Screen Thought

Time Place People Action

Robert S. Watson

M.A., B.A., B.A., Grad. Dip. Media, Adv. Cert., Cert.
Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
University of Tasmania July 2015

Abstract.

SCREEN THOUGHT

People may think in sentences but they also think in drama's audio motion-pictures. People think in screen thought. 2006-2009, film philosophers Mulhall, Wartenberg, Falzon and Plantinga proposed that movies and documentaries are kinds of screen thought that are "arguments." This inquiry explores eight elements that form a screen argument, namely: time, place, people, action, gesture, utterance, device and notion. Together these elements form an "interaction." The investigation explores how interactions are researched and developed as complex, layered movie arguments. Thirdly, unlike thinking in sentences, movie thought is built four times. Emerging from world history and biography, filmmakers write, perform, record and distribute screen arguments.

Screen Thought

Time Place People Action

Robert S. Watson

Authority of Access.

This thesis is not to be digitized. This reference hardcopy may be read under reference access in the library. Two years after the date of this signed statement, this hardcopy thesis may be made available for limited copying of quotes in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Declaration of Originality.

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for a degree or diploma by the University or any other institution, except by way of background information and duly acknowledged in the thesis, and to the best of my knowledge and belief there is no material previously published or written by another person except where due acknowledgement is made in the text of the thesis, nor does the thesis contain any material that infringes copyright.

Date. 16 Sept. 2015 **Signature.**

Acknowledgements.

Thank you to Jeff Malpas, Lucy Tatman, Imelda Whelehan and examiners who criticized earlier drafts. Jeff, your tutorials are treasured. The study's remaining faults are my own. Thank you to the Wheeler family and the University of Connecticut philosophy school that graciously hosted me before this study took shape. Thank you to University of Tasmania staff who helped with scholarships, conference travel, seminars, administration and postgraduate coordination. Previous research ceased in 2006, before I thanked supervisors Stuart Glover and Don Batchelor (whose life is sadly missed). Adrian, Abdullah, Sean, Andrew and Aneta – thank you all.

I am in the debt of family and friends who made this study possible.

Contents.

Introduction.

01. People's Thought and Action in Time-Place.

Chapter 1

Screen Elements and Interactions.

02. Films Referred to as Action Arguments.

03. Words versus Complex Action Records.

04. Knowing Failure and Citing Research.

05. The Screen Array is Hardly Spoken or Written Sentences.

06. Audio Motion-Picture Layers.

07. Even Two-Second Dramas are Made by Teams.

08. Documentary Audio Motion-Picture Array and Scope.

09. Time and Scope of a Person's Interactions.

10. Each Person's Liberation, Affection and Death.

11. Arranging Elements in a Movie.

12. Silence, Audio Gestures and Recognition.

13. Smiles and Eye-lines that Recognize and De-recognize.

14. Dealing with Unexpected Dramatic Actions.

15. Researching Dramatic Places.

16. Devices.

17. Utterances, Audio and Dialogue.

18. Notions: the Challenge to Detail Actions.

19. Interactions.

Chapter 2

Developing Interactions As Arguments.

20. Evelyn's *Synopsis.*
21. *Developing the Writing Develops the Argument.*
22. *Climax: An Emotional Arc and its Music.*
23. *A Real-Time-Base Argument and its Emotional Arc is Formulated at Once.*
24. *Makers' Fixed and Cyclic Ziggurat Argument.*
25. *Research: A Pile Of Interactions And A Guiding Argument.*
26. *From Research and Backstory – to Documentary or Movie?*
27. *Performers' Attitudes From Writers' Six Tiers of Research.*
28. *The Segue to Development.*
29. *Movie Modes: People Argued as Biography or Typology.*
30. *Modes of Biography, Typology, Conjecture, Fantasy and Surrealism.*
31. *Fear, Fact or Fallacy?*
32. *Inclusive Milieu or Expulsive Milieu?*
33. *The Worldly Agenda and the Scope of the Argument.*
34. *Time Shapes in Our History, Thought, Plot and Story.*
35. *A Lovers' History versus a Supplicants' Anthropomorphizing.*
36. *Familiarity, Shadowlands, Climax and Resolve.*
37. *Filming Decision and Responsibility.*

Chapter 3

Four Argument Cycles in a Real-World Context.

38. *Alfred Hitchcock's Senior Team Partner.*
39. *From People's Biography to Conjecture-Fantasy.*
40. *Authoritarian Beliefs and Actions.*
41. *Silencing History, Biography and Other Modes.*
42. *Parent-Child Responsibility Curves and Violence.*
43. *Worldly Argument or Colonial Tableau.*

44. Psycho's Four Screenwriters.

45. Successful Performance and Recording.

Conclusions.

46. Screen Thought: Developing Interactions as Arguments.

Coverage, Filmographies, Sources and Index.

