriver-Rice, 2011, p. 16). Seen from my perspective, this is a misreading of the scene. I cannot fathom what options might have presented themselves with half a dozen armed Afghans surrounding Michael, pressuring him into murder.

Another way in which *Brothers* deals with the American history of war and preceding war movies is by making Hank, the father, a Vietnam War veteran with strong patriotic feelings. Hence, when Tommy greets his dad for the first time after getting out of prison, he addresses him "sir" (*Brothers*, 7 min, 17 sec). In *Brødre*, only one brother is transformed by war, but in *Brothers*, Tommy's failures as a son are indirectly explained by the father's traumas in Vietnam: "After I got back from 'Nam you know, I couldn't talk to your mother. I guess I took it out on you and Tommy, you know, I ... I don't know why" (*Brothers*, 1 hour, 7 min, 21 sec). *Brothers* takes the idea that the terrors of war are internalized and uses it not only on Sam, but makes it a point that this is something that haunts a family through generations. We can easily imagine how Hank was a terrible father after he got back from Vietnam because we have just seen what war did to Sam, *and* we have seen all the classic movies about soldiers being changed by the war in Vietnam. *Brothers* also draws on previous war movies by means of various references: The opening shot in *Brødre* with marching marines is very much like the various shots of marines marching in *Full Metal Jacket*. "I don't know who said: Only the dead have seen the end of war. I have seen the end of war. The question is: Can I live again?" (*Brothers* 1 hour, 40 min, 5 sec); this voice-over by Sam at the end of *Brothers* makes you think back to the voice-over of Chris in *Platoon*: "Somebody once wrote: Hell is the impossibility of reason. That's what this place feels like. Hell" (*Platoon*, 10 min, 1 sec).

### **American family values and carefree, drunk Danes**

While *Brødre* is set in the big city with all its lights, bars, and public transportation, *Brothers* is set in a small-town American environment in Minnesota. The traditional family values are highlighted in *Brothers*: When Sam leaves for war, he removes his wedding ring, and thus his only trinket is the army tag he is wearing around his

neck. Symbolically, Grace takes the wedding ring and attaches it to a chain that she puts around her neck. He is carrying the weight of duty to his country on his shoulders, and she is entrusted with the love, trust, and family values for safekeeping. While Michael and Sarah broke up at some point early in their relationship, Grace and Sam's marriage is depicted as the ideal American cliché: The cheerleader who dated and at some point married the successful football player. We do not learn about any fallout in their relationship. The respect for marriage and the family as an institution is higher in *Brothers*. When Tommy learns that his brother is alive, he suspends his advances on Grace. Danish Jannik also desists, but he struggles more than his American counterpart. After Michael's rampage, we see Jannik standing at the door to the bathroom, considering walking in on Sarah in the shower. The family values are also expressed in the brotherly bond in *Brothers*. "You are my brother" is spoken out loud by both Sam and Tommy throughout the film, and when Sam almost kills himself, the phrase is used as the convincing argument to put down the gun: "Sam, look at me for a second. You're my brother. You're my family. Do you hear me?" (*Brothers*, 1 hour, 33 min, 30 sec).

The American version is more serious and politically correct on most accounts. In *Brødre*, when the helicopter is shot down, a brawny recruit is joking around and complaining about the lack of prostitutes in Afghanistan. Likewise, when Jannik has an outburst at the dinner table in *Brødre*, the family just laughs, whereas Tommy's comparable outburst is handled with grave silence. In the same scene, Henning makes some pretty harsh generalizations – bordering on racist remarks – that are only somewhat replicated by the kids in *Brothers*. Both the Tommy and Grace characters are more serious than their Danish counterparts – Sarah simply smiles and laughs more than Grace does, as in the situation above, but also when Jannik makes jokes about the trashed kitchen after Michael's incident or when the handymen arrive to fix the kitchen. *Brødre* is certainly not a comedy. The tragedies are just as sad and the drama is just as dramatic. Jokes and laughter are simply used to handle all the chaos and grief.

Alcohol is treated differently in the two versions, which reflects the different cultural attitudes towards alcohol: Danes consume more alcohol than Americans. It is not that there is no drinking in

*Brothers*. Both grandfathers are fond of alcohol and use it as a way of dealing with their grief. But Michael becomes extremely drunk before he goes berserk, while Sam snaps all sober. Tommy drinks, but he is less of a drunk than Jannik. When Tommy comes to bring the car back and learns of his brother's death, he is not as visibly drunk as Jannik in the same situation – in which Sarah also accuses Jannik of drunk driving.<sup>8</sup> And while an inebriated Jannik manages to make Sarah laugh with his intoxicated ramblings when she picks him up at a bar at four o'clock in the morning, Grace is not at all amused by a drunken Tommy in the remade version of the scene. Drinking, apparently, is no laughing matter in the US.

