AN EXPERIMENT IN FORM:
The Merging of Cinema-Verite Documentary and Narrative Filmmaking
by
Karine Hrechdakian

Bachelor of Arts
Wellesley University
Wellesley, MASS
1983

SUBMITTED
TO THE MEDIA ARTS AND SCIENCES SECTION
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
DEGREE
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN VISUAL STUDIES
AT THE
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

February 1989

Signature of the author _____

Karine Hrechdakian
Media Arts and Sciences Section
September 20, 1988

Certified by _____

Glorianna Davenport
Assistant Professor
Film/Video Group Media Lab

Accepted by _____

Stephen A. Benton
Chairperson
Departmental Committee for Graduate Students

AN EXPERIMENT IN FORM:
The Merging of Cinema-Verite Documentary
and
Narrative Filmmaking

by

Karine Hrechdakian

Submitted to the Media Arts and Sciences Section
on September 20, 1988
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Degree
Master of Science in Visual Studies

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis was to experiment in form, where borrowing from the cinema-verite approach and the more traditional narrative construction of Hollywood, a film was made which attempts to straddle both genres. This paper discusses the techniques and the methods used to achieve this. The film was shot over two summers, enabling a comparison to be drawn between the initial attempt and the second more defined and experienced shoot.

Documentary and narrative filmmaking are defined in their techniques, historical, and socioeconomic framework, in order to support the aim of this experiment.

In light of advances in the development of end-to-end digital transmission, the future of movie distribution is considered.

Submitted with the written portion of this thesis is a VHS transfer of the thesis film.

Thesis Supervisor: Glorianna Davenport
Title: Associate Professor
                     Film/Video Group Media Lab

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Man dreamed of recreating"the world in it's own image" (l) long before he had the means to so. He eventually invented the technologies which allowed this realization to come true; from photography, to moving pictures, and finally sound recording. At the turn of the century, these new technologies allowed for new means of expression. Experimentation in form slowly led to defining genres; ways of conveying a message. The historical, social, and economical environment, the needs and interest of society at the time, formed the womb from which cinema was born. Then, as now, technical constraints and ideological demands guided filmmakers. Sometime during this gestation the embryo split in two; Lumiere's realism and Melies's fantasy, or more broadly, documentary and fiction. Their features were formed slowly over time, and, even though such growth is often catapulted in different directions at the same time (all not so bad) an unfortunate blueprint is formed which becomes the law. Under Darwinian ruling, the american film and television industries had the monopoly to mandate such law; one which left little room for experimentation. This canon in turn affects the public, who accept it as the norm, and like its makers, do not easily tolerate alternative works. Independent filmmakers have to struggle with the economics of the medium, the very limited distribution and a desensitized mass audience.

In the context of this synopsis and my filmmaking experience, I chose for my thesis to experiment in genre and merge two opposing ideologies, documentary and fiction. For seven, years I have studied and practiced the cinema-verite approach to documentary filmmaking. With this project, I decided to venture into the realm of narrative filmmaking, the realm of cinema most attributed to Hollywood, or more broadly, to the american film industry; an industry whose product relies on immutable and precise blueprints. I wanted to question the rules of these blueprints. Can you indeed find a middle ground between the documentary and the fiction genre? Can you make a simple low-budget feature film shot in the freer spirit of *cinema verite*

without total disregard for a narrative framework? Can you "direct" nonactors into playing a characterization of themselves?

FOOTNOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. Andre Bazin, WHAT IS CINEMA? VOLUME 1, trans. Hugh Gray (Berkley, Univ. of California Press, 1967), p. 21.

II. TECHNOLOGY VS IDEOLOGY

Before the advent of much needed technologies cinema as a concept was relegated to man's imagination. Cinema was first created by man's imagination and then by his scientific discoveries. Men like Edison who in 1891 developed the Kinetoscope and the Lumiere brothers who in 1895 devised a portable camera-projector, the cinematographe, took the first steps towards the cinema we know today. Such inventors were simply contented by their inventions but others, like Bernard Palissy, were capable of"burning their furniture for a few seconds of shaky images" (1) To Bazin"they were men obsessed by their own imaginings" (2) and the cinema was born"from the converging of these various obsessions, out of a myth, the myth of total cinema." (3) A complex play between ideological, technological and economic demands, which awaited their turn to create"a perfect illusion of the outside world in sound, color, and relief." (4) Ever since the eleventh century, when scientists realized the possibility of projecting light through a small hole so that an exterior scene appeared on an interior surface, the domino effect was on its way as technology raced to create moving pictures and sound recording;"a recreation of the world in its own image". (5)

The first thirty years of the cinema must have been a very exciting time as new techniques gave birth to new means of expression. The first filmmakers had a grand playground filled with new toys and no one to tell them how to play. In 1905 the first fully equipped motion-picture, theater opened in the US and by 1910 there were ten thousand. 35mm became the standard film gauge internationally and the Star System began in the US as Florence Lawrence became the first actress to be featured under her own name. In 1911 the Centaur Film Co. built the first studio in Hollywood and by 1914 the feature film became the industry norm. Our key filmmakers during this time, starting of course with Lumiere and Melies, were Griffith, De Mille, Chaplin, Lubitsch, Stroheim, Flaherty, Clair, Lang, Eisenstein, Pabst... up until 1926 when Giergson coined the word" documentary" in a review of Flaherty's "Moana"

and the first Vitaphone sound film premiered.

Not surprisingly, the cinematic "coup d'etat" that was sound invaded a prolific industry and threatened conventions. While Chaplin resisted as the Tramp who would never speak, Griffith believed that synchronous sound could only improve the medium and help the message. Of the coming of color and, subsequently, cinemascope, Jaques Rivette says that:

> "...the bitterness of the critics is justified: they like to see what
> they already know... But how can it fail to fire the imagination
> - the idea of what is yet to come... Art lives not necessarily in
> what is new, but in what is discovered." (6)

First came the imagination, then the technology and with it came the rules. Genres were defined and accepted; their techniques refined over the years. Until new tools were invented, cinema evolved in its treatment of matter and perfection of technique. This in turn caused the severe departmentalization of a money oriented industry. Perhaps cinema in its dawn was an exciting new art form, but the economics of the medium soon placed it in the hands of businessmen like Charles Pathe, who began building his huge film empire as early as 1896. And the innocence was lost... well, not completely, for *cinema verite* developed as a stubborn resistance to the bottom line as well as the plot line. Prior to *cinema verite* documentaries mainly conveyed very subjective messages, with heavily laden narrations and grand musical accompaniment. Documentary implied reality, but it still made use of direction and interference from the filmmakers. There was a desire to hold a mirror up to man. The *cv* technique opened a new window, shedding an unfiltered light on the people and the event being filmed.

Filmmakers like Richard Leacock were disillusioned by the standard documentary form and heavily burdened by bulky, cameras and sound recording equipment. In the fifties, the development of magnetic tape recording, the invention of the transistor and the development of miniature low-power circuitry made"a radical change in documentary filming". (7) "It was the fault of the equipment which had prevented us from observing." (8) At last, they could be "the fly on the wall" and take Flaherty's work one step further.