47. A Cry In The Dark *Coverage.*

48. Heaven And Earth *Coverage.*

49. Hitchcock *Coverage.*

50. Timeline – 170 Movies Plus: Directors and Writers.

51. Documentary Sources.

52. Historiographic Sources.

53. Novels and Tales.

54. Screen Maker Sources.

55. Philosophy Sources.

INTRODUCTION

01.

People's Thought and Action in Time-Place.

This is a "Screen Thought" inquiry into people's dramatic thought and action. It explores what people think and do, especially in dramatic circumstances that affect self and others in the world. The thesis explores feature-length (roughly 100-minute) films. Section-50 lists over 170 movies, their directors and writers in a history timeline, along with some shorts and television series. The 170 movies are given loglines, so that the reader can scan a 120-year history of screen thought. For comparison and background research, 40+ documentaries, a few television series and short films are considered too. Most of the inquiry's focus is on thinking that is used to make feature-length cinema drama or "movies." The movies are about real people, although often real-world research is developed from biography to aggregated "types" of people in movies. For example, "Pip" in *Great Expectations* is a character type based on people Charles Dickens researched. The movies range in history, from the world's first feature movie in 1906 to twenty-first century movies such as *The Social Network, The Hunger Games*, *Hitchcock, Great Expectations*, *Underground* and *Ex Machina.*

This inquiry focuses on four key movie scenarios in particular. These four historic stories show movies as non-fiction. "Movie" does not mean fiction. All are based on real-world, systematic research and development. These movie scenarios have been chosen because of their dramatic biographies. They have heroines who fight against a nation of witch-hunters, a superpower invasion, a rival for affection and

a superpower film industry that fears her blockbuster film idea. These movie scenarios all investigate what real heroes think and what real heroes do in the world: *A Cry In The Dark* (1988), *Heaven And Earth* (1993), *Evelyn* (2015) and *Hitchcock* (2012). These dramas explore real people's biographies and histories with a show trial, two invasions and challenges facing lovers in the screen business. A brief synopsis of the first key movie is given below. Three brief synopses for the other key movies follow later. Moreover, very detailed synopses are redescribed in Sections 20, 47, 48 and 49. Here is the first key screen argument:

***A Cry In The Dark* (1983).**

Honest, hard-working young parents Michael and Lindy love their children and volunteer in their community. This loving family take their children on holiday to Central Australia's desert. In the night, their baby Azaria is killed and taken by a dingo (wild dog). Australian and international tabloid media exploit this bizarre killing. Although the coroner closes the dingo killing case; corrupt politicians, judiciary, media, police and national gossipers believe Lindy and Michael are monstrous murderers. Grieving young mother Lindy is tried in a media/political show trial and jailed for her whole life, while a continent of gossipers – rich and poor, young and old – spread hateful, foolish rumours. This movie contrasts a mob's foolish, anxious, cruel thinking and action – with Lindy Chamberlain's logical, steadfast, loving thinking and action.

This inquiry focuses on the critical thinking behind making this and three other "key screen arguments." Philosophers such as Stephen Mulhall, Chris Falzon, Carl Plantinga and Thomas E. Wartenberg have all raised the idea that film is a form of argument, a form of critical thinking and discussion. Wartenberg has written *Thinking On Screen: Film As Philosophy* in which he argues: "some films

do philosophize" (2007:9). This thesis builds on their approach to film by asking: If the study's four key dramas (about show trials, invasions and screen businesses) are serious arguments, what are the elements and systems that comprise the argumentative "grammar" so to speak, of these arguments?

This investigation into people's screen beliefs about dramatic world conflicts primarily uses the maker's pragmatic knowledge of film camera, microphone and editing desk to explore film's elements and systems – screen thought and action that argues "people act in time-place" – in movies and documentaries. It is a very different approach from that of critical spectators such as Gilles Deleuze, André Bazin, Siegfried Kracauer and others who listen to films, watch films and write theory about critical audience experiences. Filmmakers are critical audiences too. But makers' criticisms are driven by pragmatic understandings of how to "respond to past film arguments with future film arguments" – rather than responding to past films with sentences. 170 movie responses over the last 120 years are listed in Section-50. It is by examining patterns in their thinking that this investigation develops pragmatic ideas of elements, interactions, screen arguments and project cycles.

Many philosophers in Section-55 have been read as background to this inquiry. Philosophers often analyze thought and action in terms of sentences but this investigation redescribes the world, not as sentences, but as screen thought where what is understood is not the sentence but the "interaction." The interaction is roughly "people acting in time-place" and it is discussed throughout this inquiry. Conceiving of thought as filmmakers' interactions, this kind of thinking – screen thinking – is used to both inquire about the world's dramatic events and put "arguments." The research target is our world of people, understood via screen thought. As such, filmmakers appear to use a "film" way of thinking to research and critically think about "thought" in its broad sense including: anxiety, folly, cruelty, steadfastness, logical thinking and love – in real world situations such as: a

dingo takes a baby; a teenager defends her country; and makers build an argument about a murderer.

