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GERMAN EXPRESSIONISM  GERMANY (EST. 1919 - 1931)

As the name suggests, German expressionist filmmakers used visual distortion and hyper-expressive performance to show inner turmoils, fears and desires of that era. German Expressionism reflects the inner conflicts of its 1920s German audience by giving their woes an inescapably external presence. By rejecting cinematic realism, expressionist films showcase dramatic, revolutionary interpretations of the human condition.

How German Expressionism began

In 1916, the German government decided to ban all foreign films. With a sudden demand for more domestic titles, there was an understandably dramatic increase in the number of films produced in Germany each year. However, German audiences had become less preferential towards romance and action flicks since the beginning of WWI, and themes of violence, cruelty and betrayal become more relevant topics for discussion. This unfortunate set of circumstances, along with the constant fear of hyperinflation, provided a platform for daring, innovative filmmakers such as Fritz Lang (Metropolis) and F.W. Murnau (Nosferatu) to make German Expressionism one of the most important and influential movements in cinematic history.

"I am profoundly fascinated by cruelty, fear, horror and death. My films show my preoccupation with violence, the pathology of violence." - Fritz Lang

Unlike most other cinematic movements, Expressionism doesn't solely belong to filmmaking, and existed prior to the invention of cinema. Fortunately, this helps us understand Expressionist principles and how they were utilized by filmmakers. Consider Edvard Munch's The Scream, arguably the most famous Expressionist painting of all time; you can clearly see how the concept allows moods to be expressed by creative distortion. It shows an impression of a scene, as opposed to its physical reality. On film, this ideology can apply to every aspect of the creative process, from dream-like set designs to melodramatic on-screen performances. For this reason, German Expressionist cinema also has close-knit ties to architectural design. Films such as The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari and Metropolis are often studied as perfect examples of how set design can be used to create a world that is aesthetically controlled by the film's emotional instructions.

German Expressionism Portrays a Subjective, Emotional World Rather Than An Objective Reality

The movement radically challenged conventional filmmaking at the time, and has provided food for thought for the industry ever since. Today, the enduring influence of German Expressionism can be seen throughout the medium, with critically acclaimed directors such as Ridley Scott and Tim Burton consistently taking influence from Expressionist work. On a broader scale, German Expressionism's
enduring impact within the horror genre cannot be overstated, helping to shape the genre’s frameworks upon which the entire genre still relies.

**German Expressionist films**

From The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari to Nosferatu, the trend for shadows, angst and exaggerated sets in 1920s German cinema laid the foundations for everything from film noir to the horror genre.

Pamela Hutchinson, Alex Barrett 8 June 2017

German Expressionism is one of the most recognisable styles of silent cinema, although it can sometimes be slippery to define. Expressionism is an artistic mode that first appeared in poetry and the visual arts at the beginning of the 20th century, before moving into fields such as theatre, architecture and cinema following the First World War. Offering a subjective representation of the world, Expressionism descends partly from German Romanticism and reveals the angst of its human figures through their distorted, nightmarish surroundings.

In cinema it is most particularly associated with tilting, impossible sets, high angles and deep shadows. The Italian term chiaroscuro is often used to describe the high-contrast arrangement of light and darkness, but German film critic Lotte Eisner preferred a term from her own language: Helldunkel, which she defined as “a sort of twilight of the German soul, expressing itself in shadowy, enigmatic interiors, or in misty, insubstantial landscapes”.

German Expressionist cinema flourished after the battlefield horrors of the war, and the economic devastation caused by its aftermath. There are a few films that can be described as pure German Expressionism, such as the landmark The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari (1920), but while the movement thrived during the Weimar years, it became diluted and intermixed with other styles, including the ‘Neue Sachlichkeit’ (new objectivity) of realist street films. This variation would endure for decades in the sharp angles and pooling shadows of classic film noir.