Watching a film like Crisis, one can get a better sense of who Kennedy is, seeing him move, talk and think as he deals with important issues. When he puts his daughter on the phone, I can't imagine anyone not being charmed or not relating to the incident in one way or another. One gets a much better sense of the people being filmed. One is not being told every other minute who is who and what they are doing. One discovers it as the filmmaker does and, through this discovery, is involved in a very exciting manner.

Technical innovations seem to yield experimentation first in form and second in content. It is through this experimentation that cinema stabilizes with each new cycle of technical and aesthetic innovations. During these periods of experimentation everything, as always, is in the hands of the filmmaker, where as Renoir says;"it is in the images themselves that the creative artist can really bring his own observation to view, his particular vision." (9) For those who believed in"recording life as it happens" (10), the new portable equipment provided the technology needed to implement this predestined step; bringing them closer to the ideology of documentary. With refined tools and technique they could explore uncharted ground and help define, as they experimented, what is now the "cinema-verite" approach to documentary filmmaking.

With every step taken; with the invention of tools as with the exploration of subject matter, form and content alternate over time; bringing us closer to Bazin's contention that "every new development added to the cinema must, paradoxically, take it nearer and nearer to its origins. In short, cinema has not yet been invented!" (11)

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. Andre Bazin, WHAT IS CINEMA? VOLUME 1, trans. Hugh Gray (Berkley, Univ. of California Press, 1967), p. 22.

2. Bazin, p. 22.

3. Bazin, p. 22.

4. Bazin, p. 20.

5. Bazin, p. 21.

6. Jaques Rivette, THE AGE OF METTEURS EN SCENE, Cahiers du Cinema, The 1950s. Neo-Realism, Hollywood, New Wave (Harvard Uni. Press, 1985), p. 276.

7. Richard Leacock, TECHNOLOGY AND REALITY AT THE MOVIES, (Reprinted from Technology Review Volume 75, Number 4, Feb. 1973, MIT), p. 4.

8. Richard Leacock, PERSONAL THOUGHTS AND PREJUDICES ABOUT THE DOCUMENTARY, Presented at the 23rd C.I.L.E.C.T. Congress, Paris, 1987), p. 9.

9. JEAN RENOIR AND ROBERTO ROSSELLINI INTERVIEWED BY ANDRE BAZIN, Cinema and television (MIT Film/Video Archive, 1959), p. 27.

10. Richard Leacock, p. 5.

11. Bazin, p. 21.

III. DOCUMENTARY VS FICTION

Grierson was the first to apply the term"documentary" when reviewing Flaherty's Moana in 1926. Even though his approach was basically propagandistic rather than aesthetic, he describes this genre as"a creative treatment of actuality," (1) Paul Rotha sees it "as an interpretation of social feeling and philosophic thought which has materialized largely as the result of sociological, political and educational requirements." (2) Van Dyke says that it is"a film in which the elements of dramatic conflict represent social or political forces rather than individual ones. It deals with real people and real situations." (3) Philip Dunne finds that"the documentary is almost always an instrument of propaganda" (4), and that"its very nature is experimental and inventive" (5); even if it uses actors, plot, fantasy, or fact.

The kinds of films made reflect the needs of the time in which they are made, as well as those of the filmmakers. This is a view held by Rotha and Grierson. The technique, the medium and the content must reflect the times. The social analysis of the documentary genre, its importance in unveiling pertinent social and political issues, does not seem to be in vogue today as it was in the 50's and 60's.

Despite all of the good intentions of *cinema verite*, the documentary form continues to be the formula by which television networks abide. Certainly issues are being dealt with, however, the methods of execution leave much to be desired. Until a different distribution system comes along where the viewer has a choice, there is not much that can be done to influence these matters.

Dealing with reality implies dealing with truths. Even though these truths are tinkered with by the mere act of recording and editing them into a film, in essence, they tend to enlighten us on that bit of reality which intrigued the filmmaker. A good documentary teaches you something about life, something you might never have discovered on your own. It teaches you to, at least, think about issues and sometimes even feel for them. Thus, a documentarian is an investigator as well as a storyteller.

The technique of *cv* enables one to capture reality as it happens. It gives to the documentary a form closest its purest intention. *Cv* makes"it possible to go out and observe life with radically less interference towards the situation being recorded." (6) Thanks to portable light-weight synchronous equipment, a camera-person and a sound-person can blend into the surroundings and become more passive observers.

The story unfolds while shooting and is, essentially, composed in the editing. Each filmmaker's cameraperson is his/her own author, as inferred by his/her own shooting style. This style can be carried into the editing, linking both processes and instilling consistency of point-of-view. The imprint of a shooting style affects the representation and ultimately the interpretation of the material. This relationship is equivalent to the one found between narrative cinematography and the story it tries to tell. According to Ricky Leacock, since the beauty of making a film lies in this relationship, it ought to be done by the same person:

> "I truly believe that only the filmmaker's should edit the material they have made. I think that filming is a continuous process of learning and is part and parcel of editing, that the one skill feeds off the other. So many of the decisions make during filming are part of the final edit, and only the people who made those decisions know which worked out and which did not." (7)

Even though a documentary is based on non-narrative information, a story can be composed out of a seemingly endless amount of footage, and, like narrative construction, one tends to center it around captivating events and subjects. A real person is captured in bits of real time which are then sculpted together into a new unit of time; a film. As Philip Rosen says:

> "...the images and sounds are, in many respects, usually organized according to formal and stylistic parameters drawn from classical narrative cinema or at least are most often organized in response to those parameters." (8)

This real person then becomes a personification of his/herself, also known as a screen character. In this way, a documentarian can compose a story out of reality and provide the audience with an insight otherwise unseen.

Classical Hollywood narration constitutes a particular configuration of established rules for representing the story and manipulating composition and style. The story revolves around well defined individuals, who struggle to solve a clear-cut problem or to attain specific goals, and usually ends with a resolution, good or bad.

The films are shot in a realist manner where spatial configurations are recognizable and, if everything is clearly constructed and demarcated, the viewer is rarely confused. Soviet montage films (no scene demarcation) and art-cinema narratives (like Godard's play on subjectivity and objectivity amongst other traits) tend to break away from the"famous linearity of classical construction". (9)

The necessary information about the characters and the coming events tends to be very clearly presented through dialogue space, or action, and;

> "...the narration is so constructed that characters and their behavior produce and reiterate the necessary story data." (10)

Unlike art-cinema, reality is easily decipherable in fiction and documentary filmmaking, In fiction films this is attained not only through the roles of the characters and their dialogue, but also, through the space of the film, the shooting and the editing, There tends to be a certain logic to the progression of the action in a micro and macrocosmic way, A scene is carefully planned to convey the information in the script, This is executed by a series of shots (wide, close-ups, point-of-view, reverse, wide again, etc."), which conform to the storyline, The editing is merely the condensation of all the given variables while remaining true to the initial concept, On a wider plane, characters have a predestined route to follow from the beginning, which means that their dialogue and their actions will consistently reinforce the narrative construction, In classical Hollywood cinema,"stylistic disorientation is permissible when it conveys disorienting story situations" (usually moments of crisis and danger), It is interesting to note that these scenes are often shot in a style reminiscent of newsreel camerawork, hence, alluding to a certain realism.