In seeking answers via film thinking rather than, say, literature, some differences become apparent between dramatic arguments in our literature and our screen culture. Compare, for example, the scores of people credited at the end of most movies with the fewer people credited in a book. Due to the length and complexity of feature-film arguments, many diverse specialists are managed in project teams. The end credits in movies name the expert roles and the makers' names, or the company names of whole groups of screen thinkers. Research into screen thought would need to consider the thinking of "teams" of people making a screen argument, rather than, say, an author connected with a book. A related complication is that movie teams usually put their argument four times, in four "cycles" of making. The four-cycle model of screen thought contrasts with the single cycle attributed to directors in *auteur* film-philosophy. The four-cycle "medley relay" model of building a screen argument is explored in Chapter 3.

This study finds that, in the first cycle, specialist writers research the world of people – especially the lives of people caught up in dramatic circumstances such as falling in love, raising a family, injury by criminals, a dreamscape, environmental destruction, cross-cultural maturity, political witch-hunts, scientific discovery, dreadful invasions, community progress, falling out of love, courageous loyalty to one's friends, and many other unexpected dramas. Movie writers "develop" their research about these people as a movie screenplay, in ways explored in Chapter 2. Then, in three more cycles of the movie argument, the writing is performed, recorded and distributed – if all goes well. (Some differences in documentary are explored too.) If distribution publicity is any guide, most audiences are only interested in the star performers, and the story that audiences interpret from the screen. But if we desire to be productive in our culture, knowledge about writing, recording and distribution cycles becomes important

too. This thesis rethinks how we think of "people acting in time-place" – and how such screen thought influences what people believe today about our world.

Philosophers investigate what people experience, think and do, but what does "philosophy" mean? Philosophy is two Greek words joined together: *philo* and *sophy*. *Philo* means friendship and *sophy* means wisdom. So *philosophy* means something like "a friendly attitude towards wisdom." This friendly attitude asks a lot of questions. What is wisdom? Usually we attribute "wisdom" to a person rich in two things: *knowledge* and *experience*. How does this affect screen thinkers or screen believers? For example, one might study or watch overseas news, movies and documentaries on television for years – and so come to "know" and believe thousands of things about overseas people. If one chooses television carefully, dismissing the culturally blinkered and historically shallow, then one may be highly "knowledgeable" about the screened place overseas. But a philosopher would say: the screen believer has knowledge but no participatory working "experience" of the overseas place. By carefully choosing one's historical and culturally rich screen sources, one may be knowledgeable but not wise. The "philo" or friendship word is crucial here. A friend of wisdom might encourage the knowledgeable person to travel and work extensively in that overseas culture, and so gain deep participatory "experience" to add to their knowledge – and thus increase their wisdom.

Lack of wisdom may come from the other direction too. A second unwise person may energetically throw themselves into local networking, business and family in one place. They refuse to think much beyond their concept of nation, local work and family experiences. Within their tight group of friends, colleagues and family, they are comfortable with their long experience of the familiar group. But what happens when anxious and cruel people – or changing economics, politics or culture – overtake and ruin this narrowly experienced, comfortable group? This study explores some real people – Lindy, Le Ly and "Evelyn" – whose experience

and local competence in their family and business was destroyed by others, to a dramatic and fearful extent. A philosopher or friend of wisdom might point out that Lindy or Evelyn was busy, helpful and "experienced" early on in life. But without study and "knowledge" of regional and global cultures and history, the highly "experienced yet narrow" person is not worldly-wise. When energetic makers are not wise, they may wastefully reinvent the wheel or, as happened to Lindy and Le Ly, their comfortable places are eventually preyed on by horrific subcultures in history. Their dramas attract the investigation of moviemakers. Their local, practical experience and management has been rewarded in the short term – but they have ignored wider inquiry and knowledge until unexpected drama and calamity strikes. The philosophical approach to people is to befriend or reserve a measure of tolerance for everyone; encourage experienced people to better balance their participation with study; and encourage knowledgeable yet inexperienced people to courageously participate in life across our globe.

