

BJMC 6 Semester Tutorial: FILM APPRECIATION

You watched a film. You noticed every single aspect of the film, from script to cinematography, from acting to editing, from dialogues to music, from every scene to the complete idea, everything.

Now you wrote your review about the film. This is film appreciation.

For appreciating a film, you need to understand the history of filmmaking, how the films were made in the past, and how they are being made, and what progress can be achieved in the future cinema.

You must be able to understand what the director had in his mind while he made the film, To what extent could he be just with the film, What could have been done better.

In a nut shell, you, after figuring out the plot of the film, have to imagine how would you have done the film, and in comparison to your film, is it better or it could have been better.

Unit I - Language of Cinema Language of Cinema I –

Film and video programs are efforts at communicating and just like speaking English, tapping out Morse code, or waving semaphores, there is a whole language that can be learned including words, phrases, grammar, punctuation, rules, and common practices. And like any other language, the more thoroughly you master it, the more effectively you can communicate.

While the writer conceives the story, and the director realizes it, it is you, the editor who is the *storyteller*; given the task of organizing the thoughts and ideas and transmitting the intended message to the audience.

Communication is both an art and a craft. Part inspiration and part perspiration. Effective editing requires both aspects, and while you can't necessarily be taught the art of eloquence, you can study and practice the rules of the language, and hone your craft so you can edit quicker, more efficiently, and communicate more effectively because of it.

Focus on visual Language: Shot, Scene, Mis-en-scene, Deep focus, Continuity
Editing, Montage

Shots As Words

Just as words are the building blocks of a written language, individual shots are the building blocks of the film language. And different shots can be thought of as different parts of speech, serving different purposes and answering different questions.

You are undoubtedly very familiar with the questions: who, what, where, when, why and how. These questions are deeply ingrained in all of our brains because we are constantly asking them-consciously or unconsciously-about everything we see and do in the world. The answers to those questions are precisely the elements our brains use to make sense of the world. And coincidentally, they are the basic components of *story*.

You probably know someone who tells great stories, perhaps a grandfather or a crazy aunt. You also probably know someone who can't tell a joke to save their life. Did you ever stop to ask what makes one person a great storyteller and someone else a bad one?

Effective storytelling requires doling out the who, what, where, when, why and how answers in equal parts and just in time as the listener is wondering about them. If you dwell too long on one of the questions, without answering the others, the story becomes tiresome and the audience stops listening.

"Three guys walk into a bar. The bar is smoky and dark, there are three bare-bulb lamps dangling, and there's a cigarette burn on one of the tables. The floor is kinda dirty, it's wooden and well worn, and there are about a dozen chairs lined up before the bar...."

Enough *where* already! Who are the three guys and why are they there? Even a simple joke can be mercilessly ruined by a storyteller who doesn't know this basic rule.

As an editor, your primary job is to control the flow of information, to guide the viewer to pay attention to certain details in a certain order, and to control the point of focus both within the frame and within the story. There are many tools to aid you in this endeavor, but the most

basic of these tools are the specific shots you choose. In fact, different types of shots inherently answer each of these questions.

Who

In the film language, the *who* question is typically answered with the close-up (CU). The primary point of focus in any close-up is the subject's face. This framing typically mimics the experience of what you would see in real life if you were conversing with a person. A close-up is an intimate portrait of someone, more intimate than you would ever get with a stranger. This is part of why fans inherently feel as though they "know" famous actors. (Though the feeling is certainly not mutual!)

Close-ups can vary widely based on camera position, lens choice, and other production considerations, but ultimately you can count on such a shot to answer this fundamental question.

If you were to go too long without providing close-ups your audience will lose track of whose story they're following and they will very likely lose interest. This is especially common in complex action scenes where there is so much *what* and *how* to convey to move the story forward that it's easy to forget to keep the *who* present in the viewer's mind. But do so at your own peril. Even the most spectacular battle scene can fall flat if the audience loses track of who it is that's engaged in the fight.

What

If you want to communicate *what* is going on, you probably need to show a subject performing an activity, and typically, this is conveyed in a medium shot (MS). To clarify, dramatic events are broken down into hundreds of discrete actions that can be described by active verbs (to lift, to threaten, to save, to give, to arrest, and so on.) While sometimes such actions might be subtle and internal enough to be conveyed in a CU, or complex enough to require a sequence of shots, very often the MS provides enough distance from the subject's eyes to move the focus off of their identity, but is still close enough to emphasize what it is they're doing.

Where

The location of an event is critical. Sometimes this element is deliberately omitted for a while to emphasize suspense or disorientation, but if you go too long without answering this question,

the audience will likely grow weary and eventually disengage from your story. The *where* question is nearly always answered with a Long Shot (LS) though depending on the nature of the scene, sometimes a medium long shot (MLS) or a shot even further away than an LS such as a wide shot (WS) might do the trick.

The LS shows a subject in an environment. Even if you know the answers to the other questions, watching a scene without having a sense of where it's taking place is literally disorienting. This makes it harder for our brains to process what's going on, and ultimately we start drifting away. Inevitably this leads to the worst possible audience reaction: changing the channel.

One case where this question is frequently omitted is in non-fiction or documentary style shows that contain a lot of interviews. Just because you're dealing with footage of a talking head doesn't mean that the viewer doesn't crave some context to put it in. Incorporating even a brief shot of the room where the interview is taking place, or at least using a wider angle of the interview will show the type of location and provide the answer to this pressing question. (Is it a university office? A jail cell? A baseball diamond? The Roosevelt room in the White House?)

Sometimes, when you don't have the wide shot you need, a clever editor may be able to indicate at least a hint of the "where" using *inserts* or *cutaways* to objects or details of the environment, such as a toy on the desk, a diploma on a wall, a bird in a tree nearby, and so on. But one way or another, your audience is dying to know: where does this scene take place?

When

The *when* question can seem tricky, especially when trying to simplify it to a single shot type. *When* can mean what period in history, how long before or after an important story event, or it can mean at what point in the overall story arc. The quintessential *when* shot is the extreme-long shot (ELS or XLS), which illustrates the subject traversing such a vast space that there is a sense of how much time it will take. This could be a car traversing an endless stretch of highway, camels crossing the desert, or a ship in a huge swath of ocean.

The idea here is of a *where* shot so vast that the connection between space and time becomes apparent and it answers the *when* instead. I

know it's very Einsteinian, but trust me, it works. This can be a great shot to help indicate not only the scope of the task at hand, but also to symbolically indicate where in the overall story arc your characters are.

Of course the *when* question can be answered in different ways too. Sometimes a CU of a particular object, such as futuristic computer panel, or an antiquated telephone can signal the time period, or even the most obvious and explicit of all: a shot of a clock.

Why

This question points to the internal decision making of your subject, and when you want to delve into someone's thoughts, the classic shot to use is an extreme close-up (ECU or XCU or sometimes BCU for *big* close-up).

It's interesting that while a close-up gives the viewer the sense that they are in an intimate relationship with the subject, when you get even closer, it's like moving right inside the subject's head. The audience goes from relating to the subject as *other* to identifying with the subject his or herself.

Some *why* questions may require a more complex approach, using a sequence of shots to explain a bit of backstory or perhaps a close-up on an object or detail that carries emotional significance in the context of the story.

This is also a case where the magic of juxtaposing two shots can suggest cause and effect. For example, if you constructed a sequence so that a shot of a woman slamming a door preceded a shot of a man signing divorce paperwork, it would imply that the wife's exit prompted the husband to finally go through with the divorce. However, you could tell a very different story by simply rearranging the two shots so the paper is signed before the woman leaves; suggesting that the husband's decision to sign provoked the wife to leave.

How

While the *why* is usually a very internal aspect of the story requiring suggestive shots and editing techniques, the *how* is just the opposite. This question is very external and is usually answered using either medium close-ups (MCU) of a subject performing a physical action (opening a door, lifting a manhole cover, packing a suitcase, etc.) or a

series of CUs or ECUs of specific actions (pulling a trigger, snapping a latch closed, operating a piece of machinery, etc.)

The MCU has a fundamentally different tone than a CU does. It may seem subtle when just comparing the two shots objectively, but in context, a CU is far more intimate and subjective, while an MCU retains enough distance from the subject to maintain a disengaged perspective.

With Whom

There's one more question that you must answer to satisfy your audience's unconscious need to make sense of the information you are communicating. Whenever you have a scenario with multiple subjects, their relative proximity, posture, and the power dynamic between them is an essential story element. With two people, this information is, by definition, contained in a 2-shot.

Naturally, scenes containing more than two subjects will require other, wider shots to illustrate the relative dynamics of all subjects.

Often you can deal with one pair of subjects at a time, or group subjects into "factions" creating a "2-shot" where the two subjects each comprise multiple elements.

Putting it all Together

Remember it's not just about including all of these different shot types in your sequence, but about anticipating which questions your audience will be wondering and answering them just before they bubble up to the viewer's conscious mind. By the time they're actively wondering, "Wait, how did he do that?" or "What happened to that other guy?" you've already lost them.

Understanding Shot Sizes While nothing terrible will happen if you make up your own names for things, it can be helpful to use a standardized terminology for basic shot sizing. The following graphic described the most common framings for a single human subject.

The Full Shot (FS or LS) contains the whole human body. It's considered bad framing to cut off someone's feet. The position and stature of someone's feet communicates a lot of information. (Are they standing firm? Teetering on one side? Shuffling?) Simultaneously, this shot identifies where the subject is located.

The Medium Shot (MS) should comfortably include the pelvis, but not the knees. A lot about posture and physical movement (like walking or dancing) can be determined from the pelvis. Cutting a shot off at the waist is an awkward middle ground between an MS and an MCU; we're further away, so facial expression is harder to see, but without that essential pelvic movement, there's no additional value. Because of this, the MS is typically used to show what someone is doing.

The Medium Close-up (MCU) includes the whole upper carriage like a traditional bust. The way someone holds their shoulders and back conveys a lot of information about their character. An MCU is far enough away to give the subject a respectable amount of space, but close enough to see their face.

The Close-up (CU) should be significantly tighter than the MCU, typically including the collar, but not much of the shoulders. The emphasis here should be on the facial expression, not on body movement. Because the CU is all about the subject's face, it encapsulates their identity, which is why it's the perfect shot to answer *who*.

The Extreme Close-up (ECU or XCU) [not pictured] could be a very tight framing around a character's eyes, mouth, or some other individual detail. As described above, generally the ECU is a way to get "inside the character's head." This is just as true for interviewees as it is for superheroes or ingénues.

Expanding Your Vocabulary

As you increase your cinematic vocabulary, you learn to recognize how different shots answer different questions. And there are more than just those six basic questions but that's where it all starts. You can also think about how certain shots can be used for different purposes. For example, certain shots can serve as *Establishing shots*, *Reaction shots*, *Inserts*, *Cutaways*, *POVs*, and so on.

Establishing Shots are used to identify a location and have traditionally been used to introduce a scene. While most commonly they are Wide Shots or Long Shots, sometimes a small familiar detail can serve as an establishing shot. For example, if you cut to a new scene, and begin on a CU of a blinking "Code Blue" light, you quickly inform the audience that you're in a hospital.

Reaction shots are usually just close-ups of a specific performance showing a subject's reaction to a particular event. Often a reaction shot can be stolen from a different take, or even a different scene. There are many stories of an editor finding a few seconds of footage of an actor with his guard down after the director called cut, and using that clip as a reaction somewhere else in the scene.

What's fascinating about a reaction shot is that it only takes its meaning from the shot that precedes it. The same reaction shot can

generate entirely different emotions in the audience depending on what it is that is being reacted to. Russian filmmaker Lev Kuleshov famously explored this concept in the early 20th century.

Inserts and *Cutaways*, are invaluable to an editor trying to cut around problems in a scene, or trying to cut some time out of a sequence. Inserts are CUs of objects that have already been seen within a scene, such as a wine bottle or a gun. Cutaways are similar, but the subject of a cutaway is something that has not been seen in any of the other shots. For example, in a scene set in a park, you might *cut away* to a shot of dogs frolicking, even though we've never seen the dogs before. In another location a cutaway might be a clock on a wall, or other diners in a restaurant.

Inserts are usually pretty limited as to where you can use them: If the subject picks up the wine bottle in the wide shot, that's the only time you can use the insert of the bottle being lifted in CU. On the other hand, cutaways can be used almost anywhere you need to escape from the main action. Of course, the more craftily and elegantly you work the cutaway into the scene, the smoother and less distracting it will be. So, for example, if there was a moment where an actor looked off screen, that might be a perfect time to cut to those frolicking dogs; thereby creating the impression that it was a *point-of-view shot* (POV).