Hollywood is a constructed system; the blueprints of which seem to be religiously followed, Such an industry ultimately ends up transferring this system onto the spectator, who"comes to a classical film very well prepared," (II) The framework for the production of norms is more social and historical than it is based on tools and technique, As David Bordwell points out:

> "...connecting scenes by dissolves is possible but rare in the silent cinema, yet it is the favored transition between 1929 and the late 1950s," (12)

Plot, character stereotyping and spatial realism fit into a complex process at the heart of which is an industry intent on nurturing the norms it has created out of preservation, In this arena, reminiscent of the Greek theater, our spectators have developed a literacy of the images, but, a literacy dictated by Hollywood.

Directors like Godard make a point of turning all these norms upside down:

> "The American industry rules cinema the world over. There is nothing much to add to this statement except that our own modest level we too should provoke two or three Vietnams, and both economically and aesthetically, struggling on two fronts as it were, create cinemas which are free..." (13)

Godard chooses to fight the norms by creating an intellectually grounded counter-cinema, aimed against an industry dependent on a consumer society. Oddly, for a director who preaches the importance of reality, he finds no redeeming qualities in CV Reality gives him the inspiration from which he finds poetry. He tests our literacy of the images by injecting his own subjective narration, or confuses real vs unreal by having an actor turn and address the camera as himself, etc... He wants to disrupt all conventional associations linked to images and sound but, he"will not be content with imitating a reality 'seized at random'." (14) Jaques Rivette finds instead that:

> "If certain documentary images are superior, it is because it is in the logic of things that the genius of the machine bursts out in advance of the creator's genius... Cinema would only lose itself if it gave up the search for an exact and clearly articulated mode of writing of its own." (15)

Godard's battle against the mainstream deserves credit for it helped pave the way for"marginal enterprises". Even though he strives to define a cinema of his own, it"can only exist in relation to the rest of the cinema." (16)

On a separate but related note, the research done in interactive and participatory moviemaking opens another window. By allowing the viewer to become the hunter and gatherer of information, one can chip away at the foundation of moviemaking. The intent of Glorianna Davenport's study of "New Orleans in Transition, 1983-1986", is to explore the interactive possibilities of documentary movies. This is accomplished by extending the information set to include text files (character dossiers, laws, etc.), and offering the viewer tools with which to select and arrange specific information (relational database, edit-list management and story board routines). In as much as"cinematic documentation can offer insights into how people think and interact" (17), it could also put in question classical narrative construction by giving the viewer the power to"pilot" as he observes.

According to Jean-Charles Tachella, as far back as the late thirties Andre Bazin was already haunted by Malraux's statement that"in any case, the cinema is an industry". As he says:"In order to change this and to eventually help directors work with as much freedom as other artists, it was necessary to rethink the structures of production." (18) At the time it was very difficult to penetrate the system, Bazin did his best to encourage marginal enterprises.

Bazin describes the cinema up until the late thirties as"that marvelous accord between a new technique and an unprecedented message" (19), after which, came a reversal of the relationship between matter and form:

> "It had never been more rigorously determined by the content, become more necessary or a matter of greater subtlety...While we wait until color or stereoscopy provisionally return its primacy to form and create a new cycle of aesthetic erosion, on the surface cinema has no longer anything to conquer." (20)

By making the analogy of cinema as a river which has hollowed out its bank and reached its equilibrium, he says that"there remains for it only to irrigate

its banks... in order to excavate invisible galleries." (21) With my experiment, I hope to discover a link between the documentary and the fiction genres. I want to challenge existing beliefs in search of new ones.

What does it actually mean to look for a middle ground between documentary and fiction? It is an accepted fact that most documentaries are a subjective statement from the filmmaker. The difference is that the images and sounds are drawn from reality. The *cinema verite* approach adheres to that purity as much as possible during shooting. Applying such an approach to a narrative framework might give it a refreshing look.

With my thesis, I experimented by veering away from the *cv* discipline of non-involvement to that of control; control of story by adhering to a loose script and control of characters by careful direction of real people. There is integrity in true speech, true action, and true feelings. Watching a real person at play takes one to a level of involvement different than that of fiction.

A documentary filmmaker should be like an explorer on a journey in search of buried treasure. He excavates into the sands of reality and hopes that his film becomes an open chest filled with carved jewels for everyone to marvel at; an offering in celebration of life and beauty to be contemplated in verity. The lesson to be learned from this analogy is that in today's fast paced existence, in the crux of diverse and fast changing ideologies,"finding the surreal in the ordinary," as Ricky Leacock says, glorifies and humbles us at once.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. Richard Meran Barsam, NONFICTION FILM, A CRITICAL HISTORY, E.P. Dutton & CO, INC, N. Y. 1973, p. 2.

2. Daniel Talbot, FILM AN ANTHOLOGY, (University of California Press, 1959), p. 235.

3. Barsam, p. 2.

4. Barsam, p. 2.

5. Barsam, p. 2.

6. Richard Leacock, TECHNOLOGY AND REALITY AT THE MOVIES, (MIT Technology Review, Volume 75, # 4, 1973), p. 4.

7. Richard Leacock, PERSONAL THOUGHTS AND PREJUDICES ABOUT THE DOCUMENTARY, Presented at the 23rd C.I.L.E.C.T. Congress, Paris, 1987), p. 11.

8. Philip Rosen, THE SAUSSURIAN IMPULSE AND CINEMA SEMIOTICS, Narrative Apparatus, Ideology: A Film Theory Reader. (Columbia University Press, N.Y. 1986), p. 9.

9. David Bordwell, CLASSICAL HOLLYWOOD CINEMA, Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology: A Film Theory Reader. Edited by Philip Rosen. (Columbia University Press, N. Y. 1986), p. 20.

10. Bordwell, p. 25.

11. Bordwell, p. 28.

12. Bordwell, p. 31.

13. Tom Milne, GODARD ON GODARD, (Da Capo Press, 1972), p. 243.

14. Tom Milne, GODARD ON GODARD, (Da Capo Press, N.Y. 1972), p. 27.

15. Jaques Rivette, THE AGE OF METTEURS EN SCENE, Cahiers du Cinema: The 1950's. Neo-realism. Hollywood. New Wave. Edited by Jim Hillier, (Harvard Uni. Press, 1985), p. 275.

16. Peter Wollen, GODARD AND COUNTER-CINEMA, Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology: A Film Theory Reader. Edited by Philip Rosen. (Columbia University Press, N. Y. 1986), p. 129.

17. Glorianna Davenport, interview in TECH TALK, (MIT, March 9, 1988), 7.

18. Jean-Charles Tachella, ANDRE BAZIN FROM 1945 TO 1950: THE TIME OF STRUGGLES AND CONSECRATION, Wide Angle Film Quarterly, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Athens Center for Film and Video, Ohio Univ. College of Fine Arts, 1988), p. 67.