Using a tolerant or friendly approach, an audience member who has never experienced the dramatic conditions of Lindy's life in *A Cry In The Dark,* usually still makes sense of what Lindy believes and utters. A person who did not share with Lindy a great number of beliefs, values and feelings, could not make sense of any of her utterances, gestures and actions. For example, in *A Cry In The Dark*, Lindy calls out the proposition that a: "Dingo's got the baby!" If we did not share with Lindy thousands of beliefs, we could not make sense of her expression or situation. But we share with Lindy vast amounts of what makes up our common sense: that a "dingo" is a dog; that "got" implies the aggressive taking hold of something; that the "baby" is hers and her emotional tone warns of mortal danger. It is because of our friendly, tolerant attitude towards other people's expressions – people who are otherwise complete strangers – that we have any chance of understanding people. We understand that a baby is in danger. We understand what we ourselves mean by thinking this in our world. Screen thought observes this rich interconnection of beliefs, evaluations and intentions between one

thinking person and another in all 170 movies of Section-50. For example, when Le Ly's father in *Heaven And Earth* tells her that China, France and Japan have all invaded her farm in years past, Le Ly does not ask him what he means by these country names because she already has acquired beliefs and values about these places. Moreover, we the audience are likely to understand these terms for the same reason. We will also evaluate what it means to be invaded: we either feel something like the family's reaction to yet another invasion or we interconnect our beliefs, values and expectations in other ways with our own knowledge and experience. Here we have screen thought's concept of "interaction" – thinking (that is, evaluating, feeling and believing) people who act among self and others in time-place. Le Ly's father does not just believe his family's history, he also evaluates beliefs, has feelings about beliefs, and acts to discuss his thought with his daughter in the place of family graveyard in the time of the early 1960s.

As to encouraging "experienced people to better balance their participation with study," this inquiry accepts that many people come to know much of our world by listening to news and documentaries made by investigative journalists, and by watching movies made by wise moviemakers. Moreover, the study calls for participatory research, which is the other side of the coin to the media beliefs acquired by screen spectators or text readers. Peter Djigirr explains "Participatory research" in Djigirr, de Heer et al. (2006) *Ten Canoes.* In interview, Djigirr says: because of the problem of outsiders coming to his community and "not recognizing" the local people as people with culture and law, he and his fellow filmmakers have lifted up a story, performance and recording of their place – *Ten Canoes* – so that others (including future generations) come to recognize and participate in his community's culture and politics. Rather than accept outsiders' screen beliefs about them, they add filmmaking to their cultural participation and put their own argument.

As to encouraging "knowledgeable yet inexperienced" people to courageously participate in life around our globe – this philosophical approach is existential. Thomas E. Wartenberg says the existential view "sees philosophy less as an academic specialty than as a broad cultural practice" (Wartenberg 2008: L128). For existentialists, this broad, participatory practice focuses on "experience" in this sense:

> "a person does not, as a consciousness, simply perceive the world; she simultaneously is aware of herself perceiving the world. Consciousness is the only entity in the world that does not just exist, but also presents itself to itself as existing." (Wartenberg 2008: 20).

This study, then, emerges from considering the above philosophers and others listed in Section-55. At the same time this inquiry moves beyond sentential thinkers' focus on what people propose in sentences – to consider what people propose in screen thought. The inquiry also extends from various scholars' focus on novels to consider the world in terms of films. Moreover, this inquiry extends from an emphasis on "European" existential experience to the vast population "experiencing drama" in the Asia-Pacific of Australia, South East Asia and Pacific California. In order to shift from desires, beliefs, evaluations and intentions expressed as sentences to similar thinking in movies, this inquiry searches for something sentence-like in films. The thesis explores some screen components that allow people to formulate their thinking about the world on screen. In order to experience and participate in the world, the primary object of this inquiry is not other writers' completed films. Our world itself is the primary object of research that filmmakers interpret and film. What concerns moviemakers is the world of people, rather than a narrow interest in the device of film and its canon. So although this study asks: "What is screen thought?" it is a holist question. It examines the networked conditions of screen thought – and the disintegration of screen thought about the world by witch-hunters, invaders, censors and so on.

Rather than a rigid compartmentalized mind-exterior dualism, "holist thought and action" redescribes the world in translucent layers and networked interactions that emerge – in the case of this inquiry – from practicing and appreciating filmmaking about people.

If we listen to the audio and simultaneously watch all the motion pictures of one feature documentary or movie – or thousands of films about people – it is possible to distinguish components in these screen arguments. For example, if one mutes the sound of a television and only watches its motion-pictures, one becomes aware that film is a layered device: it has layers of audio and layers of motion-pictures. Usually we are unaware of these layers – until we carefully listen to a film without watching its motion-pictures, or vice versa. Traditionally crafted books of literature do not have film's audio and motion-picture layers. Writing has other components (inscriptions on pages, parts of a sentence) that people combine to put arguments and express thought. Are there similarly combinations of screen elements in recorded audio motion-picture films that allow filmmakers to put arguments too?