There are many other shot types and uses you will learn as you gain more experience. And just like learning any other language, the more expansive your vocabulary, the more precisely (and more eloquently) you will be able to communicate. Don't forget also that shots are dynamic and change, a single shot can transform from one type to another through a camera move or through blocking.

Using Verbs

If you think of shots as nouns, you can think of edit points as verbs. Every time you move from one shot to another, you have a variety of choices about how to connect the two elements. You can choose a *continuity cut*, where the time and action remains continuous across the two shots; you can employ a *jump cut*, where time or space is deliberately mismatched; you may make a scene cut, where you transition from one location or event to another; you can use a *cross dissolve* to simulate time passage, or perhaps a transition from one mental state to another, and so on.

Remember that ultimately your goal is to communicate a story by controlling the viewer's point of focus. Every time you must end one shot and begin another, you create an opportunity for your audience to disengage, so great care must be made in maintaining focus across those transitions.

Rules of Grammar

I know you may think I'm taking this "film as language" metaphor a little too far, but the truth is, it's not a metaphor. It literally is a language, albeit, not a literal one. It's a visual language (and don't think that all the audio elements that go into constructing a sequence aren't just as important, but that's another article entirely).

Just like increasing your vocabulary helps you communicate more effectively, so does learning the common rules of grammar. Most of these rules are intended to hide the artifice of filmmaking so your audience isn't distracted by every cut, or off wondering about how the film was made instead of just getting immersed in the story being told. Now don't worry, just like all rules, sometimes they only exist to be broken, but a broken rule only has value by standing out while you follow them the rest of the time.

Every Shot Must Provide New Information

Perhaps the most fundamental rule of editing is that you should only cut when you absolutely must. The only reason you should cut at all is when moving the story forward requires information not present in the current shot. For example, if you're watching an MCU of a cop who pulls a gun out of his holster, and you can't see the gun in that MCU, you would need to cut to a shot showing that critical story element. If you were on an MS in the first place instead of the MCU, you might not need to cut at all to see the action. However to know whether the cop is frightened or furious or making a joke, you very well might need to cut to a CU.

If instead, you had a single shot that started out on his face, then tilted down to show the gun, then back up to see his reaction, you very well might not need to cut at all, at least until you wanted to see who or what he's pointing that gun at.

Cut on Action

Because every cut is an opportunity for your audience to stop thinking

about your story and start wondering what they're going to have for dinner, or where they parked their car, or whether or not they have to use the bathroom, or a hundred other possible distractions, you need to do everything you can to keep them watching across that edit point.

One of the best ways to do this is by using action within the frame to motivate and to hide the edit itself. The action within the frame can be very subtle; if a person simply moves his eyes and looks a different direction, that might be a perfect frame to make your cut, provided that the other side of the edit reveals what it is he just looked at.

Experienced editors are constantly making tiny mental notes of every such action in the footage they have to work with. Head turns, hand movements, eye glances, these are an editor's saving graces, because they provide a reason for the viewer to keep watching after the cut is made. Be sure to make a note of them!

The best scenario of all is where you have continuity of action across the edit point. For example, if you have someone lifting a coffee mug in an LS, and you have an MCU that shows the exact same movement, you can begin the movement in one shot and finish the movement on the other side of the cut.

Cutting on action is a crucial and fundamental concept. The idea is to keep the viewer's attention, so if they're watching the movement within the frame and that same movement continues on the other side of the cut, they won't notice the edit—even though the perspective has changed and even though the two shots may have been shot on different days, the continuity of action will make your edit seem perfectly fluid, in fact it will make it invisible.

If the speed of the action is different in the two shots, this makes your job a bit harder, and you may need to experiment with rolling the edit to different points in the action to find the place where the edit feels the most fluid.

What is least desirable is to make the cut *before* or *after* the entire action takes place; as that undermines the whole point of cutting on the action itself. If the speeds are so different that this is your only choice, you may be better off looking for an entirely different action to cut on.

Split Edits Whenever Possible

Another way you can effectively hide your edit points and keep your audiences' attention rapt is to offset the audio and video edits to create a *split edit*.

In this way, the audio is continuous while the picture is changing and the picture is continuous while the audio is changing, giving the viewers something to follow along with, even while the other component is changing.

While splitting your edits in either direction does achieve the desired goal of maintaining some level of continuity across the edit point, in practice, I find that J-cuts are used vastly more often. This makes sense if you think of it like this: First the audience hears something new, and just as they wonder what caused that new sound, you provide the answer with the new visual information.

While split edits are most often thought of as a tool for editing dialogue scenes, I believe there are very few situations where you shouldn't at least explore whether splitting your edits might smooth out otherwise choppy edits.

Matching Angles

Another general rule that aids in hiding edits is to match shot types, CU to CU, MCU to MCU, and so on. One of the most important aspects is to match eyelines (at least if the two subjects are supposed to be looking at one another), but even when cross-cutting between two dissimilar scenes the smoothest edits will be ones where the overall composition of adjacent shots is similar or reciprocal.

Furthermore you should strive to match similar or complementary lens choices whenever possible. Cutting between two shots where one is shot with a wide-angle lens and the other is shot with a telephoto lens (even if they're both MCUs) will be far more jarring to the viewer than matching shots photographed with the same lens.

Similarly, if one shot has been filmed at a high angle, the ideal reciprocal shot should be shot from a corresponding low angle. This is most obvious when the lens angle is motivated by the physical blocking of the actors (so the lens choices simulate the characters' points of view), but it applies equally when the use of low or high angles is done for subtle subjective reasons.

In addition to matching similar angles, it's also important to match moving shots to moving shots and static shots to static shots. If you need to cut from a pan to a lock-off, be sure to wait until the pan comes to its natural resting point, then cut to the static shot.

The 180° Rule

This is perhaps the most notorious filmmaking rule, and it's something that needs to be adhered to while shooting, but as an editor, you are often forced to try to fix or work around mistakes made when your production team failed to observe it.

The basic rule is that if people were looking left-to-right in the real space where the scene was shot, they ought to still be looking left-to-right in all of the shots when you edit them together. This might seem painfully obvious, but it turns out that when you convert the three-dimensional world into a series of two-dimensional images, it's pretty easy to get yourself turned around, and suddenly one of your actors is looking the wrong direction. While each individual shot might look fine, when you cut them together, that one shot won't cut properly with the shots around it. Sometimes the error is subtle and sometimes it's egregious.

The reason this is called the 180° rule is because you can move the camera angle away from a subject's eyeline by 10 degrees, 90 degrees, even 170 degrees, but if you move it beyond 180 degrees, suddenly the screen direction in the resulting shot will be reversed. The boundary can be easily assessed by imagining a straight line between the eyelines of the two main subjects.

While this might seem simple, it quickly gets far more complicated when you have more than two people in a scene, or the people are moving around, or the camera is moving, or any combination of all these things. And God forbid if one of the shots is being filmed through a mirror! Even the most seasoned production crew can quickly get themselves very confused and accidentally move the camera to the wrong side of the line for part of a scene. And then, of course, it becomes your problem.

There are only a few ways to solve screen direction errors like this. The simplest is to apply a Flop filter to the offending shot, which will reverse the perspective.

However, this won't work so well if there's any text or a clock in the frame. Often just the relative position of the walls of the room can make a flop look worse than the original. Imagine a jail scene where suddenly one shot shows the felon outside of the bars!

Fixing Screen Direction Errors Editorially

If you have a different shot where there is no discernable screen direction (the characters are looking straight at the camera) you can cut to that neutral shot, and then cross the line on the next cut. However, once you're on the other side of the line, you have to stay there, or re-use that neutral shot again to cross back over.

The only other practical solution to working around such screen direction errors is to find a shot where the lens moves across the line *while the camera is rolling*. Then, from that point forward you can use the footage shot from the other side. But again, you've got to stay there unless you have another shot where the camera crosses back to the first side.

Often you have no choice but to omit the bad shot, or in the worst-case scenario where the shot is absolutely essential and you can't cheat your way around the line, you just have to live with it. Chances are, most audiences won't immediately recognize what's wrong, but I can promise you that's exactly one of those moments where suddenly everyone in the theater is unconsciously shifting in their seats, looking down and realizing their out of popcorn. And you know what that means: they're out of the story too.

Mastering these concepts and rules will help you avoid common mistakes and quickly solve potential problems that frequently occur in the editing room. There are plenty more rules and guidelines that can improve your editing, though like all languages, this one is constantly evolving: Idioms get introduced, overused ideas become clichéd and fall out of fashion, and smart and innovative storytellers will continue to invent new ways to communicate, and those will get copied and repeated and eventually will work their way into the mainstream.

The one rule that supercedes all the others is that if it works, it's right. And if it doesn't work, you need to go back to the editing room. If your test audiences (i.e. your wife and kids) don't understand what you're trying to communicate, try a different approach. Check that you're providing the answers to the six questions, and not dwelling too long on one or another. Storytelling is an ancient art, and one that when

done right can stir our very souls. After all, that's why you got involved with this crazy medium to begin with, isn't it?

Michael Wohl is an award-winning filmmaker, instructor at UCLA, author of eight books on editing and storytelling using Final Cut Studio, and was one of the original designers of Final Cut Pro.

Language of Cinema II – Focus on Sound and Colour:

Long before Technicolor revolutionized the look of movies, color appeared in movies through a number of different methods. One of the first narrative movie directors, Georges Méliès (1861–1938), known for his early special effects and camera trickery, used color on occasion to accentuate spectacle, such as bursts of yellow flame and the like. In order to achieve this effect, he had individual frames hand-painted, a laborious and expensive practice. Tinting and toning were more popular, if only because the process was easier and cheaper, though admittedly less dramatic in effect. Tinting involved dyeing the entire emulsion in one color, so that shots of sky or twilight would appear blue and fire scenes red, for instance. Toning, on the other hand, was the chemical coloring of the silver portions of the image, which changed the normally black areas of the frame into colored ones. Early directors such as England's Robert William Paul (1869–1943) and James Williamson (1855–1933) made extensive use of both techniques, which would continue in popularity throughout the nickelodeon era and beyond.

In 1908 Charles Urban (1871–1942), an American businessman and motion picture enthusiast, patented the first functional color film process, called Kinemacolor. Unlike later color processes that would become the standard, this one was a two-strip additive system. In an additive color process, the camera produced two pairs of red and green exposures simultaneously, thus requiring superimposition in the projection of the final product (Cook, p. 254). Urban and his partners quickly began making films with Kinemacolor in several countries, including England and the United States. It was mainly used on shorter films, which kept the budget down, but by the early teens it was appearing in longer features as well. Because of patent litigation and technical problems with the process, Kinemacolor disappeared several years later. Additive color methods were generally short-lived because they required faster shooting, more illumination and film stock, and tricky equipment for projecting in superimposition, which the exhibitors resisted. In spite of its brief run, Kinemacolor was very popular in its time and established the foundation for future color processes, including Technicolor.

The next legitimate color process was developed by Technicolor in the 1920s. Herbert T. Kalmus (1881–1963), Daniel F. Comstock, and W. Burton Wescott had started the firm in 1915. Like Urban and others from this period, they began with an additive process, but once that failed, Kalmus sought to invent a subtractive process that would allow the

colors to print on positive stocks and thus eliminate the superimposition of negatives. In 1922 Technicolor patented the first such color process, but the high cost made it untenable for most studios. A few years later, as talkies were emerging, Technicolor was using a two-strip subtractive process that attracted the studios' attention. Warner Bros., the most adventurous of the five major studios, was one of several companies to try it out on a limited basis. After several years into the Depression, however, the high cost again proved prohibitive for studios. Making it even less attractive were deficiencies inherent in a two-strip process, namely the lack of color range in the product (it had been proven in the nineteenth century that the full color spectrum could be achieved with combinations of only three primary colors: red, green, and blue).

In 1932 Technicolor came back with a three-strip method that included a "three-color beamsplitter and a third strip of film, so that each matrix—red, blue, green—had its own separation negative" (Bordwell, Staiger, and Thompson, p. 353). With the aid of a mirror and prisms, the image was rendered simultaneously onto three different emulsion film strips. One strip, sensitive to green, was placed behind the lens, while the other two—one sensitive to blue and the other to red—were back to back on a separate track and at a 90-degree angle from the first. Because the light was split by the prism and mirror, so that all three strips could register the image, shooting in three-strip Technicolor required a great deal more lighting on the set. Yet the result was a fuller, richer spectrum of colors on film, as is evident in the films that featured it, including Disney's animated *Three Little Pigs* (1933) and *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* (1937), as well as *Gone with the Wind* (1939) and *The Wizard of Oz* (1939).