[www.movementsinfilm.org](http://www.movementsinfilm.org)

**DOGME 95**

**DENMARK (EST. 1995 - 2005)**

On March 13, 1995, a Parisian conference was held to celebrate 100 years of film. Appropriately named Le cinéma vers son deuxième siècle, the event was specifically focused on cinema’s second
century and had invited Danish director Lars von Trier to speak. Prior to his speech, audience members (which included many of the film industry’s most respected names) were handed red pamphlets that would formally announce Dogme 95.

Together with Thomas Vinterberg, Trier had created a manifesto that deliberately mimicked Truffaut’s Une certaine tendance du cinema, the Cahiers du cinéma article that kickstarted the French New Wave in 1954. Within their manifesto, Trier and Vinterberg compiled a “Vow of Chastity”, in which they laid out the strict terms that would determine whether or not a film could be considered part of the Dogme 95 movement.

Shooting must be performed on location, without providing props or sets that don’t logically exist within that setting

Diegetic sound only. Sounds must never be produced, such as music that does not exist within the scene

All shots must be handheld. Movement, immobility and stability must be attained by hand

The film must be in colour, with no special lighting. If there’s not enough exposure, a single lamp may be attached to the camera

There can be no optical work or lens filters

No 'superficial' action (such as staged murders, elaborate stunts etc.)

Geographical alienation is strictly forbidden, meaning the film must take place here and now

No genre movies

Academy 35mm is the only accepted film format

Directors must not be credited

Compared to any other movement in film history, Dogme 95 is perhaps the easiest to define thanks to the hard lines drawn by this manifesto. Although these restrictions would certainly alienate many filmmakers from participating in the movement, the specificity of Vinterberg and Trier’s Vows of Chastity clearly outlines how the Dogme 95 manifesto planned to change cinema’s future.

"If one devalues rationality, the world tends to fall apart.” - Lars von Trier,

First and foremost, Dogme 95 intended to generate a greater focus on the values of traditional storytelling, performance and specific themes. With an emphasis on these core aspects of filmic storytelling, Dogme 95 was a backlash against the over-reliance on technology such as special effects
and groundbreaking digital tools. In this way, the movement was in direct opposition to commercial studio filmmaking at the time, and was a clear attempt to give greater power to independent creative team.

The movement would consequently form a Dogme 95 collective that included filmmakers from around the world. Also known as the ‘Dogme 95 Brethren,’ this saw Kristian Levring and Søren Kragh-Jacobsen join Vinterberg and Lars von Trier, all of whom created titles that obeyed the Vows of Chastity. However, not all films would strictly abide by every rule. When submitting a film for consideration, the director was required to ‘confess’ the ways in which they have failed to comply with their vows. For example, when submitting Julien Donkey-Boy, Harmony Korine noted a series of rule-bending during the film’s production. This ranged from faking Chloë Sevigny’s pregnant belly to buying a batch of raw cranberries.

“In joining the Dogme Brotherhood … I proudly abandon-ed those cinema tactics that I have been brought up in. And in doing this, I succumbed to a religious-like semi-calvinist fervour. But, as when I was a child, the temptation to sin was always a romantic option.” - Harmony Korine

Three years after the manifesto’s announcement, the first official Dogme 95 film was released by Vinterberg. Titled The Celebration (Festen), the film was an instant critical success, winning the Jury Prize at the 1998 Cannes Film Festival.

"I think Dogme was inspiring for quite a few peoples and sort of started a digital movement. Personally, I found it extremely uplifting and fantastic making Dogme movies, but I felt I completed it with 'The Celebration.' I think that was the end of the road on Dogme for me. It was as far as I could go." - Thomas Vinterberg

There are 35 Dogme films in total, with Lars von Trier remaining the most internationally recognised figure from the movement. Just like Vinterberg, he would eventually deviate from the Vows of Chastity’s constraints, in search of new challenges as cinema entered the 21st Century.
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ITALIAN NEOREALISM

ITALY (EST. 1943 - 1954)