Filmmakers appear to combine screen elements in television news, for example. Take a sequence of: "a newsworthy visitor arrives at an airport." The visitor waves from the aircraft door and descends the steps. At the same time a second person (newsreader) in another place – a studio – reads a script on an autocue. The script is a journalist's interpretation of the airport scene. As we listen to the newsreader, we also watch the visitor gesture with a hand wave. We watch their action of descending the stairs. Even in this brief screen sequence, we can unpack eight screen "elements" that are explored in detail in Chapter 1. All films and their scenes have two elements of *time* and *place*. In this simple example, the "time" is the present day and the "places" are an airport and a news studio. In both these places there are *devices* such as aircraft or microphones. In movie films, history documentaries, video games and television news, there are *people* interacting with

each other. In this case, a visitor *acts* to descend the steps and *gestures* to the news audience or waiting crowd. The newsreader *utters* thoughts or *notions*.

One notion is that the televised person is a "visitor" and not an "airport worker" or "local." Notions such as classification are spoken into the audio layers, and other notions are interpreted from the motion-picture layers of the visitor waving at the airport. Visually, is the wave an insult? Is it a friendly gesture, or is the visitor waving away an insect? "How the gesture is interpreted" is also a *notion*. Even a brief news item about people interacting together appears to combine screen elements such as: time, place, people, actions, gestures, speech and devices. The filmmakers also express notions that classify others. Do these screen elements show some modeling similarities with a sentence's word "elements" such as nouns, verbs and adjectives? We put word elements together to make sentences and literate thought. Just as easily, it appears, filmmakers put screen elements together to make drama, news, films, television and all our screen beliefs about the world.

Even without being a filmmaker, using screen thought, we can think about time, place, people and action in our dramatic world. What if the newsreader says the visitor is a generous friend, or alternatively, quietly runs fearful science fiction music under images of the visitor. Notions such as "a generous friend" or "an alien to fear" in the audio are difficult to think carefully about, in the short grabs typical of news broadcasts. How, for example, would a skeptic prove the notion that the newsreader was dishonest in running scary, almost subliminal music under the news item? The feature-length of a movie allows a careful filmmaker to explore a person's character in many contrasting scenes, interacting among other characters and situations. If a fairly developed pattern of scenes contradict the newsreader's brief predication of the visitor – we may, with more certainty – claim that the newsreader is dishonest, or, based on more recorded facts, we more firmly justify a belief that the newsreader is honest. Screen notions such as "visiting, honesty,

folly and contradiction" are examples of notions that moviemakers explore, over the feature-length time of putting a screen argument.

We might think of filmmakers investigating dramatic notions on screen by combining screen elements in "interactions" where thinking people act amongst self and other in time-place. The journalist observes the visitor; the newsreader reads out the journalist's interpretation; the visitor watches the news in their hotel room. Does it make sense that such interactions can be combined in screen arguments? Emerging from this study is the idea that literate people think in *sentences*; screen believers and filmmakers think in *interactions*. Many people do both. The "interaction" is the building block of interest to this investigation. Roughly, what people think and do in a scene or sequence is an interaction between them. Rather than think, speak or write what people do as a sequence of "sentences," the emphasis of this investigation is people who listen to and watch people in layered, cascading sequences of audio motion-picture interactions. As consumers, we control the audio and motion-picture layers of an interaction with a remote control. But makers control all the layers – such as who performs in the foreground and who performs as an extra in the background layers – and whether a desire or a belief is spoken. These components of screen thought are explored in Chapter 1.

Chapter 2 moves on from screen elements and interactions to ask, what if a thinker desires to contribute something intelligent or amusing or interesting or powerful or life changing in the media-sphere? How do makers assemble hundreds of interactions together in a screen argument about our striking and dramatic world? Chapter 2 develops interactions into circa 100-minute arrays, building to the climaxes and resolutions of feature screen arguments. Stretching back to Aristotle's *Poetics*, analysts have developed notions that help theatre people – and from the early 1900s, film people – to develop dramatic interactions as arguments. Screen notions prompt filmmakers to ask: Who arrived at the airport

that day? Who decided the visitor was newsworthy? Who edits the news? What did people feel? What happens next? What explains the most striking thing here? Answers are filmed in layers: audio and motion-pictures, people and places, foreground and background, action and gesture, speech and emotion, often expressed as music.

Unlike literature's emphasis on sentences, a screenwriter researches our world and *develops* the temporal architecture of a cascading, layered audio motion-picture argument about people approaching each other and interacting. This architecture – the screenplay – is later *performed* and *recorded* by a project team. The team process is explored in Chapter 3. At the same time as the performances, the argument is entirely rebuilt again as the recording layers. "Recordists" edit and deliver a master recording of the movie to the fourth cycle of "distribution." Usually the movie argument is in its fourth cycle of "distribution" from early on, with the writer and producer working with financiers. Screen thought is financed, negotiated, reshaped, argued legally, versioned and publicized during distribution. Chapter 3 explores the four project cycles, without which, no movie reaches our screens.

Unfortunately, most movie arguments fail. Most screenplays are not made into movies, and few that reach the screen, satisfy. The writing is poorly researched. Performers are miscast. The recording is ruined. Distribution siphons audience revenue and ruins writers. Chapter 3 explores some barriers that collapse screen projects and stop philosophically interesting dramatic arguments from reaching audiences. Chapter 3 also explores success.