With each year, Technicolor improved its color process, which became faster and finer-grained, offering richer colors. The process still had its drawbacks, however, namely its high cost. Shooting a film in Technicolor could add in the hundreds of thousands of dollars to individual film budgets, so studios were not ready to make most or even a quarter of their productions in color. In addition to the need for more lighting, the three-strip Mitchell cameras, owned and leased by Technicolor, were expensive, large, and heavy, making for difficult on-location shooting. The lack of competition at this time also made Technicolor more in demand and thus pricier. Further increasing the price tag, the company often required that studios rent one of its trained cinematographers. As director Alfred Hitchcock learned during the production of his first color film, *Rope* (1948), this was not necessarily a bad thing. A notorious perfectionist, Hitchcock was disappointed with the sunset sky's red-orange colors, which he felt smacked of a "cheap postcard." He brought in a Technicolor camera technician to reshoot the last five ten-minute takes of *Rope*. As this story suggests, filmmakers (not merely directors and cinematographers, but also costume designers, art directors, and set designers, and makeup artists), long accustomed to black-and-white aesthetics, underwent a necessary period of adjustment. Three-strip Technicolor remained the best and only color film method until it was updated and made obsolete in the 1950s, when single-strip color processes would emerge and television would provide legitimate competition. Only thereafter would the industry's conversion to color be nearly absolute.

Just as the idea of movies in color had its roots in the earliest recorded history of the motion pictures, so too did the notion that movies could and should talk to us. Indeed, as long as motion pictures have been projected, they have rarely been without sound and even synchronized sound, in rhythm with the images on screen. During the silent era, live organists, pianists, and symphonic orchestras accompanied the projection of movies in theaters both big and small. On occasion, live actors would stand behind the screen to speak the lines. In other countries, such as Japan, a narrator (*benshi*) would sometimes provide commentary on the action. By the mid-1920s, however, advancements in recording and audio technology ushered in the era of "talkies."

At first, synchronized sound systems were often on-disc, meaning that the film's audio (lines, foley sounds, and/or score) would be recorded onto a recordlike disc. Then, as the film projected, a disc player would play the audio in synchronization with the images on screen. In the United States, Vitaphone successfully used this process in the years after World War I. This method was flawed, however, and was often unsatisfying for viewers because the synchronization of sound and image was tenuous, easily disrupted. Across the Atlantic, German engineers concomitantly developed a means of recording the soundtrack directly onto the film, such that sound and image were truly wed during projection. This method, which was called the Tri-Ergon Process, converted sound into light beams, which were first recorded onto the film strip and then reconverted to sound in the projection process. In the early 1920s, Dr. Lee De Forest (1873–1961) was promoting a similar sound-on-film method in the United States. What gave De Forest the advantage over his counterparts was his ability to make sound audible to an entire audience with the aid of his patented Audion vacuum tubes, which were able to amplify sound coming out of a speaker without the usual distortion of the time.

In spite of these early sound-on-film innovations, the first talkies in Hollywood used a sound-on-disc system contracted by Vitaphone (owned by Western Electric). The major studios of the time, including Paramount and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (MGM), were not willing to take the risk on what would require such a costly overhaul of production and exhibition equipment. However, Warner Bros., a small but growing studio, anxious to compete with the major studios that threatened to squeeze out smaller competition, gambled by purchasing exclusive rights to Vitaphone in 1926. Warner Bros. started by making a program of talkie shorts before producing two features, *Don Juan* (1926) and *The Jazz Singer* (1927), both directed by Alan Crosland. *Don Juan* featured merely a scored soundtrack, so it still resembled a silent film. Like many films of this transitional period, *The Jazz Singer* was part silent and part talkie; it included several scenes with players speaking, but it otherwise used a prerecorded on-disc music score. Warner's gamble paid off handsomely nonetheless: the films did very well at the box office and only encouraged Warner Bros.—and the rest of Hollywood—to continue in the direction of talkies.

By 1929, most of Hollywood had made the conversion to talkies, implementing sound-on-film systems that allowed for the mechanical synchronization of image and sound. Much of Europe followed in the year or two after. Problems abounded during this initial phase of talkies for several reasons. Since the cameras of this era were so loud, they

needed to be encased during shooting so that the sensitive microphones on the set would not pick up their audible hum. This made for a rather static kind of cinema, particularly in light of the precedents set by the highly mobile camera work of silent film masters such as F. W. Murnau (1888–1931) and Carl Theodor Dreyer (1889–1968). Arc lights, which had become standard by this time, also were loud enough to be picked up by the microphones. Hollywood switched soon thereafter to tungsten light sources, which, according to film historian Barry Salt, did not overly change the look of the films. In addition, the industry struggled at first with dialogue, which often came off as forced, unrealistic, and clichéd. Lastly, the industry discovered quickly that not all of its best silent stars were able to make the transition to the age of sound.

As several noted film historians have suggested, however, these growing pains were relatively few and short-lived for such an extensive industry-wide conversion. The industry solved most of these problems in time with developments in audio and recording technology. For instance, before long studios were using multiple audio tracks on films, looping in dialogue, music scores, and foley sounds during postproduction. Quieter cameras and more directional microphones also freed up the camera and increased the quality of sound. By the early 1930s, only a few years since the inception of the conversion to talkies, directors such as Fritz Lang (*M*, 1931), Lewis Milestone (*All Quiet on the Western Front*, 1930), and Hitchcock (*Blackmail*, 1929) were using sound and dialogue in complex ways, proving Soviet film theorist-director Sergei Eisenstein's (1898–1948) assertion that synchronized sound could be employed as audio montage and/or counterpoint. With the conversion to sound, purists throughout the world proclaimed that the advent of talkies would be the death knell of cinema as they knew it, a singularly visual art. It was not long before film industries and individual filmmakers silenced these critics.

Diegetic and Non Diegetic Sound; Off Screen Sound; Sync Sound;

Onscreen And offscreen sound, termed [diegetic sound and non-diegetic sound](#), is best explained in terms of the location in which the sound takes place on the video. Essentially, diegetic sound may take place on screen or off-screen, whereas the non-diegetic sound is not taking place from within the frame, on the screen or off and is represented as coming from an outside source. We're showing you the difference between diegetic sound and non-diegetic sound in film.

What is Diegetic Sound?

Diegetic sound is sound that originates within the film and a real sound which actually takes place during the scene and appears to have a place in the scene either on the screen or off. For instance, in a scene with an individual driving a car, a horn honking would be considered a diegetic sound. Any sound that is real, or anything that has the potential to make sound within the frame is a diegetic sound. Even a sound that comes from

somewhere off the screen, but is a legitimate real sound that goes along with the purpose of the scene, is considered a diegetic sound.

Diegetic sounds, or the items producing the diegetic sound, may not be seen on the screen. For example, if you see a police officer driving his car to an emergency, and hear a siren, the sound is diegetic. You don't have to see the siren or the lights, but the sound is a legitimate sound with a natural source and therefore, it is a diegetic noise or diegetic sound.

Diegetic Sound Examples

In the film world, diegetic sounds can have many forms. Some basic examples of diegetic sounds include:

- The conversation of two or more characters on the screen.
-
- The conversation between characters off the screen in the background.
-
- Music being played in a restaurant.
-
- A piano being played in a home.
-
- Background music that is heard inside a bar.
-
- A street performer playing a guitar on the corner of a city block.
-
- Sound effects that simulate rain drops on a tin roof.
-
- Sound effects that simulate the squealing of wind outside a house.

As you can tell from each of the examples of diegetic sounds listed above, they are all natural, real sounds that can and would be expected in various situations. Even the sound effects, such as the simulated rain or wind, are considered diegetic sounds because rain and wind are legitimate, real sounds that actually would be expected in those situations.

What is Non-Diegetic Sound?

Non-diegetic sound is a sound that is from a source outside the primary scene or story. Non Diegetic sound has a source that is not visible on the screen and which has not been implied as being present on the screen. There is no source on the screen for the non-

diegetic sound which is clearly added in and are not understood to be commonly present or expected for the scene in which they are shown.

Non-diegetic sounds are often those of a voiceover, narrator, sound effect or music that is added after the fact to a scene as an addition that is understood as secondary to the footage. Sometimes referred to as commentary sound, non-diegetic sound comes into the story from outside the story and is not a natural addition to the scene.

Non-diegetic sounds are typically added in during [post-production](#). The most common form of non-diegetic sound is music that is added in to a scene following the shoot and which does not appear to be a natural element for the scene. For instance, music that is playing as a scene transitions but not as a secondary accompaniment to the scene in which it is naturally occurring would be non-diegetic. Likewise, music that is playing in a scene and appears to be coming from a car radio or some other source present to the scene would be considered diegetic.

Non-Diegetic Sound Examples

Non-diegetic sound examples can take many forms and often include character narration, soundtrack or music overlays, or sound effects that are not present in the film-world or which do not appear naturally from the real world. For example:

- Music that is clearly not part of the natural scene such as that played over a scene after the fact would be non-diegetic. Such as the sound of [drumming professional musicians](#), in a place where it isn't possible for them to play. This music is used to deliver dramatism to the audience whereas a melancholy piano is used to evoke emotion in the audience.
-
- Narration that takes place through a scene for the sole purpose of helping the audience and with no purpose of guiding anyone from the actual story or in no way speaking to anyone in the story is considered non-diegetic.
-
- Various special effects sounds that are not expected in "real life," such as the sound of bowling pins crashing as a table breaks or the sound of synthesized string instruments when an act is performed by a character on set would be non-diegetic sounds.

The use of both diegetic sound and non-diegetic sound can be used to define the worlds that filmmakers create when [producing video content](#). Now that you know the difference between diegetic sound and non-diegetic sound, what kinds of sounds will you use in your next [film production](#)? Need help bringing your creative vision to life? Contact [Beverly Boy Productions](#) today to get started!

the use of Colour as a stylistic Element,

There's no Academy Award for Best Color — yet — but this less-celebrated element of filmmaking is used to propel and convey the plot. Here's how.

A sunny, hopeful yellow. An introspective turquoise. An arresting, violent red. When you see a color in a film, what you see is no accident — filmmakers carefully compose each frame and make color decisions that affect your experience of watching, even if you don't realize it. Here are the ways in which filmmakers use color to deepen narrative.

Color simplifies complex stories. We think of early films as black-and-white, but color has been around since the start — it lent authenticity to the travelogues of the 1890s and made works like Georges Méliès' *A Trip to the Moon* (1902) feel fantastical. Barbara Flueckiger, film professor at the University of Zurich, has created a timeline of the 230+ processes used to color films over time, and by some estimates, up to 80 percent of early films featured color. Filmmakers realized that different tones could help viewers follow stories that jumped between characters and locations. In *Intolerance* (1916), for example, D.W. Griffith gave each of his four storylines a unique tint to signal they took place in different time periods. To achieve color, early filmmakers immersed film strips in dyes and chemicals, or had them painted by hand — a labor-intensive process done mainly by women in sweatshops. Sound is what ended color's onscreen reign, because connecting a soundtrack to a film strip with applied color was difficult. Color didn't return until 1932, when Technicolor created a process which transferred dye onto film. With prestige productions like *The Wizard of Oz* (1939) and *Gone with the Wind* (1939), Technicolor developed many of the color techniques still used today, even as film has gone digital.

Color makes the audience feel. Danielle Feinberg, director of photography at Pixar, describes herself as “color obsessed” (TED Talk: The magic ingredient that brings Pixar films to life). “I think about it nonstop,” she said. “Lighting and color are part of the backbone of emotion.” She points to the scene in *The Incredibles* (2004) where Mr. Incredible works at his desk at Insuracare — the colors are dulled and gray to communicate a sense of depression. In *Toy Story 3* (2010), a yellowish-green around the character Lots-o'-Huggin' Bear foreshadows that maybe this isn't the sweet, lovable bear you thought. For each film, Pixar creates a “color script” that maps out the hues for all scenes so they fit within the larger story arc. The goal: to make key moments feel appropriately vibrant or somber. Feinberg looks at the opening of *WALL-E* (2008): “We had to do massive visual storytelling because there's no dialogue — only robot boops and beeps. Yet, we needed the audience to understand that we're on Earth, that it's polluted, and that WALL-E's the last one left. So we limited the palette to tans and oranges,” she

said. “Our production designer was adamant that there be no green anywhere, because he wanted a visual punch when WALL-E finds a plant for the first time.” Color amplifies this important moment. “Your eyes have been washed in a limited palette and suddenly there’s intense green,” said Feinberg. “It cerebrally makes a difference.”