Years before the French New Wave would be celebrated for its guerilla filmmaking techniques, neorealist directors such as Luchino Visconti, Vittorio De Sica and Federico Fellini redefined how filmmakers could implement honest portrayals of life on the big screen. With an emphasis on holding a mirror up to society, the neorealist movement strived to portray real world struggles in the aftermath of WWII, and did so to great effect.
Throughout WWII, Benito Mussolini’s government had led the nation into political and economic uncertainty, and Italy’s film industry was consequently in turmoil. In an attempt to disrupt the production of propaganda, the prestigious Cinecittà film studios were severely damaged by the allied forces, making the studio unusable for the foreseeable future. This ultimately forced Italian directors to seek alternative filmmaking practices, despite having few options to choose from.

Simultaneously, a group of critics writing for Cinema had become gravely disillusioned by ‘Telefoni Bianchi’ flicks – commercial films that imitated American comedies and had no interest in the struggles of the working class. Although this frustration towards conservative, escapist cinema was somewhat suppressed in print (in fact, Cinema’s editor-in-chief was the son of Mussolini himself), the popular belief that the industry was no longer creating films relevant to the public prevailed. This, along with the destruction of Cinecittà film studios, led to a sudden shift in Italian cinematic storytelling, both in terms of filmmaking techniques and the topics of discussion. These two defining factors would ultimately lead to the rise of neorealism.

With a severe lack of resources but an abundance of real world issues to address, Italian filmmakers who had previously shot traditional productions at Cinecittà film studios were now taking to the streets with minimal equipment, non-professional actors and an unbreakable belief in their sociopolitical purpose. The end of WWII and the consequent end of German occupation then allowed the neorealist movement to thrive artistically, discussing sociopolitical turmoils and real world struggles in a way that was never possible under Mussolini’s rule.

"I try to capture reality, nothing else." - Roberto Rossellini

The movement gained international attention when Roberto Rossellini’s Rome, Open City won the Grande Prize at the 1946 Cannes Film Festival, and Italian Neorealism’s brutally honest portrayals of the working class and their enduring struggles became known as the country’s cinematic ‘golden era’ – a title that it undeniably deserves.
George Orwell, the Old Etonian who documented working-class life in The Road to Wigan Pier. There was Graham Greene (Berkhamsted School and Oxford), who expressed various left-wing views (although this did not prevent him complaining, in a letter to his wife, that in Nottingham, “One sees absolutely no one here of one’s own class... It destroys democratic feelings at birth”).

Then there were the young documentary makers. In BBC Four’s fascinating Britain Through a Lens – a documentary about the documentary – we learn about the origins of this form of film, from the late 1920s to the mid 1940s. But we also learn about how it was born out of a desire both to champion and to aid the working class – often by members of the middle class. As one early participant in the “British Documentary Movement” of the time dryly remarked, “A documentary maker must be a gentleman, a Socialist, have a university education, a private income, his own car, a nasal voice, and have made some sort of film. A well-developed nasal voice has been known to excuse the other requirements – except being a gentleman and a socialist, of course.”

The most important figure in the birth of the British documentary film was a Scot, John Grierson, the son of a schoolteacher. After studying English and Moral Philosophy at Glasgow University, he began postgraduate research into propaganda in newspapers and film – and then set out to make a kind of propaganda himself. “I look on cinema as a pulpit,” he declared – a pulpit from which to preach about how the working class really lived, and to show the middle and upper classes how much their comfort depended on working-class labour.

In 1929, employed by the government-funded Empire Marketing Board Film Unit, he made his first documentary. Titled Drifters, and running to 80 minutes, it followed – without voice-over – the work of herring fishermen in the North Sea. The public – or at least the sections of it that had no experience of such draining toil – had never seen anything like it; the British cinema, till now, had shown either fiction (usually about the well-heeled) or news. The documentary was a portal to an unfamiliar world.