In sum, this thesis explores elements of a dramatic screen "interaction" in Chapter 1: elements of time, place, people, action, gesture, utterance, devices and notions. Chapter 2 explores how dramatic interactions are combined in feature-length screen arguments. Against a historical background in which people in our world

experience unexpected drama, Chapter 3 explores the four cycles of writing, performing, recording and distributing screen thought about our world to screen believers.

Chapter 1

ELEMENTS and INTERACTIONS

02.

Films Referred to as Action Arguments.

For the most part, academics and filmgoers who approach the global screen network – or who approach the deeply personal experience of listening to and watching one "feature-length" film – do so as an audience member and spectator. Another way to approach the screen is as a team of makers. Most of the hundreds of makers in Section-50 think critically about our world for over 120 years and put their thoughts in the cinema films listed in that Section. A cinema's 100-minute "movie" or documentary is a very different way of thinking and practice compared to short films, art films and most television. The latter screen styles somewhat overlap with feature-length movies and documentaries in concepts and practise but are not cinema features.

If any long film does not contain a strong argument about life's personal and political dramas – the actions of people coping with unexpected challenges – it will not attract a public cinema audience and it is not strong movie thought for its times. Another stark distinction between other screen styles and movie or documentary thinking is that cinema movies and documentaries are "distributed" via strong political and economic controls and contested areas that differ from television or fine art distribution. For example, the political censorship of Hitchcock and Reville's family-funded movie is discussed in Chapter 3. It suggests severe economic barriers and political censorship distinguishes putting an argument in a book from arguing the similar thoughts on the cinema screen. The degree of distinction varies from one public subculture to another. On the other side of these barriers to screen arguments and discourse are screen audiences, most of whom welcome the opportunity to immerse themselves in screen thought.

From an academic perspective, cosmic and life disciplines use film all the time in their pursuit of knowledge about the Earth and bodily processes. So do disciplines devoted to thinking people acting in time-place, where some movies and documentaries explore our lives in ways of interest to academics. Some philosophers have even referred to movie and documentary films as "arguments." In reviewing his 2002 inquiry into the *Alien* quartet of movies, Stephen Mulhall refers to the *Alien* movies, not as handy illustrations for an academic argument about "human individuality". Rather, the movies themselves (and hence the makers) argue thoughtfully, seriously, and systematically about human identity and embodiment:

> "I wanted to understand these films not as raw material for philosophers, and not as handy (because popular) illustrations of views and arguments properly developed by philosophers, but rather as themselves reflecting on and evaluating such views and arguments, as thinking seriously and systematically about them" (2006:97).

Mulhall suggests some movies (much like some literature) are screen arguments that reflect on and evaluate other arguments in a discourse. For Mulhall, movies are more than trainer-wheel illustrations for "serious" written arguments. Again, Chris Falzon discusses movies by Woody Allen (1989) and David Lynch (1986) in the context of the arguments put in more "conventional" movies:

> "In the most conventional narrative, the good eventually prosper, and those who lie, cheat, and kill get caught, are punished, suffer in some way. There's an implicit argument for being moral here: it is in the nature of the world that the bad pay the price and that the good are rewarded, and so it is in your interest to be moral" (2009:591).

Implicit, intricately woven arguments and explicit, plainly expressed arguments about the consequences of people's decisions and actions are explored in movies. Arguments are not only put in movies, they are also put in documentaries. Carl Plantinga suggests that photographs and sounds are screen components that contribute to intentionally organized screen arguments by documentary makers:

> "When documentaries do incorporate photography for its value as evidence and proof, it is usually in support of some argument or claim that emerges not only from photographs and sounds, but also from their intentional organization." (2009:495)

Not only are documentaries screen arguments like movies, often movies are reenactments of real people's biographies – such as the screen biographies of three women (Lindy Chamberlain; Le Ly Hayslip and Alma Reville) considered in this study. So it is important not to assume that "movie" means "fiction". The world's first movie, Tait, Tait et al. (1906) *The Story Of The Kelly Gang* is also a biography and a documentary reenactment, as are many movies in Section-50's *Timeline*. Later this study makes distinctions between movies and documentaries but the distinctions are not to do with truth conditions.

In an academic context, the term "movie argument" is potentially valuable and attractive. Academically, "argument" does not carry the term's negative, even violent connotations in everyday usage. Logician Sharon M. Kaye writes:

> "In everyday conversation, the term "argument" is most often used for an angry exchange of words. People therefore typically think of an argument as an unpleasant situation to be avoided. In academic and professional circles however, the term argument has a technical meaning. An argument is a discussion in which reasons are advanced in favor of a proposal.

> Argument is the best way to support your opinions. It need not be angry or unpleasant at all" (2009:6).