Color shows a character’s journey. In this year’s Best Picture Oscar winner, *Moonlight*, director Barry Jenkins tells the story of a boy named Chiron growing up in a rough neighborhood and wrestling with his identity amid the crack epidemic and extreme bullying. While sharing this difficult story, Jenkins also wanted to capture the “magic of Miami,” the city where he grew up. Cinematographer James Laxton worked with Alex Bickel, colorist at Color Collective, to think about the color design of the film early in the process — and then they spent about 100 hours after filming fine-tuning the color grade digitally. “Miami is an inherently colorful place,” said Laxton. “We were able to saturate colors and bend hues to enhance things.” They also emulated the color characteristics of three different film stocks to show the evolution of the main character. *Moonlight* tells Chiron’s story in three parts: in part one, when he’s known as “Little,” they emulated Fujifilm stock, which brings out lush greens and blues; in part two, as he becomes the teenage “Chiron,” they emulated Agfa stock, which has cyan in its highlights and makes things seem a little off-kilter; in part three, when he transforms into the adult “Black,” they moved to Kodak Film stock, which gives a polished, Hollywood look.

Color communicates a film’s ideas. Filmmaker Lewis Bond hosts a [YouTube channel on film craft](#) and he has made a poetic [explainer on color in film](#). In it, he explores how colors reveal a film’s meaning, and he recommends watching movies for specific color repetitions. “When a color repeats, it’s associated with an idea,” he said. “When the color changes, it shows you this concept has changed.” In Alfred Hitchcock’s *Vertigo* (1958), green is associated with Madeleine and the main character’s obsession with her. The color becomes more and more prevalent, and eerie, right through the film’s conclusion. In *Blue Is the Warmest Color* (2013), blue is everywhere — and while the shades are bright and vivid at first, they become icy and pale. “It’s a visual externalization of tenderness fading,” said Bond. In *Moonlight*, cinematographer Laxton made a bold color choice that adds meaning — putting a bright, jarring hot pink in strategic scenes. We see it first in a heart-stopping sequence with Chiron’s mother. “We discovered that hue shooting the scene, and it just did a lot of things for us,” said Laxton. It feels both angry and sensual at the same time, but beyond that, the color signals moments when Chiron breaks from reality. The pink color repeats in a dream sequence, as Chiron faces his real desires — another key moment when his identity is forged. “It feels heightened,” said colorist Alex Bickel. “It takes you to a supernatural place.”

While color helps further a film’s story, all interviewed here agree: It must do so without calling too much attention to itself. “The last thing I want anyone to think while watching a movie is, ‘God, the color in this scene is great. Or, it’s terrible,’” said Bickel. “It works best on a subconscious level.”

Difference between story, plot, screenplay

“Scripts” and “screenplays” are interchangeable when it comes to feature films, but television scripts are always called scripts. (Except when they’re called teleplays, which is only in certain on-screen credits.)

“Story” is more or less what it sounds like: the plot, the characters, the settings and tone. It differs from a script or screenplay only in that the dialog often isn’t written out, and the overall action may be somewhat compressed. A writer might be credited with the “story” for a movie, but not the “screenplay,” if he wrote a treatment but not the final script. Usually, if one writer handles both “story” and “screenplay,” he/she receives a more general “written by” credit.

Plot is what happens. The story makes us care.

That’s what I wrote on coverage for a script that I read last week. This particular script was fairly well-structured with the act breaks happening relatively close to where they should. It had plenty of conflict between characters whose goals were well-defined. It also had a strong plot that had a series of events that escalated in intensity and danger.

But, man, was that story lacking.

And now you’re asking, “But if it had a good plot, doesn’t that mean it had a good story?” The answer to that is a resounding, “Hell no!”

So now your next question is, ” why wasn’t the story better if it had a decent plot?”

I’ll repeat the answer. Plot is what happens, and it’s the story that makes us care.

Another way to say that is that there’s a lot more that goes into making a story good than just a good plot. There are thematic elements to consider. Does the writer write with a voice that has something to say? Without that, the plot will remain hollow and empty without much story at all.

The thematic elements also makes us care about the characters. There is no story if you don’t care about what happens to the characters. Again, the plot will be nothing more than a series of connected events, but there won’t be a story there.

Now you’re saying, “Hey, Smith, didn’t you say earlier that the characters were well-defined?” Yes, they were well-defined, but that doesn’t mean they were able to generate any sympathy or empathy. They were well-defined in that they had distinct personalities and individual voices that made them come across as individuals and realistic people.

But that's only part of what goes into creating a GOOD character. Without an emotional connection to the character, they're just that: a character. When, as a writer, you allow your characters to act in ways that turn people against your character without giving the character a damn good reason for acting that way, you're predictably going to lose the audience. When you lose the audience, they no longer care about what happens to your character in the script. At that point, you cease to have a story, and you merely have a plot.

That is ultimately what happened with the script that I'm referring to. It had many of the elements that it needed, but I couldn't bring myself to care about the main character. The thing that's most unfortunate about that is that the writer was writing about a topic that is very serious and should have been filled with drama. Unfortunately, the lack of sympathy for the characters translated in to a lack of drama in the plot.

Ah, drama, the lifeblood of any screenplay. That is another component that separates plot from story. A good plot combined with compelling characters and intriguing thematic components will give birth to drama. Without drama, you have no story, and the screenplay in question was lacking in drama. How do you get drama? By making the audience care about what happens to the characters.

That leads to your next question, "Okay, smart guy, how do you get the audience to care about the characters?"

That, my friends, is the million dollar question. Some scripts have it and some scripts don't. There are techniques that scribes who ply their trade writing about the secrets of concocting a successful screenplay have provided. There are a myriad of classes and workshops that you can take to teach you what people in the past have done. Does the main character have to be likable for the audience to care about them? It's helpful, but not necessary. (See *The Hustler* or *Pulp Fiction*). Does the main character at least have to do something good or find redemption? Again, helpful but not necessary. (See *Goodfellas* or *A Clockwork Orange*). The point is that there isn't a magic bullet, but from my own perspective, I have some observations.

In order to get us to care about your characters, must have a want or a need that we can become emotionally attached to one way or another. They also must have a personality that draws us in. They need to be interesting or something interesting needs to have happened to them. Plus, what's happening to them in the story needs to be interesting. Another thing that they need is common sense. That is unless you're dealing with the rare occasion that not having common sense is the point. (See *Forrest Gump* and *Dumb and Dumber*). But you can't have a character do things that defy common sense unless there is a good and compelling reason within the framework of your story.

If I had to put my finger on one thing with the script in question, that would be it. The writer had the main character continually and willingly getting into situations that defied common sense. Now, if the writer comes back with another draft of the script and the

main character is continuing to do this, but with a compelling reason that makes sense within the context of the plot, then an actual story may be in the offing.

But anything short of that, and we still won't care about what the characters are going through. If we continue to be apathetic towards the characters, then the writer will still be left with a decent plot and not much of a story.

If you're working on a screenplay and you need some guidance on turning your plot into a story, we offer seven levels of screenplay coverage in which we evaluate your script and offer suggestions for improvement.

Unit II - Film Form and Style

German Expressionism and Film,

German Expressionism consisted of a number of related creative movements in Germany before the First World War that reached a peak in Berlin during the 1920s. These developments in Germany were part of a larger Expressionist movement in north and central European culture in fields such as architecture, dance, painting, sculpture, as well as cinema. This article deals primarily with developments in German Expressionist cinema before and immediately after World War I.

Many critics see a direct tie between cinema and architecture of the time, stating that the sets and scene artwork of Expressionist films often reveal buildings of sharp angles, great heights, and crowded environments, such as the frequently shown Tower of Babel in Fritz Lang's *Metropolis*.^[13]

Strong elements of monumentalism and modernism appear throughout the canon of German Expressionism. An excellent example of this is *Metropolis*, as evidenced by the enormous power plant and glimpses of the massive yet pristine "upper" city.

German Expressionist painters rejected the naturalistic depiction of objective reality, often portraying distorted figures, buildings, and landscapes in a disorienting manner that disregarded the conventions of perspective and proportion. This approach, combined with jagged, stylized shapes and harsh, unnatural colors, were used to convey subjective emotions.

A number of artists and craftsmen working in the Berlin theater brought the Expressionist visual style to the design of stage sets. This, in turn, had an eventual influence on films dealing with fantasy and horror.

The prime example is Robert Wiene's dream-like film *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* (1920) which is universally recognized as an early classic of Expressionist cinema. Hermann Warm, the film's art director, worked with painters and stage designers Walter Reimann and Walter Röhrig to create fantastic, nightmarish sets with twisted structures and

landscapes with sharp-pointed forms and oblique, curving lines. Some of these designs were constructions, others were painted directly onto canvases.

German Expressionist films produced in the Weimar Republic immediately following the First World War not only encapsulate the sociopolitical contexts in which they were created, but also rework the intrinsically modern problems of self-reflexivity, spectacle and identity.

Following the esteemed critiques of Siegfried Kracauer and Lotte Eisner, these films are now viewed as a kind of collective consciousness, so inherently tied are they to their social milieu. Briefly mentioned by J. P. Telotte in his analysis of German film, “German Expressionism: A Cinematic/ Cultural Problem”, expressionism focuses on the “power of spectacles”[14] and offers audiences “a kind of metonymic image of their own situation”. [14]

This film movement paralleled Expressionist painting and theater in rejecting realism. The creators in the Weimar Period sought to convey inner, subjective experience through external, objective means. Their films were characterized by highly stylized sets and acting; they used a new visual style which embodied high contrast and simple editing. The films were shot in studios where they could employ deliberately exaggerated and dramatic lighting and camera angles to emphasize some particular affect – fear, horror, pain. Aspects of Expressionist techniques were later adapted by such directors as Alfred Hitchcock and Orson Welles and were incorporated into many American gangster and horror films.

Some of the major filmmakers of this time were F. W. Murnau, Erich Pommer, and Fritz Lang. The movement ended after the currency stabilized, making it cheaper to buy movies abroad. The UFA financially collapsed and German studios began to deal with Italian studios which led to their influence in style of horror and films noir. The American influence on the film industry would also lead some film makers to continue their career in the US. The UFA's last film was *Der blaue Engel* (1930), considered a masterpiece of German Expressionism.

Noir Italian Neorealism,

The main element that combines the films of the Film Noir era together is their common theme. The theme has no specific definition, as the many different Film Noir productions vary in plotlines, but they mainly focus on the citizens of the lower-classes and crime underworld. The stories of Film Noir are stories of everyday people, with a sense of realism that a vast majority of the audience can relate to. This common theme can be traced back to post-World War II Italy, and the rise of a new movement called Italian Neorealism.

Italian Neorealism was birthed in Italy at the end of World War II. Italian filmmakers, as a response to the chaos and turmoil and horrific economic conditions that afflicted the

country, began to focus their films on the everyday struggles of lower-class citizens. Directors such as Roberto Rossellini and Vittorio De Sica, in an attempt to capture these struggles in its truest form, shot their films on low budgets with unknown, non-professional actors.

The first major film of this movement is *Open City* (1945), directed by Rossellini. Filmed in the time directly after the Nazi Occupation of Italy, Rossellini shot mostly outdoors amidst the destruction of the war to attempt to portray the most realistic story possible. Set in the final days of the Nazi Occupation in 1944, *Open City* tells the story of a small underground resistance movement against the Nazis. Among the resistance force is a priest named Don Pietro Pellegrini (Aldo Fabrizi), who assisted by transmitting messages. When the resistance is betrayed, German Soldier capture the priest and another member of the resistance, Giorgio Manfredi (Marcello Pagliero). They interrogate both with extreme violence, torturing and killing Giorgio as the priest watched, and later executing the priest. As with the other films in the Neorealism movement, the actors who played the characters in *Open City* were non-professional at the time of filming. These actors had more than likely faced the oppression that the film was trying to capture, which added to the realism of the film.

Scene from *Open City*. Filmed mostly on location after the destruction of World War II. Note Rome in the background, giving the film a realistic edge.

Another recognized Neorealism film is De Sica's *Bicycle Thieves* (1948). The story is very minimalist, following a man named Antonio Ricci (Lamberto Maggiorani) wandering the streets to find his stolen bicycle, only to attempt to steal another bicycle and be caught and labeled as a thief himself. But the execution of the story provides a very realistic look at the conditions of post-war Italy. The bicycle was a symbol of hope for Antonio, who had been offered a job as long as he owned a back. Soon after he gets the job, his bicycle is stolen. The events of the film as Antonio searches for his stolen property show the degree of desperation that the Italian people were facing in the recovery of World War II. As with the rest of the Neorealist movement, the actors were completely non-professional. The lead actor, Maggiorani, was a factory worker before getting the role. All the scenes were shot on location, giving an even more realistic feel to the film.