The attitude towards guns is also entirely different in the two movies. As a matter of course, Sam has a firearm, and when he hears a dog bark, he whips out his gun. This is unheard of in a Danish context, in which Michael, a commanding officer in the military, has to steal a gun from the police to be able to threaten anybody – which might seem unlikely or perhaps even comical in the US.

### **The inspired narrative remade**

This article has illustrated a circular, globalized process in which a Danish movie clearly draws on an American tradition of war movies, but is still based on an original story with local Danish detail, Danish cultural norms and the aesthetics of New Danish Cinema. In *Brothers*, the original narrative, in general terms, stays the same in terms of acts and dramatic devices. If we recall Verevis's discussion on foreign films being stripped of local detail and political content in the remakes to exploit the English-language markets, my analysis has shown that *Brødre* is indeed stripped of local detail, and American local detail is added instead. Furthermore, most of the carefree, sometimes politically incorrect Danish lightheartedness is simply not remade. Perhaps it was deemed inappropriate; perhaps it is just very difficult to remake humorous lightheartedness. An argument in favor of the latter is that local detail is kept in other recent remakes: the television series *The Killing* (2010 - ) takes place in the US but is kept in the "Nordic noir" of the original and *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo* (2011) is actually set in Sweden.

In the case of political content, however, the remake of *Brødre* is hardly stripped – in fact, more political content is added in *Brothers*. My analysis has revealed a clear-cut example of a remake that sac-

rifices local detail to interact with its new country's political present and cultural history – something that the remakes with intact local detail will probably have a harder time doing.

## References

- Bondebjerg, I., 2005. The Danish Way: Danish Film Culture in a European and Global Perspective. In: A. Nestingen and T.G. Elkington eds. *Transnational Cinema in a Global North*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press. pp. 111-140.
- Beeden, A. and de Bruin, J., 2010. The Office – Articulations of National Identity in Television Format Adaptation. *Television and New Media*, 11(1), pp. 3-19.
- Breum, T., 2004. *Film, fortælling og forførelse 2*. København: Frydenlund.
- Durham, C.A., 1998. *Double Takes*. Hanover: Dartmouth College.
- Hjort, M., 2005. From Epiphanic Culture to Circulation: The Dynamics of Globalization in Nordic Cinema. In: A. Nestingen and T.G. Elkington, eds. *Transnational Cinema in a Global North*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Larsen, P.H. 2003. *De levende billeders dramaturgi*, vol. 1. Phønix-Tr.: DR.
- Loock, K. and Verevis, C. eds., 2012. *Film Remakes, Adaptations, and Fan Productions: Remake/Remodel*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Mazdon, L., 2000. *Encore Hollywood*. London: British Film Institute.
- Shriver-Rice, M., 2011. Adapting National Identity: Ethical Borders Made Suspect in the Hollywood Version of Susanne Bier's *Brothers*. *Film International*, 9(2), pp. 8-19.
- Verevis, C., 2006. *Film Remakes*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Villadsen, E., 2000. Besættelsesbilleder. *Kosmorama* 46(226), pp. 5-27.

## Film References

- American History X*, 1998. [Film] Directed by Tony Kaye. USA: New Line Cinema, Savoy Pictures & The Turman-Morrissey Company.
- Apocalypse Now*, 1979. [Film] Directed by Francis Ford Coppola. USA: Zoetrope Studios.

*Born on the Fourth of July*, 1989. [Film] Directed by Oliver Stone. USA: Ixtlan.

*Brothers*, 2009. [Film] Directed by Jim Sheridan. USA: Lionsgate, Relativity Media, Sighvatsson Films, Michael De Luca Productions & Palomar Pictures.

*Brødre*, 2004. [Film] Directed by Susanne Bier. Denmark: Two Brothers Ltd., Fjellape Film AS, Memphis Film, Sigma Films & Zentropa Entertainments.

*Full Metal Jacket*, 1987. [Film] Directed by Stanley Kubrick. UK, USA: Natant, Stanley Kubrick Productions & Warner Bros.

*Groundhog Day*, 1993. [Film] Directed by Harold Ramis. USA: Columbia Pictures Corporation.