If an argument is a "discussion" (an "investigative conversation"), do movies discuss a topic or subject? This study collects together 170 movies in Section-50 where movie writers investigate topics or subjects. They research and develop arguments that performers rebuild as performances. The performed arguments are recorded and distributed. In this study, these 170 movies are accepted as screen discussions or "arguments" in which reasons are advanced on screen to present, consider, affirm or deny their opening proposals. *A Cry In The Dark* opens with claims that rational-thinking Lindy loves her children and takes them on a camping holiday. Then the media and judiciary deny this by claiming that Lindy is crazy and hates her baby enough to murder her in a religious cult desert sacrifice ritual. The balance of the movie re-affirms Lindy as a rational-thinking mother who loves her children and takes the time to be with them and support their growing up.

Such an approach is not without many philosophers who deny that a documentary film, a movie (or another lengthy narrative art form such as the novel) can formulate an argument. Bruce Russell is quoted in Thomas E. Wartenberg as saying: "Narrative films so lack explicitness that it is not true that there is some particular argument to be found in them." (2007:18) Wartenberg also quotes Murray Smith who questions whether films are proper philosophical arguments because of their "ambiguity". Rather than finding movie thinking to be irrationally ambiguous, this study accepts film's ambiguity as its "translucent layers" of propositions or reasons advanced on screen, as elaborated later. This investigation somewhat agrees with Russell that the audio and motion-pictures of screen arguments often are more implicit in their reasoning than, say, the explicit statements of propositional calculus – or the explicit "thought track" of a narrator in a novel. None-the-less, a documentary or moviemaker can pose and answer Edward Craig's question in *Philosophy*: "What is there?" (2002:1). Filmmakers

answer such philosophical questions using lenses and microphones that collect data from the cosmos of space or from the molecular level of the human body. Filmmaker devices such as lenses and electromagnetic receptors make such natural and cosmic research possible. Filmmakers answered Craig's other question "What should we do?" by filming people acting in time-place. Movies are particularly concerned with the choices people face in their both personal and public areas of life, and are capable of filming how people answer the question "what should we do" quite explicitly. *People acting* in *time* and *place* are some of the eight screen thought elements considered later in this investigation.

Movies may presume and imply thousands of things as they explicate what a few people think and do. Filmmakers put their true or false, strong or weak ideas in screen arguments – yet the films still require audiences to interpret what the makers have filmed. In this regard, a screen argument is little different from a verbal or written text argument that also presumes and implies many things. As Wartenberg puts it, and I agree:

> "the claims that artworks make are often implicit and therefore require the viewer to make them explicit. But this does not mean that the viewer is the one who constitutes a work's meaning as some have argued. Indeed, it would be paradoxical, for example, to say that I, rather than [Pablo Picasso's] *Guernica*, express outrage against the atrocity perpetrated by Franco because I have to see that this is what the painting expresses. And, similarly, just because an argument is implicit, it does not therefore have to be imprecise. Finally, it is worth noting that interpretive disagreements about what and how philosophical texts argue remain unresolved after centuries of ongoing debate" (2007:19).

Precision can be a hallmark of audio motion-pictures. A film of Wittgenstein's face is at least as "precise" at identifying the person Wittgenstein, for example, as his

name spelled in text. Many people interested in another's identity would say the photo is precise – and the name without the photo refers to many people surnamed Wittgenstein. At the same time, both Wartenberg and this study are sympathetic to philosophers' concern that screen arguments such as documentaries and movies are not explicit in the same way that conventional written style in journals – and spoken arguments in philosophy seminars – may explicate an argument. But often written arguments are not clear. Agreeing with Wartenberg, Kaye believes that many verbal arguments in culture are not as explicit and clear as they might be. For this reason, logicians offer thinkers a tool for reworking verbal arguments to improve their precision and strength. Kaye calls this tool "standard form":

> "In order to identify and study arguments, we rewrite them in standard form. Standard form is a schema for identifying the steps of an argument. This is the general format:
>
> 1. The first reason is … .
> 2. The second reason is … .
> 3. Therefore the proposal is … .
>
> Steps 1 and 2 are called the premises while the final step is called the conclusion. An argument can contain any number of premises leading to a single conclusion. It can also contain a series of sub-conclusions. A sub-conclusion is a conclusion that functions as a premise for a further conclusion." (2009:6).

This syllogistic thinking is central to Kaye and also Mark Zegarelli's 2007 discussions of logical verbal thought, speech and writing. These elements – verbal notions in *thought*, *speech* and *devised* writing – are later explored as three of the elements in a screen interaction. In subsuming these elements, screen thought puts traditional critical thinking to the side and brings other elements of *time*, *place*, *people*, *action* and *gesture* into the motion-architecture thinking of an interaction.