The critical successes of the films of the Neorealist movement created a new audience for stories of lower-class struggles. But the movement quickly fell apart in the early 1950s, as Italy began to show positive signs of recovery and the demand for more positive films, influenced by the American Cinema, soon phased out the movement completely. Still, Italian Neorealism impacted several film schools, including the French New Wave and Film Noir.

While Film Noir strayed away from the execution of style that Italian Neorealist used, such as using non-professional actor, Film Noir did take away the appeal of lower working class struggles. An example of this is the 1955 film *Kiss Me Deadly*, directed by Robert Aldrich. The film follows the life of a private eye named Mike Hammer (Ralph

Meeker), working to catch everyday crooks. Aside from his career, Hammer is a normal, working class citizen who deals primarily with even lower class people. The events that unfold in the plot lead Hammer to a close encounter with death after picking up a hitchhiker named Christina (Cloris Leachman). Hammer seeks vengeance by pursuing the case to of who murdered Christina and attempted murder on his own life. While the actors in *Kiss Me Deadly*, were not non-professional, it did follow the Italian Neorealist method of shooting on location, giving a realistic appeal to the film. It also highlighted the struggles of the working class at the time, though symbolically, with undertones about the Cold War and the paranoia it caused. The macguffin of the film, a small, hot container with a glowing substance inside, was a metaphor for the fears of the Cold War.

Unlike Film Noir, Italian Neorealism was a movement that eventually met its end. But it is impossible to ignore its impact on the films that followed. Audiences for the first time were given a truly emotional, realistic view of the toils and trials that the working class and impoverished face on an everyday basis. It painted a picture of these people as being more than just one of a larger group – it made them individuals. These films were something that these people could relate to, and were successful because of their realism. Film Noir imitated this realism and focus on the working class to gain success in its own way, mixing the themes that Italian Neorealism brought to light with the stylistic elements of German Expressionism to create one of the most influential film genres in recent history. Film Noir continues to evolve, even in modern films, keeping the ideas of Film Noir, and, in effect, Italian Neorealism and German Expressionism, alive and well over the decades.

– John Abbott

French New-Wave,

New Wave (French: La Nouvelle Vague) is a French art film movement which emerged in the late 1950s. The movement was characterized by its rejection of the era's traditional filmmaking conventions in favor of experimentation and a spirit of iconoclasm. New Wave filmmakers explored new approaches to editing, visual style, and narrative, as well as engagement with the social and political upheavals of the era, often making use of irony or exploring existential themes. The New Wave is often considered one of the most influential movements in the history of cinema.

The term was first used by a group of French film critics and cinephiles associated with the magazine *Cahiers du cinéma* in the late 1950s and 1960s. These critics rejected the *Tradition de qualité* ("Tradition of Quality") of mainstream French cinema, which emphasized craft over innovation and old works over experimentation. This was apparent in a manifesto-like 1954 essay by François Truffaut, *Une certaine tendance du cinéma français*, where he denounced the adaptation of safe literary works into unimaginative films. Along with Truffaut, a number of writers for *Cahiers du cinéma* became leading New Wave filmmakers, including Jean-Luc Godard, Éric Rohmer, Jacques Rivette, and

Claude Chabrol. The associated Left Bank film community included directors such as Alain Resnais, Agnès Varda, and Chris Marker.

Using portable equipment and requiring little or no set up time, the New Wave way of filmmaking often presented a documentary style. The films exhibited direct sounds on film stock that required less light. Filming techniques included fragmented, discontinuous editing, and long takes. The combination of realism, subjectivity, and authorial commentary created a narrative ambiguity in the sense that questions that arise in a film are not answered in the end

Origins of the movement

Alexandre Astruc's manifesto "The Birth of a New Avant-Garde: The Camera-Style", published in *L'Écran* on 30 March 1948, outlined some of the ideas that were later expanded upon by François Truffaut and the *Cahiers du cinéma*. It argues that "cinema was in the process of becoming a new means of expression on the same level as painting and the novel ... a form in which and by which an artist can express his thoughts, however abstract they may be, or translate his obsessions exactly as he does in the contemporary essay or novel. This is why I would like to call this new age of cinema the age of the caméra-stylo."

Some of the most prominent pioneers among the group, including François Truffaut, Jean-Luc Godard, Éric Rohmer, Claude Chabrol, and Jacques Rivette, began as critics for the famous film magazine *Cahiers du cinéma*. *Cahiers* co-founder and theorist André Bazin was a prominent source of influence for the movement. By means of criticism and editorialization, they laid the groundwork for a set of concepts, revolutionary at the time, which the American film critic Andrew Sarris called auteur theory. (The original French *La politique des auteurs*, translated literally as "The policy of authors".) Bazin and Henri Langlois, founder and curator of the *Cinémathèque Française*, were the dual father figures of the movement. These men of cinema valued the expression of the director's personal vision in both the film's style and script

Truffaut also credits the American director Morris Engel and his film *Little Fugitive* (1953) with helping to start the French New Wave, when he said "Our French New Wave would never have come into being, if it hadn't been for the young American Morris Engel who showed us the way to independent production with (this) fine movie."

The auteur theory holds that the director is the "author" of his/her movies, with a personal signature visible from film to film. They praised movies by Jean Renoir and Jean Vigo, and made then-radical cases for the artistic distinction and greatness of Hollywood studio directors such as Orson Welles, John Ford, Alfred Hitchcock and Nicholas Ray. The beginning of the New Wave was to some extent an exercise by the *Cahiers* writers in applying this philosophy to the world by directing movies themselves.

Apart from the role that films by Jean Rouch have played in the movement, Chabrol's *Le Beau Serge* (1958) is traditionally (but debatably) credited as the first New Wave feature.

Agnès Varda's *La Pointe Courte* (1955) was chronologically the first, but did not have a commercial release until 2008. Truffaut, with *The 400 Blows* (1959) and Godard, with *Breathless* (1960) had unexpected international successes, both critical and financial, that turned the world's attention to the activities of the New Wave and enabled the movement to flourish. Part of their technique was to portray characters not readily labeled as protagonists in the classic sense of audience identification.

The auteurs of this era owe their popularity to the support they received with their youthful audience. Most of these directors were born in the 1930s and grew up in Paris, relating to how their viewers might be experiencing life. With high concentration in fashion, urban professional life, and all-night parties, the life of France's youth was being exquisitely captured.

The French New Wave was popular roughly between 1958 and 1962. The socio-economic forces at play shortly after World War II strongly influenced the movement. Politically and financially drained, France tended to fall back on the old popular pre-war traditions. One such tradition was straight narrative cinema, specifically classical French film. The movement has its roots in rebellion against the reliance on past forms (often adapted from traditional novelistic structures), criticizing in particular the way these forms could force the audience to submit to a dictatorial plot-line. They were especially against the French "cinema of quality", the type of high-minded, literary period films held in esteem at French film festivals, often regarded as "untouchable" by criticism.

New Wave critics and directors studied the work of western classics and applied new avant garde stylistic direction. The low-budget approach helped filmmakers get at the essential art form and find what was, to them, a much more comfortable and contemporary form of production. Charlie Chaplin, Alfred Hitchcock, Orson Welles, Howard Hawks, John Ford, and many other forward-thinking film directors like Sam Fuller and Don Siegel were held up in admiration while standard Hollywood films bound by traditional narrative flow were strongly criticized. French New Wave is influenced by Italian Neorealism and classical Hollywood cinema.[2]

In a 1961 interview, Truffaut said that "the 'New Wave' is neither a movement, nor a school, nor a group, it's a quality" and in December 1962 published a list of 162 film directors who had made their feature film debut since 1959. Many of these directors, such as Edmond Agabra and Henri Zaphiratos, were not as successful or enduring as the well-known members of the New Wave and today would not be considered part of it. Shortly after Truffaut's published list appeared, Godard publicly declared that the New Wave was more exclusive and included only Truffaut, Chabrol, Rivette, Rohmer and himself, stating that "Cahiers was the nucleus" of the movement. Godard also acknowledged filmmakers such as Resnais, Astruc, Varda and Demy as esteemed contemporaries, but said that they represented "their own fund of culture" and were separate from the New Wave.

Many of the directors associated with the New Wave continued to make films into the 21st century.

Film techniques

The movies featured unprecedented methods of expression, such as long tracking shots (like the famous traffic jam sequence in Godard's 1967 film *Week End*). Also, these movies featured existential themes, such as stressing the individual and the acceptance of the absurdity of human existence. Filled with irony and sarcasm, the films also tend to reference other films.

Many of the French New Wave films were produced on tight budgets; often shot in a friend's apartment or yard, using the director's friends as the cast and crew. Directors were also forced to improvise with equipment (for example, using a shopping cart for tracking shots.) The cost of film was also a major concern; thus, efforts to save film turned into stylistic innovations. For example, in Jean-Luc Godard's *Breathless* (*À bout de souffle*), after being told the film was too long and he must cut it down to one hour and a half he decided (on the suggestion of Jean-Pierre Melville) to remove several scenes from the feature using jump cuts, as they were filmed in one long take. Parts that did not work were simply cut from the middle of the take, a practical decision and also a purposeful stylistic one.

The cinematic stylings of French New Wave brought a fresh look to cinema with improvised dialogue, rapid changes of scene, and shots that broke the common 180° axis of camera movement. In many films of the French New Wave, the camera was used not to mesmerize the audience with elaborate narrative and illusory images, but rather to play with audience expectations. Godard was arguably the movement's most influential figure; his method of film-making, often used to shock and awe audiences out of passivity, was abnormally bold and direct.

His stylistic approach can be seen as a desperate struggle against the mainstream cinema of the time, or a degrading attack on the viewer's supposed naivety. Either way, the challenging awareness represented by this movement remains in cinema today. Effects that now seem either trite or commonplace, such as a character stepping out of their role in order to address the audience directly, were radically innovative at the time.

Classic French cinema adhered to the principles of strong narrative, creating what Godard described as an oppressive and deterministic aesthetic of plot. In contrast, New Wave filmmakers made no attempts to suspend the viewer's disbelief; in fact, they took steps to constantly remind the viewer that a film is just a sequence of moving images, no matter how clever the use of light and shadow. The result is a set of oddly disjointed scenes without attempt at unity; or an actor whose character changes from one scene to the next; or sets in which onlookers accidentally make their way onto camera along with extras, who in fact were hired to do just the same.

At the heart of New Wave technique is the issue of money and production value. In the context of social and economic troubles of a post-World War II France, filmmakers sought low-budget alternatives to the usual production methods, and were inspired by the generation of Italian Neorealists before them. Half necessity and half vision, New Wave

directors used all that they had available to channel their artistic visions directly to the theatre.

Finally, the French New Wave, as the European modern Cinema, is focused on the technique as style itself. A French New Wave film-maker is first of all an author who shows in its film their own eye on the world. On the other hand, the film as the object of knowledge challenges the usual transitivity on which all the other cinema was based, "undoing its cornerstones: space and time continuity, narrative and grammatical logics, the self-evidence of the represented worlds." In this way the film-maker passes "the essay attitude, thinking – in a novelist way – on his own way to do essays."

Genre and the development of Classical Hollywood Cinema

Classical Hollywood cinema is a term used in film criticism to describe both a narrative and visual style of film-making which became characteristic of American cinema between the 1910s (rapidly after World War I) and the 1960s. It eventually became the most powerful and pervasive style of film-making worldwide. Similar or associated terms include classical Hollywood narrative, the Golden Age of Hollywood, Old Hollywood, and classical continuity.

Development of the classical style

Early narrative film (1894–1913)

For centuries the only visual standard of narrative storytelling was the theatre. Since the first narrative films in the 1890s, film-makers sought to capture the power of live theatre on the cinema screen. Most of these film-makers started as directors on the late 19th century stage, and likewise most film actors had roots in vaudeville or theatrical melodramas. Visually, early narrative films had adapted little from the stage, and their narratives had adapted very little from vaudeville and melodrama. Before the visual style which would become known as "classical continuity", scenes were filmed in full shot and used carefully choreographed staging to portray plot and character relationships. Cutting was extremely limited, and mostly consisted of close-ups of writing on objects for their legibility.