19. Bazin, p. 73.

20. Bazin, p. 74.

21. Bazin, p. 74.

IV. THE THESIS FILM

A. THE INTENT

1) FORM:

Cinema verite teaches one to recognize "significance in the majestic as much as in the trivial." One does not start with preconceived and often prejudiced notions about the people or the events. Instead one searches, with a camera, for a story, which is finally brought to life in the editing. You have a synchronous camera and a synchronous tape recorder, no tripod, no lighting (except for an occasional light bulb here and there) and, most important of all,"you are not permitted to tell your victims what to do nor are (you) to interview them." (1)

The mobility of a *cv* crew makes one receptive to sudden changes while filming. The overall technique is also conducive to changes to the original concept Throwing oneself at the unknown, one has to be very quick while shooting and from a myriad of interweaving paths, find a way to a"coherent and fascinating" (2) film. Filmmakers like Leacock and Rouch"don't know exactly what they are going to do... The film is the search. They know they are going to arrive somewhere and they have the means to do it." (3)

The Hollywood blueprints are quite the opposite. From the very beginning, one knows what one wants and how to go about getting it."The shooting is merely practical application, constructing something as similar as possible to what was imagined." (4)

Since I have been making documentaries, a natural curiosity has drawn me to the other side; the side of directing. Still, I did not want to write a script, I am not a writer. I did not want to be confined to a studio, manage a large crew or deal with actors who needed to be told who they were. If I have at my disposal a colorful palette of places and people to chose from, why not make use of them, and why not simplify the technique?

I chose two people, with whom I worked and drew up a storyline which was not that far removed from their actual lives. I had the outline of a story, a clear trajectory, but no script If a scene was not based on actual facts, the dialogue and the action were constructed in a way that was related to them. This meant endless discussion and preparation. When it came time to shoot and a scene did not work, we simply changed it.

Every scene was set up for the film with the exception of one, but, even its reality was altered by my presence. The story was constructed around a series of points; actual events in the two main characters lives. We then created scenes to fill in the voids. Since I had particular locations in mind, I tried to work them into the ideas. We occasionally stumbled upon a place that inspired us and on the spot created a scene, like the Famous Clam Eating. The back-bone of such impromptu scenes was always well connected to the established story. The actual filming gave us the leeway to make either small or large changes on a moment's notice. This exciting framework was reminiscent of *cv* in its playfulness, and, was quite unlike tight narrative construction. The process was control with an invitation to spontaneity. For the camera, the characters, and the story, it was an open forum. At first this grueling process actually sparked more discouragement than excitement, but something about its gritty nature gave us the necessary motivation to persevere.

I later found with Godard a similar attitude in Godard as he says:

> "I improvise but with material which goes a long way... In a single day if one knows how to go about it, one should be able to complete a dozen takes. Only instead of planning ahead, I invent at the last minute. This isn't improvising but last minute focusing. You must have an all over plan and stick to it..." (5)

> "I write the key moments of a film, which gives me a plot with seven or eight point - which scene - they belong to. The thing that helps me get ideas is the setting. Often I start from there." (6)

Conceiving of this film, I wanted to move away from standard stereotypical character roles sculpted into predictable niches, that the establishment persists in perpetuating as shallow "role models", which, in the long run, cause more damage by perpetuating inane and offensive morals. On the other hand, as Howard Becker says:

"Even when you don't want to do what is conventional, what you do want to do can best be described in the language that comes from the conventions, for it is the one language everyone knows." (7)

Except for the unusual technique, the form of the film is rather conventional. It is a simple story, simply told. What I was in search of was, as Ricky Leacock says:

"... what I really like is superb imagery with its associated sound, and I don't mean arty pictures! I mean that hard-to-define and rarely-found quality of there being a love affair between the filmmaker and the image. This is something that you cannot buy, you cannot demand, you cannot derive from a story board, that can only be achieved with patience and the skill and sensitivity of the filmmaker..." (8)

After much trial and error, my hypothesis, yielded, in the form of three scenes, its first proof and confirmed my belief that there is such a thing as a middle ground between documentary and narrative filmmaking: the Canoe, the Famous Clam Eating, and the Quarry scene.

FOOTNOTES TO FORM

I. Richard Leacock, PERSONAL THOUGHTS AND PREJUDICES ABOUT THE DOCUMENTARY, (Presented at the 23rd C.I.L.E.C.T. Congress, Paris, 1987), p. 1.

2. Ibid, p. 1.

3. Milne, p. 18O.

4. Tom Milne, GODARD ON GODARD, (Da Capo Press, 1972), p. 18O.

5. Tom Milne, GODARD ON GODARD, (Da Capo Press, 1972), p. 173.

6. Tom Milne, GODARD ON GODARD, (Da Capo Press, 1972), p. 179.

7. Howard Becker, ART WORLDS, (Uni. of California Press, 1982), p. 57.

8. Richard Leacock, PERSONAL THOUGHTS AND PREJUDICES ABOUT THE DOCUMENTARY, (Presented at the 23rd C.I.L.E.C.T. Congress, Paris, 1987), p. 10.

2) TOOLS:

In 1981 I was in Beirut making a film in S.8 which was later transferred and edited in 1" video. As a woman alone in that environment and for the type of film I was making (a personal documentary) this medium was the only choice I had. I remember being on the Green Line in downtown Beirut (one of the hotter places in town), being led along endless corridors and stairs of demolished old houses by the head of the Phalangist fighting force. For a good part of the tour, while instructing me on what I could and could not shoot, his younger aide persisted on asking me why I wasn't using 16mm because it was more professional. Today, I would have opted for 8mm video.

Subject matter should dictate the form as well as the appropriate tools and methods of shooting. This time, I was making a feature length movie. In order not to be snubbed by fundraisers, festivals and the marketplace, I had to work in 16mm, preferably 35mm. Beauviolla's 16mm Aaton camera can be converted in three simple steps to Super-16mm. I was able to shoot 16mm film with the aspect ratio of 35mm. I saved on the cost of film and I shot handheld. If the thesis portion of the film is successful and I am able to raise money to finish it, I will blow it up to 35mm without loosing the top and bottom portion of the image, a point independent filmmakers simply had to accept in the past.

The first summer I alternated between a 12mm and 16mm Zeiss lens. The Canoe scene was shot with a Cook Zoom 9.5 to 120mm. In '88 I rented the 16mm Zeiss again and added a 25mm Zeiss which I wanted for close-ups. These prime lenses were a pleasure to work with, and they take credit for the sharpness of the images.

I used a Nagra for sound and, with the exception of the Canoe scene, where I rented two radio microphones which were wired on Bill and his father, I always used a 415 Sennheiser and a Zeppelin. By my side was a sound-person who I trained. Due to the experimental nature of this process, it was important that my characters felt comfortable with this person. Since group dynamics were a priority, I chose someone we all knew and who was dedicated to the project. (All of those who participated in the making of this experiment

dedicated many hours with no pay). Since shoots were canceled and rescheduled on moments notice. I needed someone who could be flexible. Obviously, at times, an inexperienced sound-person caused some problems, but, in retrospect, I don't regret the sacrifice. As Godard says:

> "I need people who can be at my disposal the whole time... The terrible thing is that in cinema it is so difficult to do what a painter does quite naturally: he stops, steps back, gets discouraged, starts again, changes something. He can please himself." (1)

While Hollywood can create sunshine in the middle of the night we had to literally stumble in the dark. There was a lot of trial and error during the filming; time to pause, to rethink, to come back another day and reshoot a scene a whole different way. I tried to minimize external pressures on myself and my characters, who were also struggling to find in themselves a happy medium between the real and the acted. The purpose of this experiment was to define this unusual process and draw out a set of rules. The bulk of the work has been done. What is left is the fine tuning and further application of what's been learned.