In 1931, he helped produce Industrial Britain. This latest documentary, unlike Drifters, had a voice-over – delivered in an exemplary cut-glass accent. The same was true of Housing Problems, a 1935 documentary about the horrors of East End slums: its narrator describes “a block of flets”, and renders “here” as “hyah”. Britain’s early documentary makers may well have wanted to celebrate the working class, but they evidently didn’t feel the country was ready for a working-class narrator. Still, working-class voices were heard in Housing Problems – it was the first documentary to feature interviews. This was the idea of Grierson’s sister, Ruby, who wanted to hear what the slum-dwellers had to say about their vermin-infested homes (she apparently told them, “It’s your chance to tell the b------s what it’s really like to live in a slum”). This documentary was funded not by the government but by the British Commercial Gas Association, which stood to make a handsome profit out of the rebuilding work the documentary was calling for. In a sense, Housing Problems was a case not only
of the middle class trying to help the working class, but the rich trying to help the poor – even if only out of capitalist self-interest.

The year after, 1936, saw the release of the period’s best-known documentary: Night Mail, a tribute to postal workers, featuring music by Benjamin Britten and verse by Auden. Again, the purpose was to hail the ordinary working man, but you need only to read Auden’s lines to see that they were written with an upper- or middle-class voice in mind: he uses “course” and “across” as a rhyme.

Another striking characteristic of these early documentaries is their crispness: occasionally Britain Through a Lens drops in clips from documentaries of the 1980s, and their inferiority in picture quality is puzzling. The 1930s and 40s footage, all in black-and-white, is clear, vivid, stirring, particularly in the films of Humphrey Jennings, once acclaimed as “the only real poet that British cinema has yet produced”. But the 1980s footage, in colour, is bathed in a wan, drab, sickly light, as in a men’s public lavatory. In documentary, the distant past appears to be ageing better than the recent.

A more significant comparison, though, is between attitudes to social class then and now. In the 1930s, middle-class producers made films extolling the working class; in the 21st century, middle-class producers make reality TV series, from Big Brother to Geordie Shore, in which the working class is held up to ridicule. John Grierson, one suspects, would probably not have rejoiced.
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Movie movements that defined cinema: Czech New Wave

Czech New Wave defined cinema in the 60’s

By Phil De Semlyen, Ian Freer, Ally Wybrew | Posted 8 Aug 2016

Key filmmakers: Jaromil Jires, Jan Nemec, Milos Forman, Vera Chytilova, Ivan Passer, Jiri Menzel, Jan Kadar

Key dates: 1962-1968

What is it? Not so much a formal movement as a loose collective of filmmakers with a passion for taking the piss out of communists, the Czech New Wave put plenty of noses out of joint on the greyer side of the Iron Curtain. Its tart and often hilarious takes on the fumbling regimes of the time emerged from Prague’s famed FAMU film school, which turned out gifted directors galore. When one of them, Jiri Menzel (‘Jiri Dazeem’, if you’re John Travolta), claimed the Oscar for Best Foreign Film in 1967 with his comic masterpiece Closely Watched Trains, they were suddenly a force on the
world stage too. Like many of his peers’ films, Menzel’s bildungsroman took its inspiration from
Czech literature. He adapted novelist Bohumil Hrabal’s tale of a young railway worker in World War II into a wistful comic classic in the best tradition of great coming-of-age films, with unrequited love, sexy nurses and foiled Nazis galore.

Satirical in an equally sly way, Milos Forman and Ivan Passer’s The Fireman’s Ball was a communist roast so spiky, it was banned by the ruling regime forever. As the Prague Spring fomented resistance to Soviet occupation, Forman – who would head to Hollywood in 1971 and later win Oscars for One Flew Over The Cuckoo’s Nest and Amadeus – could be found at Barrandov Studios working alongside Passer, Menzel, Ivan Kadar and Vera Chytilova (the so-called “first lady of Czech cinema”) to define the country’s cinema. Then, of course, the Soviets put a stop to all that by banning their films. It being extremely hard to argue with a man in a tank, the movement petered out in the early 1970s.