Maturation of the silents (1913–late 1920s)

The Mothering Heart screenshot

Theatrical release poster for Ben-Hur: A Tale of the Christ

Though lacking the reality inherent to the stage, film (unlike stage) offers the freedom to manipulate apparent time and space, and thus to create the illusion of realism – that is temporal linearity and spatial continuity. By the early 1910s, film-making was beginning to fulfill its artistic potential. In Sweden and Denmark, this period would be known as a "Golden Age" of film;^[7] in America, this artistic change is attributed to film-makers like David W. Griffith finally breaking the grip of the Edison Trust to make films independent of the manufacturing monopoly. Films worldwide began to noticeably adopt visual and narrative elements which would be found in classical Hollywood cinema. 1913 was a

particularly fruitful year for the medium, as pioneering directors from several countries produced masterpieces such as *The Mothering Heart* (D. W. Griffith), *Ingeborg Holm* (Victor Sjöström), and *L'enfant de Paris* (Léonce Perret) that set new standards for film as a form of storytelling. It was also the year when Yevgeni Bauer (the first true film artist, according to Georges Sadoul) started his short, but prolific, career.

In the world generally and America specifically, the influence of Griffith on film-making was unmatched. Equally influential were his actors in adapting their performances to the new medium. Lillian Gish, the star of *The Mothering Heart*, is particularly noted for her influence on screen performance techniques. Griffith's 1915 epic *The Birth of a Nation* was ground-breaking for film as a means of storytelling – a masterpiece of literary narrative with numerous innovative visual techniques. The film initiated so many advances in American cinema that it was rendered obsolete within a few years. Though 1913 was a global landmark for filmmaking, 1917 was primarily an American one; the era of "classical Hollywood cinema" is distinguished by a narrative and visual style which would begin to dominate the film medium in America by 1917. Classical Hollywood cinema in the sound era (late 1920s–1960s)

The narrative and visual style of classical Hollywood style would further develop after the transition to sound-film production. The primary changes in American film-making came from the film industry itself, with the height of the studio system. This mode of production, with its reigning star system bankrolled by several key studios, had preceded sound by several years. By mid-1920, most of the prominent American directors and actors, who had worked independently since the early 10s, would have to become a part of the new studio system to continue to work.

The beginning of the sound era itself is ambiguously defined. To some, it began with *The Jazz Singer*, which was released in 1927 and increased box-office profits for films, as sound was introduced to feature films. To others, the era began in 1929, when the silent age had definitively ended. Most Hollywood pictures from the late 1920s to 1960s adhered closely to a genre – Western, slapstick comedy, musical, animated cartoon, and biopic (biographical picture) – and the same creative teams often worked on films made by the same studio. For instance, Cedric Gibbons and Herbert Stothart always worked on MGM films; Alfred Newman worked at 20th Century Fox for twenty years; Cecil B. DeMille's films were almost all made at Paramount Pictures; and director Henry King's films were mostly made for Twentieth Century Fox. Similarly, actors were mostly contract players. Film historians and critics note that it took about a decade for films to adapt to sound and return to the level of artistic quality of the silents, which it did in the late 1930s.

Many great works of cinema that emerged from this period were of highly regimented film-making. One reason this was possible is that, with so many films being made, not every one had to be a big hit. A studio could gamble on a medium-budget feature with a good script and relatively unknown actors: *Citizen Kane*, directed by Orson Welles and regarded by some as the greatest film of all time, fits that description. In other cases, strong-willed directors like Howard Hawks, Alfred Hitchcock, and Frank Capra battled

the studios in order to achieve their artistic visions. The apogee of the studio system may have been the year 1939, which saw the release of such classics as *The Wizard of Oz*, *Gone with the Wind*, *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*, *Stagecoach*, *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington*, *Destry Rides Again*, *Young Mr. Lincoln*, *Wuthering Heights*, *Only Angels Have Wings*, *Ninotchka*, *Beau Geste*, *Babes in Arms*, *Gunga Din*, *The Women*, *Goodbye, Mr. Chips*, and *The Roaring Twenties*.

Style

The visual-narrative style of classical Hollywood cinema as elaborated by David Bordwell, was heavily influenced by the ideas of the Renaissance and its resurgence of mankind as the focal point. It is distinguished at three general levels: devices, systems, and the relations of systems.

Devices

The devices most inherent to classical Hollywood cinema are those of continuity editing. This includes the 180-degree rule, one of the major visual-spatial elements of continuity editing. The 180-degree rule keeps with the "photographed play" style by creating an imaginary 180-degree axis between the viewer and the shot, allowing viewers to clearly orient themselves within the position and direction of action in a scene. According to the 30-degree rule, cuts in the angle that the scene is viewed from must be significant enough for the viewer to understand the purpose of a change in perspective. Cuts that do not adhere to the 30-degree rule, known as jump cuts, are disruptive to the illusion of temporal continuity between shots. The 180-degree and 30-degree rules are elementary guidelines in film-making that preceded the official start of the classical era by over a decade, as seen in the pioneering 1902 French film *A Trip to the Moon*. Cutting techniques in classical continuity editing serve to help establish or maintain continuity, as in the cross cut, which establishes the concurrence of action in different locations. Jump cuts are allowed in the form of the axial cut, which does not change the angle of shooting at all, but has the clear purpose of showing a perspective closer or farther from the subject, and therefore does not interfere with temporal continuity.

Systems

Narrative logic

Classical narration progresses always through psychological motivation, i.e., by the will of a human character and its struggle with obstacles towards a defined goal. This narrative element is commonly composed of a primary narrative (e.g. a romance) intertwined with a secondary narrative or narratives. This narrative is structured with an unmistakable beginning, middle and end, and generally there is a distinct resolution. Utilizing actors, events, causal effects, main points, and secondary points are basic characteristics of this type of narrative. The characters in classical Hollywood cinema have clearly definable traits, are active, and very goal oriented. They are causal agents motivated by psychological rather than social concerns. The narrative is a chain of cause and effect with the characters being the causal agents – in classical style, events do not occur randomly.

Cinematic time

Time in classical Hollywood is continuous, linear, and uniform, since non-linearity calls attention to the illusory workings of the medium. The only permissible manipulation of time in this format is the flashback. It is mostly used to introduce a memory sequence of a character, e. g., *Casablanca*. Cinematic space

The greatest rule of classical continuity regarding space is object permanence: the viewer must believe that the scene exists outside the shot of the cinematic frame to maintain the picture's realism. The treatment of space in classical Hollywood strives to overcome or conceal the two-dimensionality of film ("invisible style") and is strongly centered upon the human body. The majority of shots in a classical film focus on gestures or facial expressions (medium-long and medium shots). André Bazin once compared classical film to a photographed play in that the events seem to exist objectively and that cameras only give us the best view of the whole play.

This treatment of space consists of four main aspects: centering, balancing, frontality, and depth. Persons or objects of significance are mostly in the center part of the picture frame and never out of focus. Balancing refers to the visual composition, i. e., characters are evenly distributed throughout the frame. The action is subtly addressed towards the spectator (frontality) and set, lighting (mostly three-point lighting, especially high-key lighting), and costumes are designed to separate foreground from the background (depth).
Relations of systems

The aspects of space and time are subordinated to the narrative element.
Criticism

This style of cinema is not without its critics, ranging from the lack of realism which resulted in a more post-WWII realistic cinema to feminist theories on the male gaze in these classic movies, to note two examples.

Legacy

The New Hollywood of the 1960s–70s was influenced by the romanticism of the classical era, as was the French New Wave.

Unit III - Alternative Visions

Third Cinema and Non Fiction Cinema,

Third Cinema (Spanish: Tercer Cine) is a Latin American film movement that started in the 1960s–70s which decries neocolonialism, the capitalist system, and the Hollywood model of cinema as mere entertainment to make money. The term was coined in the manifesto *Hacia un tercer cine* (Toward a Third Cinema), written in the late 1960s by Argentine filmmakers Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino, members of the Grupo Cine Liberación and published in 1969 in the cinema journal *Tricontinental* by the OSPAAAL (Organization of Solidarity with the People of Asia, Africa and Latin America).

Third Cinema manifestos and theories evolved in the 1960s and 1970s as a response to the social, political, and economic realities in Latin American countries which were experiencing oppression from perceived Neo-colonial policies. In their manifesto, Solana and Getino describe Third Cinema as a cinematic movement and a dramatic alternative to First Cinema, which was produced in Hollywood, for the purpose of entertaining its audiences; and from Second Cinema that increased the author's liberty of expression. Fundamentally different, Third Cinema films sought to inspire revolution against class, racial and gender inequalities. Spectators were called upon to reflect on social injustices and the process by which their realities occurred, and to take action to transform their conditions. Even though Third Cinema films arose during revolutionary eras in Latin America and other countries, this filmmaking is still influential today. This style of filmmaking includes a radical form of production, distribution and exhibition that seeks to expose the living conditions of people at the grassroots level.

Purpose and Goals of Third Cinema Third Cinema seeks to expose the process by which oppression occurs; and to criticize those responsible for social inequality in a country or community. Some of the goals of Third Cinema are:

- Raise political consciousness in the viewer/spectator
- Expose historical, social, political and/or economic policies that have led to exploitive conditions for the nation
- Engage spectators in reflection which will inspire them to take revolutionary action and improve their conditions
- Create films that express the experiences of the masses of a particular region
- Produce and distribute films that are uncensored by oppressive entities

Production Due to their political nature, Third Cinema films were often censored and therefore, the production and distribution of these films were innovative. Films used documentary clips, news reels, photographs, video clips, interviews and/or statistics and in some cases, non-professional actors. These production elements are combined in an inventive manner to create a message that is specific to its local audience. The staff in production share all aspects of the production process by working collectively. In Third Cinema, for example, a Director can be the Cameraman, the Photographer or the Writer at different phases of the production. Since Third Cinema films were highly politicized, they often lacked the funding and support needed for production or distribution and instead sought funding outside government agencies or traditional financing opportunities available to commercial films. Other unique aspects of Third Cinema film production is the use of their local natural landscape for film shootings often in parts of the country not previously seen. This unique feature was augmented by highlighting the local history and culture of its nation.

Women in Third Cinema

Third Cinema's critique and resistance of Hollywood's imperialist "spectator" cinema also opened for differing representations of women in film. While feminist film movements in the United States in the 1970s critiqued the eurocentric and

heteronormative sexism within the First-World, the intersection of heterosexism with racism and imperialism seemed to get little attention from mainstream film journals.[9] Because of the reluctance of First-World feminists to acknowledge the importance of nationalism and geographic identity within differing struggles of women, the films made by the women of Third Cinema were usually seen as “burdened” from the Western feminist perspective by these identities.

“Notions of nation and race, along with community-based work, are implicitly dismissed as both too “specific” to qualify for the theoretical realm of “feminist theory” and as too “inclusive” in their concern for nation and race that they presumably “lose sight” of feminism.”

Along with the advancement and availability of technology, and the revolutionary tactics proposed by Third Cinema, third-worldist feminist film-makers began to tell their own stories. Because the genre proposed a non-homogeneous approach to cinema (one which allowed variation from region to region and intersection between fiction and documentary), differing stories of “womanhood” and women's position within revolutions could be told. Lebanese film director Heiny Srour commented in one interview:

“Those of us from the Third World have to reject the ideas of film narration based on the 19th century bourgeois novel with its commitment to harmony. Our societies have been too lacerated and fractured by colonial powers to fit into those neat scenarios.”

Notable films include Sarah Maldoror’s *Sambizanga* (Mozambique, 1972) which takes place in Angola where a woman awakens to “revolutionary consciousness” to the struggle of the ruling party the MPLA. In Heiny Srour’s documentary *Saat al Tahrir* (The Hour of Liberation) (Oman, 1973) followed women fighters during the revolution in Oman. Srour’s 1984 film *Leila wal dhiab* (Leila and the Wolves) (Lebanon) followed the role of women in the Palestine Liberation Movement. Helena Solberg Ladd’s *Nicaragua Up From the Ashes* (U.S. 1982) documents the role of women in the Sandinista revolution. Sara Gomez’s *De cierta manera* (One Way or Another) epitomizes Third Cinema’s involvement in the intersection of fiction and documentary as it gives a feminist critique of the Cuban revolution.

Introduction to Feminist Film Theory,

Feminist film theory is a theoretical film criticism derived from feminist politics and feminist theory influenced by Second Wave Feminism and brought about around the 1970s in the United States. With the advancements in film throughout the years feminist film theory has developed and changed to analyse the current ways of film and also go back to analyse films past. Feminists have many approaches to cinema analysis, regarding the film elements analyzed and their theoretical underpinnings.

The development of feminist film theory was influenced by second wave feminism and women's studies in the 1960s and 1970s. Initially in the United States in the early 1970s

feminist film theory was generally based on sociological theory and focused on the function of female characters in film narratives or genres. Feminist film theory, such as Marjorie Rosen's *Popcorn Venus: Women, Movies, and the American Dream* (1973) and Molly Haskell's *From Reverence to Rape: The Treatment of Women in Movies* (1974) analyze the ways in which women are portrayed in film, and how this relates to a broader historical context. Additionally, feminist critiques also examine common stereotypes depicted in film, the extent to which the women were shown as active or passive, and the amount of screen time given to women.