FOOTNOTES TO TOOLS

1. Tom Milne, GODARD ON GODARD, (Da Capo Press, Inc. N.Y. 1972), p. 180.

TECHNIQUE:

I shot the film as would a *cv* documentarian. I made sure that the placement of the characters gave me as much freedom of movement as possible. Re-takes were always shot differently and allowed for more options in the editing. The movement of the characters were roughly choreographed; they rested on certain key gestures coinciding with certain key words. But, for the most part, the movement of the camera was"determined by the actor". (1)

Shooting a film handheld allows for much greater flexibility. Godard occasionally uses a hand-held camera for speed:

> "I could not afford to use the usual equipment, which would have added three weeks to the schedule. Directors waste four hours over a shot which should take five minutes of actual shooting." (2)

Handheld footage also creates a certain immediacy and involves the viewer in the images. Wanting to make a film deeply rooted in reality, it was only natural for me to use a technique that enhanced realism.

The notion of inviting the unexpected played a crucial role in the making of this film, including changes to the original concept. This flexibility was key to the constant reshaping of the story as a whole, or of particular scenes which failed for some reason or another. The *cv* approach invites such changes, not to be confused with improvisation, as a great deal of preparation and discussion went into each scene.

FOOTNOTES TO TECHNIQUE

1. Jean Renoir and Roberto Rossellini interviewed by Andre Bazin, Cinema and television, a translation from France Observateur, 1959 (Media Lab Film/Video archive), p. 26.

2. Tom Milne, GODARD ON GODARD, (Da Capo Press, Inc. N. Y. 1972), p. 174.

3) CHARACTERS AND CONTENT

Using real people in controlled situations allows for natural gestures and intonations to develop the film characters. I like, for instance, the way Bill holds his cigarette and consistently blows the smoke up and away from Sabine's face, and I like her warm blooded expressive hand movements. A documentarian thrives on these intrinsic manifestations which enrich and substantiate a character's filmic personas. By choosing Sabine and Bin, I, in effect, guaranteed a substantial move away from standard stereotypical cinematic roles.

> "The star system has as one of its functions the creation of a rough character prototype which is then adjusted to the particular needs of the role." (1)

> "My own guess is that far more people went to see the movie because Robert Redford was in it than because of any festering guilt or any deep curiosity about Watergate. If I had to bet, box office-wise, on either the star system or the national conscience, I'd bet on the star system every time." (2)

There seems to be a need in today's fast paced existence for momentary reprieves as well as reality checks. An easy tendency is to allow ourselves to slip into a comfortable mode of existence, to accept and follow the rules and dogma. The entertainment network creates, as pan of its lucrative business, certain ideals of men and women which are far from reality. It is said that harsh truths never sell, but are we not insulting our viewer's intelligence? My insistence on using real people was to challenge these norms and, if successful, create two eccentric and yet very real characters. Based on real events in their lives, I also wanted to break away from the standard ingredients of mainstream cinema, like gratuitous sex and violence, predictable storyline and characters. When one considers that the primal motivation of classical Hollywood films is money, then one begins to understand why this industry in geared to creating box-office hits which

> "...ran the studio for a year and covered a whole year's worth of mistakes. Once this mentality captured the fancy of Hollywood, a whole bunch of people were trying to make the great American Hit, instead of making the great American Movie." (3)

My upstart attempt against the almighty Hollywood will hardly make a dent in the system. However, I believe in the principles for which I fight and my understanding that future technologies might open up new avenues of distribution gives me the necessary motivation to carry on.

FOOTNOTES TO SUBJECTS AND CONTENT

1. David Bordwell, CLASSICAL HOLLYWOOD CINEMA, Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology: A Film Theory Reader. Edited by Philip Rosen, (Columbia University Press, N.Y. 1986), p. 18.

2. Larry McMurtry, FILM FLAM: ESSAYS ON HOLLYWOOD, (Simon and Schuster New York, N.Y. 1987), p. 45.

3. Gene Siskel, A NIGHT A THE MOVIES, (Omni magazine, Future Films, June 1987), p. 52.

B. THE MAKING

1) PHASE ONE - SUMMER 1987:

The first summer of shooting was the most chaotic and confusing. I had a notion of what I was after, but no clear idea of how to reach it. Since I was breaking new ground, I had no real definitions, nor rules, nor examples to follow.

The making of this film was a search for the right equilibrium, an equilibrium which got defined after much effort. I wanted to be as true to Bill and Sabine as possible and my first mistake was to allow too much freedom; too much improvisation. Despite good intentions, this tended to make for longer scenes where the message took forever to be conveyed, and where Sabine and Bill's character were not getting defined clearly enough. Scenes dragged on and performances were unfocused, even listless. By being too real in a forced situation, they often ended up being boring. It was frustrating because I knew we could do better. Instead of having two intriguing people, I had created two dull characters. I was failing them and myself.

From the 1987 rushes emerged a good twenty five minutes of film with which I was very pleased. Three scenes in particular proved to us that we had, sometimes quite inadvertently, reached a good equilibrium. On the scale of fiction vs documentary, the scenes tipped towards the latter. If we could understand why they worked, then perhaps we could discern some rules to be followed in the future. These scenes were: the Canoe with Ralph, the Famous Clam Eating, and the night and dawn at the Quarry.

The Canoe:

In the film, Bill is dealing with his real father's sudden illness and imminent death. A few months before we started shooting, Ralph was diagnosed as having cancer. He was given just a few months to live. We asked him if he would like to be in the film and he agreed.

Ralph wanted to take one last canoe trip (he loved to fish). He chose a quiet river took his fishing gear and with Bill set out in one canoe. Keith (Bill's brother-in-law from the musket scene), Sabine (who took sound) and myself manned a second canoe. I used a Cook zoom lens and I rented radio microphones which were wired on Bill and his father.

This canoe trip would have happened whether or not we were going to film. I didn't want to intrude too much on their privacy and kept a certain distance during the filming. Bill and I decided just before we started, that he wouldn't force any issues on his father. With the Nagra behind me, I should have had a split line on the headphones enabling me to listen to their conversation in order to have had more control. Most of what we see is in non-sync. Only when I sensed it was appropriate, did I interrupt them and ask Bill to slate with his paddle.

Stylistically, I had intended to shoot it from a distance. I did not want myself or the viewer to intrude on this real moment. No one should have seen Ralph up close during his dry-heaves. He may not have brought up his cremation so matter of factly, and the audience may have doubted the integrity of that conversation had they seen it up close. The placidity of the scene is the key to its power. We get a good sense of Bill's relationship with his father. In the context of the illness, the quietude and warmth communicated in their conversation (laced with Bill's sardonic sense of humor) carries the scene to a level of emotionality representative of his character. This mood is further instilled by the gentleness and aloofness of the shooting.