*Let Me In*, 2010. [Film] Directed by Matt Reaves. UK, USA: Overture Films, Exclusive Media Group, Hammer Film Productions & EFTI

*Million Dollar Baby*, 2004. [Film] Directed by Clint Eastwood. USA: Warner Bros., Lakeshore Entertainment, Malpaso Productions, Albert S. Ruddy Productions & Epsilon Motion Pictures.

*Platoon*, 1986. [Film] Directed by Oliver Stone. UK, USA: Hemdale Film & Cinema 86.

*The Deer Hunter*, 1978. [Film] Directed by Michael Cimino. UK, USA: EMI Films & Universal Pictures.

*The Fighter*, 2010. [Film] Directed by David O. Russell. USA: Closest to the Hole Productions, Fighter, Mandeville Films, The Park Entertainment, Relativity Media & The Weinstein Company.

*The Girl With the Dragon Tattoo*, 2011. [Film] Directed by David Fincher. USA, Sweden, Norway: Columbia Pictures and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

*The Lion King*, 1995. [Film] Directed by Roger Allers & Rob Minkoff. USA: Walt Disney Pictures.

### TV Series References

*The Killing*, 2011-present. [TV series] Developed by Veena Sud. Directed by Ed Bianchi, et al. Canada: Fox Television. AMC.

*The Bridge*, 2013-present. [TV series] Developed by Meredith Stiehm, et al. Directed by Gwyneth Horder-Payton, et al. USA: FX Productions. FX network.

## Website References

- Box Office Mojo. *Brothers*. [online] Available at: <<http://boxoffice-mojo.com/movies/?id=brothers09.htm>> [Accessed 27 November 2013].
- Box Office Mojo. *Million Dollar Baby*. [online] Available at: <<http://boxofficemojo.com/movies/?id=milliondollarbaby.htm>> [Accessed 27 November 2013].
- The Internet Movie Database. *Brødre, Trivia*. [online] Available at: <[http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0386342/trivia?ref\\_=tt\\_trv\\_trv](http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0386342/trivia?ref_=tt_trv_trv)> [Accessed 27 November 2013].
- The Internet Movie Database. *Brothers, User Reviews*. [online] Available at: <[http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0765010/reviews?ref\\_=tt\\_urv](http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0765010/reviews?ref_=tt_urv)> [Accessed 27 November 2013].
- Scope.dk. *Tickets Sold*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.scope.dk/solgtebilletter>> [accessed 27 November 2013].
- Wikipedia. *Opposition to the war in Afghanistan*. [online] Available at: <[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Opposition\\_to\\_the\\_War\\_in\\_Afghanistan\\_\(2001%E2%80%93present\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Opposition_to_the_War_in_Afghanistan_(2001%E2%80%93present))> [Accessed 27 November 2013].

## Noter

- 1 With 424,479 tickets sold, *Brødre* was the 149th best-selling picture in Danish movie theaters of all time, and along with *Kongekabale* the most successful Danish film of 2004. Source: <<http://www.scope.dk/solgtebilletter>> [Accessed 27 November 2013] and <[http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0386342/trivia?ref\\_=tt\\_trv\\_trv](http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0386342/trivia?ref_=tt_trv_trv)> [Accessed 27 November 2013].
- 2 This holds true for *Brothers* as well: The two brothers are The Odd Couple and both are, at different stages in the movie, the Fish Out of Water.
- 3 *Hollywood Genres* is actually built upon genre studies of American cinema during the period 1930-1960.
- 4 Source: <[http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0765010/reviews?ref\\_=tt\\_urv](http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0765010/reviews?ref_=tt_urv)> [Accessed 27 November 2013].
- 5 Source: <<http://boxofficemojo.com/movies/?id=brothers09.htm>> [accessed 27 November 2013].
- 6 In comparison, Clint Eastwood's *Million Dollar Baby* (2004), a comparable drama, grossed \$216,763,646 worldwide. Source: <<http://boxofficemojo.com/movies/?id=milliondollarbaby.htm>> [Accessed 27 November 2013].

- 7 If 2400 characters with spaces equals a page. Source: Wikipedia.com, <[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Opposition\\_to\\_the\\_War\\_in\\_Afghanistan\\_\(2001%E2%80%93present\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Opposition_to_the_War_in_Afghanistan_(2001%E2%80%93present))> [Accessed 27 November 2013].
- 8 According to the Internet Movie Database, Nikolaj Lie Kaas *was* actually drunk when they shot the scene. He thought it would be more convincing that way. Source: <[http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0386342/trivia?ref\\_=tt\\_trv\\_trv](http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0386342/trivia?ref_=tt_trv_trv)> [Accessed November 2013].