In contrast, film theoreticians in England concerned themselves with critical theory, psychoanalysis, semiotics, and Marxism. Eventually, these ideas gained hold within the American scholarly community in the 1980's. Analysis generally focused on the meaning within a film's text and the way in which the text constructs a viewing subject. It also examined how the process of cinematic production affects how women are represented and reinforces sexism.

British feminist film theorist, Laura Mulvey, best known for her essay, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema", written in 1973 and published in 1975 in the influential British film theory journal, *Screen* was influenced by the theories of Sigmund Freud and Jacques Lacan. "Visual Pleasure" is one of the first major essays that helped shift the orientation of film theory towards a psychoanalytic framework. Prior to Mulvey, film theorists such as Jean-Louis Baudry and Christian Metz used psychoanalytic ideas in their theoretical accounts of cinema. Mulvey's contribution, however, initiated the intersection of film theory, psychoanalysis and feminism.

In 1976 the journal *Camera Obscura* was published by beginning grad students Janet Bergstrom, Sandy Flitterman, Elisabeth Lyon, and Constance Penley to talk about how women were in films but they were excluded in the development of those films or erased from the process. *Camera Obscura* is still published to this day by Duke University Press and has moved from just film theory to media studies.

Other key influences come from Metz's essay *The Imaginary Signifier*, "Identification, Mirror," where he argues that viewing film is only possible through scopophilia (pleasure from looking, related to voyeurism), which is best exemplified in silent film.[7] Also, according to Cynthia A. Freeland in "Feminist Frameworks for Horror Films," feminist studies of horror films have focused on psychodynamics where the chief interest is "on viewers' motives and interests in watching horror films".

Beginning in the early 1980s feminist film theory began to look at film through a more intersectional lens. The film journal *Jump Cut* published a special issue about titled "Lesbians and Film" in 1981 which examined the lack of lesbian identities in film. Jane Gaines's essay "White Privilege and Looking Relations: Race and Gender in Feminist Film Theory" examined the erasure of black women in cinema by white male filmmakers. While Lola Young argues that filmmakers of all races fail to break away from the use to tired stereotypes when depicting black women. Other theorists who wrote about feminist film theory and race include bell hooks and Michele Wallace.

From the 1985 onward the Matrixial theory of artist and psychoanalyst Bracha L. Ettinger revolutionized feminist film theory. Her concept, from her book, *The Matrixial Gaze*, has established a feminine gaze and has articulated its differences from the phallic gaze and its relation to feminine as well as maternal specificities and potentialities of "coemergence", offering a critique of Sigmund Freud's and Jacques Lacan's psychoanalysis, is extensively used in analysis of films, by female directors, like Chantal Akerman, as well as by male directors, like Pedro Almodovar. The matrixial gaze offers the female the position of a subject, not of an object, of the gaze, while deconstructing the structure of the subject itself, and offers border-time, border-space and a possibility for compassion and witnessing. Ettinger's notions articulate the links between aesthetics, ethics and trauma.

Recently, scholars have expanded their work to include analysis of television and digital media. Additionally, they have begun to explore notions of difference, engaging in dialogue about the differences among women (part of movement away from essentialism in feminist work more generally), the various methodologies and perspectives contained under the umbrella of feminist film theory, and the multiplicity of methods and intended effects that influence the development of films. Scholars are also taking increasingly global perspectives, responding to postcolonialist criticisms of perceived Anglo- and Eurocentrism in the academy more generally. Increased focus has been given to, "disparate feminisms, nationalisms, and media in various locations and across class, racial, and ethnic groups throughout the world". Scholars in recent years have also turned their attention towards women in the silent film industry and their erasure from the history of those films and women's bodies and how they are portrayed in the films. Jane Gaines's *Women's Film Pioneer Project (WFPP)*, a database of women who worked in the silent-era film industry, has been cited as a major achievement in recognizing pioneering women in the field of silent and non-silent film by scholars such as Rachel Schaff.

As of recent years many believe feminist film theory to be a fading area of feminism with the massive amount of coverage currently around media studies and theory. As these areas have grown the framework created in feminist film theory have been adapted to fit into analysing other forms of media.

Auteur- Film Authorship with a special focus on Ray or Kurosawa

deaths. Without the least effort and without any sudden jerks, Satyajit Ray paints his picture, but its effect on the audience is to stir up deep passions. There is nothing irrelevant or haphazard in his cinematographic technique. In that lies the secret of its excellence.' – Akira Kurosawa

Very few people in Indian cinema can claim to have ascended the heights that Mr. Ray did in his long and distinguished career. Presented with numerous film festival awards, the lifetime achievement Oscar and the Bharat Ratna (India's highest civilian honour), he is recognized the world over as a master of his craft. However, film making was not his

first love. Satyajit Ray started out as a commercial artist and his initiation in the cinema came about only in his late 20s, when he was introduced to Jean Renoir and the magic of European humanist movies. Subsequently all his works communicated an emotive interpretation of the human condition and an impassioned telling of the most mundane facets of Indian culture.

This, to me, is a most fascinating portal into the man's work as a director. Late in his life, when an interviewer had asked him for the best technique of film-making, he had replied that it is one that is not conspicuous, not noticeable. 'It is a poor film, which draws attention to style, rather than content.' His movies lacked any flashiness, any immoderate editing or pulsating scores. But the stories he told were very articulate representations of ordinary life, of ordinary people. In the end, Ray was a storyteller, and he did just that: tell stories, with high disregard for embellishments. His crew would often comment that most of his editing took place in the camera, and he was very, very certain about the scene he wanted to shoot. Technique was merely a means to a humanistic end.

His cinematic oeuvre is of a lucid character, with mystically simple narratives that operate on multiple levels of interpretation. Perhaps this is why some critics render his movies as clumsy, or cluttered with inconsequential dialogue. But this very linear, neo-realist approach to filmmaking is what sets him apart from other directors, both his contemporaries and successors.

Born during the peak years of India's freedom struggle, Ray was greatly influenced by Rabindranath Tagore's literature. He explained the structure of his films as being influenced by India's cultural make up at that time, which was a fusion of the east and west. In order to fully comprehend the medium of films at large, he said, one needs to be familiar with the West and Western art forms. 'Film, as a mode of expression, and the very concept of an art form existing in time was a western concept, not an Indian one.' This is mostly why his films resonated far better in the west than they did in his motherland. Jingoists often derided his work and called them a mere romanticism of India's poverty. This shallow critique, however, reveals that even his staunchest critics found the embodiment of truth in his stories.

He is largely remembered as the consummate auteur, having dabbled in nearly all the aspects involved in making his movies. His most famous contribution to world cinema was *Pather Panchali*, the first movie of the Apu Trilogy. It was an incisive foray into colonial village life in Bengal and artfully depicted sombre Indian traditions and mores. Beautifully captured from the eyes of Apu, its child-protagonist, it depicted the joys, angst and sorrow of growing up in rural, famine-stricken Bengal. A personal favourite amongst his many movies is *Shatranj Ke Khiladi* (*Chess Players*). It is a masterfully executed tale of two kings engrossed in a singular game of chess, while their kingdoms are quietly snatched away from them by the British.

To this day, his movies are revered throughout the Indian and international film making community, with directors of the calibre of Martin Scorsese and Danny Boyle citing him as an inspiration.

Unit IV Hindi Cinema

Hindi cinema, often known as Bollywood and formerly as Bombay cinema, is the Indian Hindi-language film industry based in Mumbai (formerly Bombay). The term is a portmanteau of "Bombay" and "Hollywood". The industry is related to Cinema of South India and other Indian film industries, making up Indian Cinema—the world's largest by number of feature films produced.

Indian cinema has an annual output of 1,986 feature films in 2017. Bollywood is its largest film producer, with 364 Hindi films produced in 2017. Bollywood represents 43 percent of Indian net box-office revenue; Tamil and Telugu cinema represent 36 percent, and the remaining regional cinema constituted 21 percent in 2014. Bollywood is one of the largest centres of film production in the world. In 2001 ticket sales, Indian cinema (including Bollywood) reportedly sold an estimated 3.6 billion tickets worldwide, compared to Hollywood's 2.6 billion tickets sold. Bollywood films tend to use vernacular Hindustani, mutually intelligible by people who self-identify as speaking either Hindi or Urdu, and modern Bollywood movies[18] increasingly incorporate elements of Hinglish.

The most popular commercial genre in Bollywood since the 1970s has been the masala film, which freely mixes different genres including action, comedy, romance, drama and melodrama along with musical numbers. Masala films generally fall under the musical film genre, of which Indian cinema has been the largest producer since the 1960s when it exceeded the American film industry's total musical output after musical films declined in the West; the first Indian musical talkie was *Alam Ara* (1931), several years after the first Hollywood musical talkie *The Jazz Singer* (1927). Alongside commercial masala films, a distinctive genre of art films known as parallel cinema has also existed, presenting realistic content and avoidance of musical numbers. In more recent years, the distinction between commercial masala and parallel cinema has been gradually blurring, with an increasing number of mainstream films adopting the conventions which were once strictly associated with parallel cinema.

1950s - Cinema and the Nation (Guru Dutt, Raj Kapoor, Mehboob),

he ten highest-grossing films at the Indian Box Office in 1950

Rank	Title	Cast
1.	<i>Samadhi</i>	Ashok Kumar, Nalini Jaywant, Shyam, Kuldip Kaur
2.	<i>Babul</i>	Nargis, Dilip Kumar, Munawar Sultana
3.	<i>Dastan</i>	Suraiya, Raj Kapoor, Veena
4.	<i>Jogan</i>	Nargis, Dilip Kumar, Purnima
5.	<i>Har Har Mahadev</i>	Trilok Kapoor, Nirupa Roy, Durga Khote
6.	<i>Sangram</i>	Ashok Kumar, Nalini Jaywant
7.	<i>Beqasoor</i>	Madhubala, Ajit, Yakub

- | | | |
|-----|----------------|--|
| 8. | <i>Sargam</i> | Raj Kapoor, Rehana |
| 9. | <i>Arzoo</i> | Kamini Kaushal, Dilip Kumar |
| 10. | <i>Aankhen</i> | Nalini Jaywant, Shekhar, Bharat Bhushan, Yakub |

Vasanth Kumar Shivashankar Padukone (9 July 1925 – 10 October 1964), better known as **Guru Dutt**, was an Indian film director, producer and actor. He made 1950s and 1960s classics such as *Pyaasa*, *Kaagaz Ke Phool*, *Sahib Bibi Aur Ghulam* and *Chaudhvin Ka Chand*. In particular, *Pyaasa* and *Kaagaz Ke Phool* have been included among the greatest films of all time, *Pyaasa* by Time magazine's "All-TIME" 100 best movies list and by the 2002 Sight & Sound critics' and directors' poll, where Dutt himself is included among the greatest film directors of all time.

In 2010, he was included among CNN's "top 25 Asian actors of all time".

He is most famous for making lyrical and artistic films within the context of popular Hindi cinema of the 1950s, and expanding its commercial conventions, starting with his 1957 film *Pyaasa*. Several of his later works have a cult following. His movies attract full houses when re-released; especially in Germany, France and Japan.

Choreographer, actor and assistant director

While Dutt was hired by Prabhat Film Company as a choreographer, he was pressed into service as an actor, and even as an assistant director. After Prabhat failed in 1947, Dutt moved to Bombay, where he worked with two leading directors of the time, with Amiya Chakravarty in *Girls' School*, and with Gyan Mukherjee in the Bombay Talkies film *Sangram*. Then, Dev Anand offered him a job as a director in his new company, Navketan, after the first movie had flopped.

Dutt's first film, Navketan's *Baazi*, was released in 1951. It was a tribute to the 1940s film noir genre of Hollywood with the morally ambiguous hero, the transgressing siren, and shadow lighting.

Dev Anand and Dutt had reached an agreement that if Dutt were to turn filmmaker, he would hire Anand as his hero, and if Anand were to produce a film then he would use Dutt as its director. Anand subsequently used Dutt in his movie *Baazi*, while Dutt employed Anand in *C.I.D.*. After Dutt's death, Anand said that "He was a young man, he should not have made depressing pictures."

Dutt and Anand would make two super-hit films together, *Baazi*, and *Jaal*. Creative differences between Dutt, and Chetan Anand (Anand's elder brother), who was also a director, made future collaborations difficult.