The scene which eventually unfolds is very gentle; a father and son having idle conversation. Bill, out of the blue, asks"have you given any thought to where you would like to be buried?" As he is about to answer, Ralph is gripped by dry heaves, a symptom of his medication. When they pass he replies very unassumingly and the fishing goes on. These events were chronologically kept in the edit as they happened in reality. The purpose of this scene was to reveal Ralph's imminent death.

This is a very real and very moving scene in its unforcefulness, and is most

definitely closer to documentary than it is to fiction. Bill took control by asking the right question, but the timing of Ralph's heaves was purely accidental. It is a good example of the merging of the two genres, an equilibrium between control and non-involvement.

This scene also proved that less is better. The power of silence, of watching someone in the act of doing something, (fishing, loading guns, eating,..) can teach you as much about their character as their own words can. This scene also proved the importance of a setting and action. Being in a canoe fishing on a beautiful day placed Ralph in a very familiar setting which distracted him from the filming.

The Famous Clam Eating:

We accidentally came upon a little clam eatery. It was late in the afternoon and the sun was casting a beautiful golden light Sabine and Bill were hungry, so it seemed natural to shoot our next scene there. Besides, we needed to lead into the night at the Quarry.

What followed was a perfect mix between a planned and an improvised scene. The restaurant was called"Farnham's Famous Clams" and to my surprise as I began shooting, they began to eat the clams as if they were famous dead people. In between Jimi Hendrix, Sarah Bernhardt and the Kennedys, Bill tells Sabine what the plan of action is, that he is taking her to a "hole in the ground". Thanks to the clams, it's a funny scene.

According to the story, Bill had to tell Sabine where he was taking her next and why. It was up to him to infiltrate that dialogue into the conversation. A few intentional seeds were planted, and the scene fed by a plate of clams grew out of their genuine playfulness. I never had them repeat anything twice.

I would have to say that despite the fictional intention, this scene evolved very naturally with as little control as possible. When using non-actors, finding the right balance is crucial in obtaining a convincing performance. This is made

especially easier if the course of action or the setting is inspiring in itself. In the Famous Clam Eating scene, the act of eating became the ideal distraction and in the scene to follow, the Quarry itself offered a magnificent playground.

The Quarry:

Something magical is bound to happen when you find yourself in a place like the Quarry. When it's slightly cold and you build a big fire, the warmth naturally permeates everyone's mood. A minimalist crew was key to setting up the intimacy needed for Bill to talk about his father's real death.

I wanted to give the feeling of staying up all night and slowly let the quarry come into light We succeeded because we simply lived it and I filmed it as it happened. We shot two takes of them singing, and the rest was one-on-one. The dog appeared out of nowhere and Sabine dove into the water because she felt like it

2) PHASE TWO - SUMMER 1988:

After viewing the footage, I determined the problems which included scenes that dragged on, lack of character focus and insufficiently written dialogue. I then devised the following set of rules by which phase two shooting would be governed:

1. Less is better. If you do not have anything to say, do not say it.

2. Never repeat a take if you do not have to. Never have them repeat anything more than four times.

3. Give the characters some action to follow during the scene.

4. The setting has a presence of its own, it can be another distraction and can provide an exciting backdrop. Shoot outdoors as often as possible.

THESIS FILM REEL ONE:

Having succeeded with the Canoe scene, we needed another scene to set it up. We had Bill visit his sister Bonny and brother-in-law Keith. Bonny is giving a haircut to her son Josh. It gave her something to do. Bill teased Josh to distract him, and the scene evolved effortlessly.

Two men in the woods, loading and firing muskets, is an image worthy of cinematic attention. Since Keith built the guns himself, the process of firing was second nature to him and provided an ideal set up for Bill to ask leading questions. I had them repeat the scene several times, which gave me about four variations shot from different angles, from which to edit. The shoot occurred late in the afternoon, taking less than two hours and experiencing no dramatic change in the light.

I am very pleased with the outcome of this scene. Keith has a strong presence on film, Bill's timing was good, and our experience paid off too. Since Keith and Bonny had a tendency to keep talking during moments of silence, we applied rule number one which cut the scene length in half.

Sabine's character developed. I reshot her in New York, this time portraying the city without leaving the apartment. Since last summer, she has become more of an environmental activist and is looking for ways to manifest her convictions. We used this desire and made it her character's driving force. We coupled it with her natural boldness in taking action and created the mythical whaling expedition. I had shot a scene at a house by the sea, in Westport Mass, and liked the location. We worked it into the story and had Sabine in a dingy rowing to shore.

THESIS FILM REEL TWO:

In '88, we decided to re-shoot Bill by the fire. We wanted him to talk about Ralph differently. In '87, I had trouble focusing and I barely had any shots of Sabine. We weren't going to have her say much, but her presence in the shots made a difference. We all huddled around the fife and listened to his stories as

we recorded them. He had prepared them in his mind, and I shot them each three times. I modified each take, simplified, altered punctuation, shortened monologues, etc...

He told three stories and I made a point of shooting each one in a continuous take. The reason why the second one has cut-away is because the camera reel ended and the middle portion of my last take was out of focus on Bill. His third and last take was consistently his best.

I also wanted to reshoot it with a close-up lens. In '87 I used a 16mm Zeiss, I switched in '88 to a 25mm Zeiss. Needless to say my aperture was opened up all the way leaving me no depth of field. Focusing required a lot of concentration. This time we had plenty of wood to fuel the fire. I filmed and Sabine fed it when the flames got too low. Bill's face comes in and out of darkness at times, the flickering glow waves across their faces, the wind blows, and the fire crackles. What more did I need?

C. CONCLUSION

What does a merging of between two opposing ideologies imply and which elements of fiction and documentary were used to create the merging?

From fiction, we borrowed a narrative construction. We invented the story, created scenes, wrote dialogue, repeated takes, and I directed.

From documentary, we used real people in their real settings. The motives behind their actions were based on actual events in their lives. Their character traits were accentuation of their real personality. We used the shooting technique of *cinema verite* and most importantly, we were open to changes.

The antithesis of non-involvement is control. Combine the two, and one gets an interesting blend which leans in either direction depending on the scene. I started with a motive for a scene, found a setting and developed a framework from which I created dialogue. I discussed with them and made sure that Sabine and Bill felt in their element. The day of the shoot I set up the choreography of their movements to the camera in relation to external variables which included the quality of the light, ambient sound, backdrop, maneuverability for me and the sound-person, etc... I rehearsed the scene a couple of times, everyone went through their motions and made changes accordingly. Ideally, I shot three takes where dialogue, gestures and camera movements varied. At that point, if there was still a problem, it was either technical or the scene needed to be reworked because the shooting did not feel right or their performances needed different dialogue, delivery or more gestures.

A *cv* frame-of-mind lets you be resourceful and helps you solve problems simply. In a scene like the musket firing, there were dry leaves on the ground. I asked Bill to shuffle when I moved so that my noise would be drowned in his. In New York with Sabine, her wooden floor creaked so I put a wide board down and had her keep handling her newspaper. To light that room I installed a 500

Watt 3200k bulb in her ceiling fixture and hung a wide sheet of scrim for diffusion. I lit the background with a 500 and a 250 Watt 3200k bulb in wide porcelain fixtures we assembled ourselves.