What to watch: The Loves Of A Blonde (1965) (pictured above), The Shop On Main Street (1965), Closely Watched Trains (1967) (pictured top), The Fireman’s Ball (1967)

What did it influence? Ken Loach, among others. He picked Closely Observed Trains as the film he’d most want to share with future generations.

Trivia: Kirk Douglas sent Milos Forman a copy of Ken Kesey’s One Flew Over The Cuckoo’s Nest in 1966. It was confiscated by Czech customs. Forman finally made it a decade later.

What to say: “Communism was like living in fear that was boring.” (Milos Forman)
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Soviet Montage Films (1924 - 1933)

Because Soviet Montage is so entwined with the history of the U.S.S.R. and the Russian Revolution, reading up on the early beginnings of the movement can feel more like a history in politics and propaganda than the history of making films, but this is bound to happen when a state attempts to seize complete control of a nation’s entire film industry’s production, distribution and exhibition. The ways in which communism shaped the use of montage theory is inseparable to the movement as a whole, and without the historical context it would be hard to differentiate the desires of the Soviet Union and the experimental intrigue from filmmakers residing within it. While France and Germany embraced avant garde cinematic techniques immediately after WWI, the political turmoil of the U.S.S.R. meant that Russia would not have a coherent, sustainable movement until the 1920s.
After the Bolshevik revolution, Narkompros (the People' Commissariat of Education) was established until the new government could take complete control the film industry. The Soviet Union was still in a state of civil war at this point, and the industry continued to struggle. Lenin would finally nationalize the film industry entirely in 1919, causing production companies to be dissolved. This meant, however, that an entire generation of filmmakers would disappear. With this in mind, the nation's State Film School was founded in the same year, and director Lev Kuleshov, who had previously made an impression with his film Engineer Prite's Project, was invited to create his own workshop within the institute. His task was to train those who the Soviets deemed more important to the film industry, including filmmakers and actors alike.

Under the New Economic Policy, a limited amount of privately owned production companies were allowed to create films. By this time, the government had placed film as a priority, with Lenin famously saying "Of all the arts, for us the cinema is most important."

Kino-Eye (1924) by director Dziga Vertov

The film centers on a joyful Soviet village and its community of young Pioneers. The production is also the origin for the term, Kino-Eye, which became a popular technique throughout the movement.

The Extraordinary Adventures of Mr. West in the Land of the Bolsheviks (1924 by director Lev Kuleshov

Following the hilarious exploits of an American outsider, Mr. West visits the land of the Bolsheviks. The film explores the common misconceptions perceived by Americans, and how seeing the reality of Soviet people could build a better relationship between the two nations.

The film is the first feature film to come from Kuleshov's workshop at the State Film School.

Battleship Potemkin (1925) Bronenosets Potemkin by director Sergei M. Eisenstein (as S.M. Eisenstein)

During the Russian Revolution of 1905, a battleship's crew commit mutiny against their tyrannical officer. Meanwhile, a street protest causes the death of numerous police officers.

During the same year, Sovkino, a new government-owned distribution monopoly, was formed.

The Death Ray (1925) Luch smerti by director Lev Kuleshov

A Soviet engineer invents a death ray, allowing him to explode fuel mixtures. An intelligence agent steals the invention and uses it to suppress the many labor strikes across the country. Workers then seek to reclaim the device and use it to reclaim their safety.
Strike (1925) Stachka by director Sergei M. Eisenstein

Set before the Russian Revolution began, the film centers on oppressed workers organizing a strike due to their dire conditions.