As director

Baazi was an immediate success. Dutt followed it with Jaal and Baaz. Neither film did well at the box office, but they brought together the Guru Dutt team that performed so brilliantly in subsequent films. He discovered, and mentored, Johnny Walker (comedian), V.K. Murthy (cinematographer), and Abrar Alvi (writer-director), among others. He is also credited for introducing Waheeda Rehman to the Hindi cinema. Baaz was notable in that Dutt both directed and starred, not having found a suitable actor for the principal character.

Fortune smiled on Dutt's next film, the 1954 blockbuster Aar Paar. This was followed by the 1955 hit, Mr. & Mrs. '55, then C.I.D., Sailaab and in 1957, Pyaasa – the story of a poet, rejected by an uncaring world, who achieves success only after his apparent death. Dutt played the lead role in three of these five films.

His 1959 Kaagaz Ke Phool was an intense disappointment. He had invested a great deal of love, money, and energy in this film, which was a self-absorbed tale of a famous director (played by Guru Dutt) who falls in love with an actress (played by Waheeda Rehman, Dutt's real-life love interest). Kaagaz Ke Phool failed at the box office and Dutt was devastated. All subsequent films from his studio were, thereafter, officially headed by other directors since Dutt felt that his name was anathema to the box office.

Dutt also influenced his box office smash hit Chaudhvin Ka Chand. A Muslim love-triangle, the film starred Guru Dutt alongside Waheeda Rehman and Rehman. The film was directed by M. Sadiq and had its title track "Chaudhvin Ka Chand Ho" in a special colour sequence. This is the only time one can see Guru Dutt in colour.

Sahib Bibi Aur Ghulam, a critically and commercially successful film, was directed by his protégé, writer Abrar Alvi, which won him the Filmfare Best Director's award. The film starred Tragedy Queen Meena Kumari and Guru Dutt along with Rehman and Waheeda Rehman in supporting roles. The film's star, Waheeda Rehman, denied rumours that the film was ghost-directed by Dutt himself.

The Indian New-Wave,

This tries to understand new wave cinema movement from its historical roots with the help of prominent writings on films.

New wave is an umbrella term for movement in art, music, film, fashion, and politics. As defined by Merriam-Webster dictionary new wave cinema is defined as “a cinematic movement that is characterized by improvisation, abstraction, and subjective symbolism and that often makes use of experimental photographic techniques”.

In their path-breaking work, Dictionary of Film Studies Annette Kuhn and Guy Westwell described the new wave cinemas as “an international movement of new cinemas beginning in the 1960s, often in association with film societies, and informed by

cinephila, new developments in documentary film-making, and contemporary politics and youth cultures”. They also note down the main features of new wave cinemas as follows:

- (a) Deliberately challenged pre – existing traditions and conventions of both art and commercial cinema
- (b) Out of studio production
- (c) Small-scale budget
- (d) Realistic location
- (e) Political and aesthetic radicalism
- (f) Degrees of self-reflexivity (cause – effect relationship)
- (g) Degrees of interrelationship between texts (intertextuality)
- (h) Move storytelling from linear narration and high levels of narration
- (i) The position of viewer as an element of film narration. This means that ordinary people are portrayed in these films in native setting. This attracted people towards the realistic attempt of new waves.

The concept of “new” is not easily conveyed. There are various arguments of the ontology of “new”. The claims of being new is “not old”, “creating some which is not existing”, “already existing but not experienced”, “recently created”, "not used by anyone else previously" and so on.

The new wave cinema as a concept and practice developed in 1959 and decades following in France and other countries. The impressions of French cinema are carried over in other cinemas of Europe (Britain, West Germany (Germany), Poland, Czechoslovakia, Italy), Asia (India, Hong Kong, China (Fifth generation), Taiwan, Iran and other middle east), United States (Hollywood) and Latin America.

The birth of new wave cinema is credited to Nouvelle Vague (French term for new wave) in French cinema in the late 1950s associated with the magazine Cahiers du cinéma. The French wave is thoroughly studied, written and refereed in film academia and often considered the biggest leap in film movement history. The French new wave predisposed the world cinema and led to the independent film movement which resisted and challenged the dominance of production houses and studios.

The birth of New wave cinema movement in French as well as other countries was as part of the outstanding efforts of a group of filmmakers who rejected the existing formula in scripting, production values, editing, promotion and exhibition. However, the movement in film as art or parallel movements was there two decades before the French new wave. As seen in earlier section the Soviet Montage days of the USSR, German expressionism, Italian neo – realism, the Indian new wave movement initiated by Satyajit Ray [who was influenced from Italian film Bicycle Thieves (dir. Vittorio De Sica, 1948)], Cinema Novo of Latin America were great attempts which created a wave in world cinema. The new wave movement is often studied contrasted with the commercial or mainstream cinema of that country. In case of Indian cinema, the Indian Parallel cinema is juxtaposed to the Bollywood and other regional languages.

The post-structuralism in literature and film offers an idea of intertextuality within the medium. This feature is also visible in new wave cinema, which led to overlapping of different movements together. The independent film movement, Cinema Novo (Latin American) and new wave movement are often clubbed together by

Globalisation and Indian Cinema,

In some ways it's nothing new ? even in times of Raj Kapoor, Indian cinema had quite a bit of international following. *Mera Joota Hai Japani* would be on the lips of many a Middle Easterner who did not even understand the Hindi language. Russia as well as the far away Africa too had legions of fans of what is now popularly known as Bollywood ? the Indian film industry.

Yet, despite the far-reaching pockets of fans, Indian cinema was by no means a global enterprise. What has made it so in the recent years is the burgeoning global Indian Diaspora that now stands at about 20 million strong! The direct impact of such clout has had a four-pronged effect on globalization of Indian cinema:

(i) Increasing interest in, and influence of Bollywood productions. Films such as *Taal*, *Lagaan*, and *Devdas* have competed with Hollywood releases at box offices in the U.S. and England. Conversely, Hollywood releases such as *Moulin Rouge* have known to be inspired by the dazzling sets and the song-and-dance routines of the standard Bollywood fare.

(ii) The catering of Bollywood to global Indian audiences. This is evident not only in NRI story-lines of films such as *Pardes* on to *Kabhi Khushi Kabhi Gham*, but also in the Westernized settings and styles of many recent releases. Case in point is the multi-starrer *Kaante*, which is not only styled like a Hollywood thriller, but is also based on one - *Reservoir Dogs*. But regardless of the theme, setting, or style, global Indian audiences now play a critical role in the success or failure of Bollywood productions. Both *Lagaan* and *Devdas*, based on highly traditional themes, have had a considerable chunk of their revenues come from overseas audiences.

(iii) Interest in India-centric themes is crossing over to mainstream, as is evident in films such as *Monsoon Wedding* and the just released Universal Studios film *The Guru*. In England, it has been *Cotton Mary*, *East is East*, and the recent hit, *Bend it Like Beckham*.

(iv) Increase in numbers and visibility of NRI filmmakers such as Mira Nair, Deepa Mehta, Nagesh Kukunoor, Gurinder Chada, and many others. Such a trend further encourages aspiring novices such as Piyush Dinker Pandya (*American Desi*), Anurag Mehta (*American Chai*) and many others.

Elsewhere too, such references of the globalization of Indian cinema are on the rise. An event unimaginable just a decade ago is shaping up for May of this year in the midst of dazzling Atlantic City. The 5th Annual International Bollywood Awards will be held at

one of the city's landmark, the Trump Taj Mahal. Over the years, besides the glitterati from Mumbai, this event has featured their Western counterparts such as Richard Gere, Steven Seagal, Sir Andrew Lloyd Weber, and Michael Jackson. As its publicity blurb says, "The Bollywood awards will bring prestige, glamour, visibility, credibility, and national and international coverage to Indian Cinema." Judging from its track record, no reason to doubt that.

Locally, we continue to stay on top of this trend. This month we bring you an exclusive interview with Jimi Mistry, star of *The Guru*. This will soon be followed in upcoming issues by an interview with the talented Gurinder Chada of the *Bend it Like Beckham* fame.

Most excitingly though, we feature in this issue, a veritable ambassador of Indian cinematic talent who has been building bridges between Bollywood and Hollywood, much before its time. For four decades now, Ismail Merchant has been carving a name for himself in Hollywood. What's more, a good portion of his films has had India-centric themes. We hope you enjoy our look at this icon of world cinema, even as things get juicier for us, the global Indian cinephile.

The multiplex Era,

A multiplex is a movie theater complex with multiple screens within a single complex. They are usually housed in a specially designed building. Sometimes, an existing venue undergoes a renovation where the existing auditoriums are split into smaller ones, or more auditoriums are added in an extension or expansion of the building. The largest of these complexes can sit thousands of people and are sometimes referred to as a megaplex.

The difference between a multiplex and a megaplex is related to the number of screens, but the dividing line is not well-defined; some might say that 14 screens and stadium seating make a megaplex; while others might say that at least 20 screens are required. Megaplex theaters always have stadium seating, and may have other amenities often not found at smaller movie theaters; multiplex theatres often feature regular seating.[citation needed

The Kinopolis-Madrid Ciudad de la Imagen megaplex in Spain is the largest movie theater in the world, with 25 screens and a seating capacity of 9,200, including one 996-seat auditorium.

Film Culture

An educated man will define films as motion pictures with a flowing storyline. A layman will define it as an entertainment medium. But a film can simply be defined as nothing more than a multiple combinations of a 'camera on' and 'camera off' (shot). Having made the term sound ridiculously simple, doesn't really make the process of filmmaking

any simple, nor does it take away its importance from our culture. Every rendered video with shots stitched together is technically a film, but every film doesn't add value to our society.

In a country like India, where approximately 1700 films are made every year. It's not just a part of our culture, it's a culture in itself. So, this powerful medium needs to make a responsible effort to feed the society with subtle social moralities, so the socio-political balance is maintained. Unfortunately, this responsibility seems missing in the recent past.

History of the Indian film industry goes back to 1913, when Dada Saheb Phalke came up with his first silent film Raja Harishchandra. Since then, the industry has gone through multiple reforms and stages, as any other art form. But over the years India went through only a technical reform, and hence could never make a mark in the world cinema circuit. The divided terminology of commercial cinema, art cinema and parallel cinema has majorly contributed to the chaos in the film fraternity.

Satyajit Ray

India recently celebrated 100 years of Cinema. And during this period India managed to produce more than 50,000 films. But is it at all about the number game? Film as a medium not only influences our society, but also takes the same society's reflection, and projects it to the world.

In our history of 100 years of cinema, one can hand-pick films who made a mark in the international circuit. Satyajit Ray's "Pathar Panchali" in 1955 was the first film to gain international acclamation. Since then Mrinal Sen's "Kharij" (1983) , Chetan Anand's "Neecha Nagar" (1946), Mira Nair's "Salaam Bombay" (1988) and Shahji N. Karun's "Piravi" (1989) were among the few films who made a mark outside the domestic boundaries, winning prestigious international awards till the end of the 20th century.

Baahubali (Poster)

Now the major question of why arises. Is it because we are not intelligent enough as filmmakers? Or we are not equipped enough? Or is it because, we ourselves set a lower benchmark of films just meaning 'Entertainment'?

The intellectuals might want to choose the third. But one also has to understand, a film has to cater to a target audience, and the majority of the audience in India is still not ready to consume beyond the already set benchmark. Statistically, most of the Indian films which got global recognition were not the films consumed by the Indian audience. So to sustain filmmaking as a business, the portrayal of content changed from what the filmmaker wanted to portray, to what the audience wanted to see.

The gradual dilution of content has led to the modern-day number game(100crclub). The number system has been forced by the media, into the audience's psyche to such an extent that presently films are being judged only by the money it's making. Sadly the

present scenario, is leading good filmmakers to take a commercial framework for their film to sustain in the industry.

There is no one route to make a film, And commerce and numbers should not be the only parameters to make films. One has to find a midway to merge content with commerce, and that should be the way forward for parallel cinema. In recent times, films like “Court”, “The Lunchbox” and “Baahubali” stuck to the basic framework of the Indian film industry yet made a huge buzz internationally. Hence, proving a point.

The Indian film industry has immense potential, it just needs the right mix to make its mark in the global scheme of things.

Unit V

1. Rear Window by Alfred Hitchcock (Language of Cinema)
2. Battleship Potemkin by Sergei Eisenstein (Language of Cinema)
3. Man with a Movie Camera by Dziga Vertov
4. Germany Year Zero directed by Roberto Rossellini (Italian Neo Realism)
5. Metropolis by Fritz Lang/Double Indemnity by Billy Wilder (German Expressionism and Film Noir)
6. Pather Panchajali by Satyajit Ray
7. The hour of the Furnaces by Fernando Solanas

Unit IV

1. Nishant by Shyam Benegal/Aakrosh by Govind Nihalani (Indian New wave)
2. Pyaas by Guru Dutt