In the fire scene Bill wore a white T-shirt and, even better, Sabine wore black and white stripped leggings, both of which helped me focus. In the scene with Bonny and Josh, I reflected more light from underneath, by stretching white sheets at our feet. Dressed in white, I blended into the background, which worked to my benefit when I viewed the rushes and saw a big patch of white reflected in her glasses when she turns twice.

The same resourcefulness applied to the sound. For example, in the Famous Clam Eating, the Nagra and the microphone rested on the bench between the characters. Sabine kept an eye on the meter during the filming.

Sometimes, a single day's work proved better than an entire two weeks of effort. An example of such a day included all the driving shots in the Mercedes, Sabine with the horses,. the Famous Clam scene, Sabine peeing in the field, Bill at the fire (reshot in '88), dawn and morning at the Quarry.

As a documentarian, I am very aware that my presence can have a considerable effect on the outcome of scenes as delicate as the Canoe. There were many times during the making of this experimental film, where a certain sacrifice had to be made, a sacrifice as seen from the point of view of a traditional director, but a perfectly natural retreat on the part of a documentarian. This even applied to the most written of scenes. The bottom line is that we are dealing with real people not actors. You learn to recognize their individual capabilities and only push against their limits to a certain point.

A *cv* mentality allowed me, like Godard's painter, to sit back, look at my work, think about it, blend the nuances between the real and the fictive colors, and paint new strokes, sometimes creating new scenery, sometimes merely livening up an existing one. The process of making the film was one of

discovery, not a "mere application of what's already been determined". The film will be interpreted as fiction, but a certain rawness suggestive of *cv* envelops the images.

The actual filming was very exciting because I had the freedom to move and respond to the characters actions. I could close-in inches from their faces, glide down in search of their hands, and wait for a movement to lead my gaze elsewhere. The dance of the camera was never arbitrary, it was"determined by the actor".

Sometimes, I directed by nudging them, or by flicking my right index (over Aaton handle) to set off a cue. The one sign they learned to recognize quickly was my left foot shaking back and forth, which meant "shut up!". Had someone documented me during filming, the range of emotions would swing from pure insanity to pure ecstasy, as Ricky Leacock so appropriately says:

> "For me there must be pleasure. I do what I do for the pleasure that is involved. I may be tried by the circumstances. I may have a terrible time getting what it is that I am after. I may not know what I am after, but when I get it I know and it gives me tremendous satisfaction. To my way of thinking the death of all creativity lies with the general and current interpretation of the word"professional," which has come to mean the opposite of its original meaning of excellence, to an implication of mechanical coldness." (1)

Despite using double perf film on the very first shoot, all the wrong exposures, uncharged batteries, sleepy soundperson, exposed rolls, etc...

Despite cramped legs, aching backs, bruises, the burning heat of flames, the endless wait for a plane or a cloud to pass, an invisible bullfrog sending in his desperate need of passion messages of love Pavoratti couldn't have matched, overriding Bill's emotional moment by the fire, which I shot accidentally at 30 frames/second...

Despite the night watchman who never went to sleep and forced us, in the dead of the night, to trail back to the car through the woods with crates of equipment, props, food, blankets, and wood.

Despite all the anger and frustration and confusion and anguish and tears, despite all of it combined and more, we did have fun, and we did smile at the end when we got it right, when we knew we could get it even better, next time.

FOOTNOTES TO CONCLUSION

1. Richard Leacock, PERSONAL THOUGHTS AND PREJUDICES ABOUT THE DOCUMENTARY, (Presented at the 23rd meeting of C.I.L.E.C.T. Congress, Paris, 1987), p. 11.

V. THE FUTURE

Distribution is a key word to independent filmmakers. Good distribution means good exposure, increased viewing audience and can open avenues for funding. Even if you want to get into a small festival circuit, you still have to comply with rules derived from industry standards. My thesis film does so only in form, not in technique, nor in treatment of matter. Having a 35mm print will open some doors, not all of them. John Sayles who directed "Return of the Secaucus Seven" and more recently "Brother from another Planet" says:

> "The two most important factors that will determine whether alternative, non-Hollywood movies get made are distribution and exhibition." (l)

Why can't you apply the same principles of publishing to movies? If only you could find a way to make your product available, and let your audience decide whether or not it wants to see your movie and pay for the viewing privilege. It would be financial suicide to open a video store whose sole products were alternative movies. It might work if placed in New York, San Francisco, Chicago, Boston, etc.., but what about the rest of the world? Do we assume that they are not interested, as the movie industry would like to have us believe?

> "It is in the nature of industries, to assume that they offer the public a good thing, and it is clearly the sole function of the public relations wing of the movie industry to keep assuring the public that in movies they (almost invariably) get a good thing." (2)

As for television, Joshua Meyrowitz says:

> "Network broadcasters have little interest in designing programs that meet the specialized needs of small segments of the audience. The key is to design a program that is least likely to be turned off, rather than a program viewers will actively seek out." (3)

According to a recent review of Mark Miller's essays described as "the most provocative writing on the subject since Marshall McLuhan" (4), the picture

Miller seems to paint of network television is an even grislier one. Advertising, the heart of capitalism, in its hunt for the dollar, has successfully saturated its audiences and created a "self-regulating system":

> "TV preempts derision by itself evincing endless irony...TV protects its ads from mockery by doing all the mocking, thereby posing as an ally to the incredulous spectator... More disquieting even than the old nightmare of conspiracy, is the likelihood that no conspiracy is needed." (5)

McLuhan said that the electronic age would involve men "deeply in one another". Ithiel de Sola Pool insists that the electronic technology needs to follow the example of the printing press, as supported by the first Amendment, because it"is conducive to freedom". (6) Perhaps then our attention should turn towards what is yet to come, or rather what is already here.

"The Media Lab is committed to making the individual the driver of information technology rather than the driven." (7) If ones computer is designed to serve ones individual needs, and can search vast information bases, then the creation of such a system inherently breaks down existing monopolies on information (print and movies), encouraging instead the birth of a larger more diverse network, which caters to more specialized audiences:

> "The time may come when producers who are denied the lease of a channel by a cablecaster will be able to send their video program to the public's home over a broadband telephone network. Cablecasters will lose their monopoly of pay video programming as well as their whole business if the phone system is cheaper." (8)

Ithiel de Sola Pool bases these contentions on advances in the development of end-to-end digital transmission and the use of optical fibers, which has the needed bandwidth.

> "The resulting system is ISDN - Integrated Services Digital Network - Phone systems are converting from analog to digital switching and to digital transmission because they are cheaper and more reliable. With it they can talk on the phone, have their utilities metered, watch a video picture on their television, and receive their electronic mail, all at once without interference." (9)

If a system is set up where anyone could lease a channel, produce or use already produced material, make it available and charge the public, then the individual is allowed to have control. By "decentralizing" existing monopolies smaller markets are created whose sole survival depend on the salability of their products, products which can be intended to meet the needs of smaller specialized audiences. There must be a percentage of the population who wants to"graze, browse and search" for alternative choices.

> "A pay system allows the audience itself to decide what will be offered. If they pay for specific programs that they wish to watch, their choices have less uniformity than in an ad-based system. People who pay for programs care about the specific content of what they buy." (10)

Even if such a system doesn't "pay off," in its start, compared to present conditions of limited festival exhibition, a wider exposure is a reward in itself. Most of us make movies because we fell in love with the medium. If we were looking for a get rich scheme, we, too could copy the Hollywood blueprints and help perpetuate them. I think it's about time the public had a chance to decide for itself.