Mother (1926) Mat by director Vsevolod Pudovkin

Based on The Mother by Maxim Gorky, Mother tells the story of the 1905 Russian Revolution. The film is the first instalment in Pudovkin's ‘Revolutionary Trilogy’, which also includes The End of St. Petersburg and Storm Over Asia.
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Movie movements that defined cinema: New German Cinema

New German Cinema

By Willow Green | Posted 8 Aug 2016

Key filmmakers: Rainer Werner Fassbinder (pictured above), Werner Herzog, Alexander Kluge, Volker Schlöndorff, Helma Sanders-Brahms, Hans-Jürgen Syberberg, Margarethe von Trotta, Wim Wenders

Key dates: 1968-1982

What is it? New German Cinema or ‘Neuer Deutscher Film’ (or ‘Das Sexy Fassbinder Ones With The Ladies Und Der Boobies’) emerged like a sapling from the country’s moribund postwar film industry. Culturally the country, still 20 years from farewelling Lenin, was at a low ebb. The Red Army Faction was spreading terror, the nation split down the middle and Western rock stars were soon polishing off Berlin's heroin supplies. Into this void, like an answer to West German cineastes' prayers, came three greats: Rainer Werner Fassbinder, Werner Herzog and Wim Wenders, as well as a phalanx of other talents that included female directors like Helma Sanders-Brahms and Margarethe von Trotta. They took 1962's Oberhausen Manifesto, a call to arms by 26 disillusioned German filmmakers, as their springboard, parlaying its unofficial mantra “Papa’s Kino ist tot” (“Papa’s cinema is dead”) into brain-bending new visions of what cinema could be when its creators really set their minds to it.

Their ambitions were only matched by their productivity during an incredible ten years in German cinema. When Herzog wasn’t thinking about hauling steamboats around South America, he was striking up sparky relationships with Bruno Schleinstein, a street musician better known as Bruno S., and the often barely-hinged Klaus Kinski. While Herzog was exploring man’s inner essence – the beast inside – in Aguirre, Heart Of Glass and The Enigma Of Kaspar Hauser, Fassbinder dwelt on his
capacity for artifice and elaborate parlour games (The Bitter Tears Of Petra Von Kant, Fox And His Friends) and Wenders headed for the open road that would eventually lead to Paris, Texas.


What did it influence? The death of the prolific Fassbinder in 1982 after a drug overdose robbed the movement of its prime mover, but he left his mark on young American film lovers like Richard Linklater and Quentin Tarantino. Also, about a million pretentious students.

Trivia: Krautrockers Can recorded the soundtrack for Wim Wenders’ Alice In The Cities in less than a day.

What to say: “The old film is dead. We believe in the new one.” (The Oberhausen Manifesto)
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Movie movements that defined cinema: the French New Wave

The French New Wave was a defining moment in cinema

By Phil De Semlyen, Ian Freer, Ally Wybrew | Posted 8 Aug 2016

Key filmmakers: Alain Resnais, Jean-Luc Godard, François Truffaut, Agnès Varda, Éric Rohmer, Claude Chabrol, Jacques Rivette, Jacques Demy

Key dates: 1959-1964

What is it? Fresh, funky and completely new, the filmmakers of the French New Wave – the ‘nouvelle vague’ if you want to be all Gallic about it – were smart, experimental and, crucially, French. Inspired by hardboiled American mavericks like Sam Fuller and Don Siegel, whose films they’d grown up on, they rejected formalism and tradition in favour of a punky new ethos. Instead of the long takes of stylists like Max Ophüls, the so-called “Cinéma du Papa” of the maligned René Clément or the theatricality of Marcel Carné, Jean-Luc Godard, François Truffaut and their peers were egged on by fellow film writer André Bazin and mainlined jolts of energy into their films with
jump cuts, non-linear narratives, improvisation and plain old-fashioned, devil-may-care cool. All of a sudden, film could be rap as well as poetry.

Godard and Truffaut are the figures most associated with it, but it was arguably their fellow Cahiers du Cinema-er, Claude Chabrol, who kicked things off with his nouvelle vague-lite drama Le Beau Serge in 1958. From then on it was iconic moment after iconic moment. Think of Jean-Paul Belmondo’s fag-ash fatalism and Jean Seberg’s woodsprite charm in Breathless; Jean-Pierre Léaud’s fourth-wall-shattering defiance on the beach in The 400 Blows; the temporal mayhem of Last Year At Marienbad. Think cool hats and defiant spirits. It wasn’t all pixie crops and t-shirts, though. Dividing across the Seine, Left Bank directors like Alain Resnais and Chris Marker took a more consciously artistic approach with experimental films like Hiroshima Mon Amour and La Jetée, as their cine-literate Cahiers peers were tearing up the rulebook altogether.