Film costs are high, but video's race to offer an affordable alternative is rounding the final comer. Some, like Leacock see great potential in video-S. He thinks that a different kind of movie will be made, because one can have it with one at all times, record hours on end inexpensively, shoot in low light conditions, and with a small video editing system, edit at home. As for a move away from traditional linear storytelling, videodisc sparked with its introduction an infinite number of applications to interactive storytelling. This is the shape of things to come. New technologies intrinsically emancipate existing ideologies.

For the distant future, Eric Drexler paints what seems to be a fantastic world, where:

"Nanotechnology will make possible high resolution screens that project different images to each eye; the result will be three-dimensional television so real that the screen seems like a window into another world... A suit and helmet could simulate most of the sights and sensations of an entire environment, whether real or imaginary. Nanotechnology will make possible vivid art forms and fantasy worlds far more absorbing than any book, game, or movie." (11)

Until man creates such a technology which brings us closer to and beyond a"recreation of the world in its own image" (12), those of us who want to continue making linear movies, will have to"infiltrate the subsoil, in order to excavate invisible galleries." (13)

FOOTNOTE TO CHAPTER V

1. John Sayles, A NIGHT AT THE MOVIES (Omni magazine, Future Films, June 1987), p. 50.

2. Lanoy McMurtry, FILM FLAM: ESSAYS ON HOLLYWOOD, (Simon & Schuster New York, N.Y. 1987), p. 41.

3. Joshua Meyrowitz, NO SENSE OF PLACE: THE IMPACT OF ELECTRONIC MEDIA ON SOCIAL BEHAVIOR, (Oxford University Press, New York, London, 1985), p. 73.

4. Sven Birkerts, THE HIPNESS UNTO DEATH: a review of Mark Crisping Miller's BOXED IN: THE CULTURE OF TV, (Northwester University Press, 1988), (The Atlantic magazine, September 1988), p. 94.

5. Ibid, p. 96.

6. Ithiel de Sola Pool, TECHNOLOGIES OF FREEDOM: ON FREE SPEECH IN AN ELECTRONIC AGE, (The Belknap Press, New York, N.Y. 1986), p. 231.

7. Stewart Brand, THE MEDIA LAB: INVENTING THE FUTURE AT MIT, (Viking Penguin, New York, N.Y. 1987), p. 255.

8. Pool, p. 176.

9. Pool, p. 177.

10. Pool, p. 184.

11. Eric K. Drexler, ENGINES OF CREATION: THE COMING ERA OF NANOTECHNOLOGY, (Anchor Press/Doubleday, New York, N.Y. 1987), p. 233.

12. Andre Bazin, WHAT IS CINEMA?, (Berkley University of California Press, Berkley, Los Angeles, London, 1982), p. 21.

13. Bazin, p. 74.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS:

Barsam Meran Richard. <u>Nonfiction Film: A critical history</u>. E.P. Dutton & CO., INC. New York, N. Y. 1973.

Bazin Andre. <u>What Is Cinema?</u> Berkley University of California Press, Berkley and Los Angeles, C.A. 1967.

Becker Howard S. <u>Art Worlds</u>. University of California Press, Berkley, Los Angeles, London, 1982.

Brand Steward. <u>The Media Lab: Inventing the future at MIT</u>. Viking Penguin, New York, N.Y. 1987.

Drexler Eric K. <u>Engines ofCreation: The coming era of nanotechnology</u>. Anchor Press/Doubleday, New York, N.Y. 1987.

Hillier Jim, editor. <u>Cahirs du Cinema: The 1950's. Neo-Realism, Hollywood, New Wave</u>. Harvard University Press, 1985.

Kawin Bruce F. <u>Mindscreen: Bergman, Godard. and First-Person Film</u>. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 1978.

Langer Susanne K. <u>Philosophy in a New Key: A study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art</u>. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA., London, England. 1957.

MacCabe Colin. <u>Godard: Images, Sounds, Politics</u>. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, England. 1980.

McLuhan Marshall. <u>Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man</u>. A Mentor/Penguin Publication, New York, N. Y. 1964.

Mast Gerald. <u>A short History of the Movies</u>. MacMillan Publishing Co. New York, London. 1986.

Meyrowitz Joshua. <u>No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behavior</u>. Oxford University Press, New York, London, 1985.

McMurtry Larry. <u>Film Flam: Essays on Hollywood</u>. Simon & Schuster Trade Division, New York, N.Y. 1987.

Milne Tom, translator & editor. <u>Godard on Godard</u>. A Da Capo Press, Inc. New York, N.Y. 1972.

Pool Ithiel de Sola. <u>Technoloies 0f Freedom: On free speech in an electronic Age</u>. The Belknap Press of Harvard University, Cambridge, M.A. and London, England. 1983.

Rosen Philip, editor. <u>Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology: A film Theory Reader</u>. Columbia University Press, New York, N.Y. 1986.

Talbot Daniel, editor. <u>Film: an anthology</u>. University of California Press, Berkley, Los Angeles, London. 1959.

Tudor Andrew. <u>Theories of Film</u>. Secker and Warbur & British Film Institute, London, England. 1974.

Turkle Sherry. <u>The Second Self: Computers and the Human Spirit</u>. Simon and Schuster, New York, N.Y. 1984.

Press, Athens, Ohio, 1987. Wollen Peter. <u>Semiotic Counter-Strategies: Readings and Writings</u>. Verso Editions and NLB, London, England. 1982.

MAGAZINES AND PERIODICALS:

<u>A night at the movies</u>, Omni magazine, Future Films, June 1987.

Andre Bazin, <u>Wide Angle: A film Quarterly of theory, criticism, and practice</u>. Vol. 9, No. 4. Ohio University

Birkerts Sven, <u>The Hipness unto Death, a review of Mark Crispin Miller's Boxed In: The Culture of TV</u>, The Atlantic Magazine, Septempber 1988.

Davenport Glorianna, <u>Software Considerations For Multimedia Video Projects</u>. Paper written for Video Extension Technical Meeting, Bellcore, June 9-10, 1988.

Davenport Glorianna, <u>New Orleans in Transition, 1983-1986: The Interactive Delivery of a Cinematic Case Study</u>. Revised for The International Congress for Design Planning and Theory, Boston, August 19, 1987.

<u>Glorianna Davenport</u>. an interview in Tech Talk, MIT, Cambridge, MA. March 9, 1988.

Leacock Richard, <u>Personal Thoughts and Prejudices about the Documentary</u> Presented at the 23rd C.I.L.E.C.T. Congress, Paris. MIT.

Leacock Richard, <u>Working with Flaherty</u>. MIT Film/Video Group. 1985.

Leacock Richard, <u>Technology and Reality at the Movies</u>. Technology Review, Vol. 75, No. 4, February, 1973, MIT, Cambridge, M.A.

<u>Rossellini, Renoir, interviewed by Andre Bazin</u>. Cinema and television, a translation from France Observateur, 1959 (Media Lab Film Nideo archive).