What to watch: The 400 Blows (1959), Hiroshima Mon Amour (1959), Breathless (1960), Jules And Jim (1962), Cléo From 5 To 7 (1962), Bande À Part (1964), Pierrot Le Fou (1965)

What did it influence? Any film movement prefixed by the word ‘new’ (New Hollywood, New German, the Czech New Wave etc.) carries a debt to Godard and co., although John Cassavetes was blazing a similar trail on the other side of the Atlantic in the late ’50s. The enduring impact of the movement can be felt in movies as diverse as The Life Aquatic (which quotes directly from Jules And Jim), Pulp Fiction and The Conversation. It was also for the nouvelle vague filmmakers that American critic Andrew Sarris coined the term “auteur theory” and the arguments over what it means and who it applies to haven’t stopped since. Thanks Andrew.

Trivia: Quentin Tarantino’s production company, A Band Apart, is named after Godard’s Bande À Part.

What to say: “Chris Marker, Alain Resnais and Agnès Varda spearheaded the more studied, Rive Gauche-style school of New Wave directors.”

What not to say: “Anyone got a copy of the script?”

THE POLISH SCHOOL

Key dates: 1955-1963
What is it? Some movie movements are unofficial, loose and at best the product of a few filmmakers who might not even be Facebook friends. Not so the Polish School. This was a tight-knit group of film grads who emerged from the famous Lodz Film School in the late '50s. They’d gathered in the school’s rectorate building to watch American and European films that had been allowed into the country after Khrushchev’s post-Stalin thaw, and those influences are visible in works that addressed the scars of war and repression with stylish elan, like jazz musicians playing a requiem mass.

They worked together as graduates too. Jerzy Skolimowski and Roman Polanski collaborated on Knife In The Water, Skolimowski and Andrzej Wajda on Innocent Sorcerers, and they had each had been bereaved by the war: Wadja’s father had been killed by the Russians, Skolimowski’s by the Germans, while Roman Polanski’s mother was murdered in Auschwitz. Their films, while differing in focus (Polanski’s interest was psychology, Wajda’s identity), shared a flair that would make the movement’s name outside Poland. Tragedy struck in 1961 when Andrzej Munk was killed driving back from Auschwitz where he was filming Passenger.


What did it influence? The so-called Polish ‘cinema of moral anxiety’ – a fun-loving bunch – emerged from Lodz with names like Krzysztof Kieslowski, Krzysztof Zanussi and Agnieszka Holland to the fore. Polanski, of course, conquered Hollywood in the '70s.

Trivia: Polish sunglasses’ sales soared on the back of Zbigniew Cybulski’s look in Ashes And Diamonds.
expectations of what Hollywood films could be. Representing a productive union between studio
and director in which the director takes creative control of the film, New Hollywood resulted in
commercially viable pictures that explored previously taboo subjects in innovative new ways.

New Hollywood isn’t so much a style of filmmaking as it is a movement and a period of time. It refers
to a post-Hays liberation of creativity ushered in by a generation of young filmmakers who took the
primary authorial role away from studios and into their own hands. Their style, production process
and storytelling approach opposed what people expected of Hollywood films prior to this point. No
longer were studio films produced solely for commercial gain; instead, the studio system worked in
conjunction with viewing film as an art and reviving creativity of expression. Author filmmakers
explored unconventional storytelling techniques, examined risky subjects and did it in style, on
Hollywood’s dime.

Televisions started appearing in homes in the 1950s, disrupting the comfortable Hollywood status
quo. By the 1960s, attitudes were shifting and commercial success was down as the “Golden Age” of
Hollywood became a distant memory. The big-budget studio productions were failing to draw
crowds, and some of the most expensive films ever made were flops that shoved studio funds down
the tubes. With the Production Code disbanded and studios scrambling for something new, clever
young filmmakers saw an opportunity to create lower-budget, uniquely engaging films. New waves
of cinema coming from Europe and Japan were making their way through American film schools, as
the likes of Jean-Luc Godard, Federico Fellini and Ingmar Bergman became all the rage among
American cinephiles. From this cinephilia, New Hollywood was born.

The first films generally attributed to the New Hollywood movement are Arthur Penn’s Bonnie and
Clyde (1967) and Mike Nichols’ The Graduate (1967). These films ignored taboos and appealed to
the youth, addressing sex and violence with now iconic moments in motion picture history. While
Mrs. Robinson was trying to seduce a young Dustin Hoffman with that legendary under-the-leg shot,
this new brand of filmmaking was bewitching audiences and generations of eventual filmmakers.
These films were centered on complex themes with morally ambiguous messages, reflecting the
nonconforming generation disillusioned by Vietnam, upset with the elite and rich with
contemplation, which re-tooled American film into a means of looking critically at the country’s
history and future.

Arthur Penn and Warren Beatty first collaborated on Mickey One in 1965. After Bonnie and Clyde
was passed from Francois Truffaut to Godard to Warren Beatty and finally to Penn, the latter was
originally reluctant to take the directorial chair. But it didn’t take long before he realized Bonnie and
Clyde isn’t just another gangster picture but a searing social commentary on violence and hypocrisy
in America in the 1960s. It is a period crime story with a contemporary lesson.

While the studio, Warner Brothers, was still blind to the untapped potential of what would be the
New Hollywood movement, they gave Penn and Beatty free reign to fill the film’s cast with unknown
stage actors like Gene Hackman and Estelle Parsons and to shoot the film in Texas. When the film
was complete, the studio and its executives hated it, as did middle-brow film critics at a number of
national papers. Only Pauline Kael of The New Yorker praised the film (she would go on to offer the
same congratulations to The Graduate). Then Bonnie and Clyde did well in Europe, and it was Time’s
cover story and “best movie of the year.” When Warner Brothers re-released the film in America, it
became one of the biggest money-makers of the era and was nominated for ten Academy Awards. The possibilities afforded by this elevated, disaffected, auteur-driven filmmaking became clear.

As the culture of American cinema widened after Bonnie and Clyde and The Graduate, many European directors came to join the movement so that they could couple their artistic desires with Hollywood budgets. Roman Polanski, Stanley Kubrick, Milos Foreman and John Boorman all crafted some of their best work within the wave of New Hollywood’s current. Their films boasted an outsider approach that spoke to New Hollywood’s nature of exploring and exposing American morality with a fresh eye.

Film studies professor and author Todd Berliner believes five principles govern the narrative strategies characteristic of Hollywood films of the New Hollywood movement:

"Seventies films show a perverse tendency to integrate, in narratively incidental ways, story information and stylistic devices counterproductive to the films’ overt and essential narrative purposes.

Hollywood filmmakers of the 1970s often situate their film-making practices in between those of classical Hollywood and those of European and Asian art cinema.

Seventies films prompt spectator responses more uncertain and discomforting than those of more typical Hollywood cinema.

Seventies narratives place an uncommon emphasis on irresolution, particularly at the moment of climax or in epilogues, when more conventional Hollywood movies busy themselves tying up loose ends.

Seventies cinema hinders narrative linearity and momentum and scuttles its potential to generate suspense and excitement."


The New Hollywood era lasted until around 1980, when big-budget Hollywood pictures began to re-dominate the market. It is challenging to put an “end” point on a movement. Perhaps it is Francis Ford Coppola’s One from the Heart (1982), or perhaps Warren Beatty both opened and closed the movement with Reds (1981), the epic drama in which he directed, starred, produced and wrote. Regardless of which picture closed the books on New Hollywood, the movement’s run through the 1970s altered the landscape of cinema forever. Filmmakers continue to be inspired by and draw from the works of the New Hollywood auteurs, who produced many of the art form’s most revered works.