The reason this inquiry emphasizes *time*, *place*, *people*, *action* and *gesture* is that filmmakers do not answer, "What is there?" and "What should we do?" in writing. Moviemakers develop and record performances of people acting in time-place. Documentary makers narrate and record people acting in time-place. The written propositions of verbal critical thinking (such as an academic report) come into screen thought in the ancillary project documents of screen thought but not into its mainstream delivery. The primary elements filmmakers think about are: time, place, people and their actions; and these recorded elements are arranged over thousands of motion-picture frames and hundreds of thousands of audio samples. To rearrange such data about people's actions from both lens and microphone requires critical thinking on a vast scale, but it is not the critical thinking of report writers.

Unlike Kaye et al., the film industry approaches the analysis of real-world events, human thought, and film itself, by rewriting any argument in the industry's own, very different, version of "standard form." In the screen's "standard form," the key layers are not notions and written words in sentences – but people and actions in interactions. Much as critical thinker Kaye redescribes arguments in standard form in order to analyze the speaker's thinking, this study follows critical thinkers in the screen discipline by inscribing four key movies as a logical array of interactions and actions. Filmmakers redescribed the bare bones of screen thinking and call this standard form a "coverage" synopsis. Lindy's *A Cry In The Dark* argument about a dingo, her baby, the judiciary and media in 1980, is "covered" in Section-47. The coverage hardly writes of Lindy's feelings, desires, belief or speech – it is not like prose. Rather, Lindy's actions are covered – she rummages in tent – and this is followed by her next action – she chases the dingo – and so on towards the argument's conclusion. Coverage is a linear series of conjunctions. But behind the coverage of every movie in Section-50 are vast decision trees of disjunctions – the decision paths of screen thinkers that are explored in this investigation.

The standard form of coverage – and later, the forms of scripts and screenplays – are arranged "in order to identify and study arguments" (as Kaye says of critical thought). Besides *A Cry In The Dark*, three other key movie arguments – *Evelyn, Heaven And Earth* and *Hitchcock* are covered in Sections 20, 48 and 49. Film philosophy papers do not appear to use or report coverage when identify and studying screen arguments. For example, the dozens of scholarly screen papers in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* (2010) and Paisley Livingston and Carl Plantinga (2009) editors, *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy and Film* (UK: Routledge) do not quote from, or publish coverage. For this study, though, coverage has been a very useful early method for isolating many elements of screen thought. Coverage encourages the analyst to identify the element of "action" in a filmmaker's screen thinking. In doing so, related elements such as time, place and people emerge.

In the realm of the screen, "writer" is a technical term that does not at all mean a prose writer because the thinking skills of a strong feature-length screenwriter are those of the outdoor novelist, historian, performance dramaturge, choreographer, soundscape musician and three-dimensional lighting motion architect combined. Although critical prose writers are occasionally strong movie screenwriters as well (one thinks of Graham Greene's *The Third Man* 1949 for example), the thinking involved in filmmaking overlaps but it is not identical with literate thought. Filmmakers usually call screenwriters "writers" and this can be confusing because screenwriters think "audio motion-pictures" very much more than they think in words. As explored later, words (as notions, speech and devised text) are the three lesser elements of screen thought.

Screenwriters do type words on the page but most of those words translate the motion-pictures and the audio of recalled or imagined people, their times and places, characters' bodies, faces, clothing, interior architecture, landscapes, weather, people's actions, gestures and devices – rather than any words that

characters may think or utter. Writers translate imagined film places, people and their actions onto the screenplay page as the discipline's technical language. Mostly, words are code for audio motion-picture performance, recording and distribution. Performance involves bodies and feelings. Distribution involves the public sphere of other people. Screenplay words are not "writing" in the sense of writing word in a report or a novel.

As Arnold Weinstein says, "unlike the novel and unlike poetry, theatre is a social form and it is an embodied form" (2013: 17). But film is another discipline's step beyond Weinstein's theatre. As Section-45 discusses: theatre is planned, staged and acted as live performance among performers – whereas movies are "recorded angles" of framed performance where the other people in the "angle" of an action and its audio are often not present at all during a take. Playwrights think in terms of live interaction among performers on a formal or informal stage. Screen thinkers think in terms of performed recorded angles and a cascade of layers including music and effects layers. A written text is a long way away from social and embodied theatre – and even further away from exploring people as worldly screen thought.

Part of what writers in the screen discipline "write" as argument is the engineering blueprint for a screen recording. As explored later in this study, an engineered "recording" is the third of four cycles that put a screen argument. As consumers, we are rarely aware that a favorite star or a strong film story is a recording – unless the volume is annoying or something goes wrong with the equipment or we buy a new device and have problems learning to use it. Recording is a whole discipline that is not re-theorized in this thesis, but to ignore the cycle of recording in an exploration of screen thought would also be amiss. Audio recording is extensively explored in Section-50 movies such as: Francis Ford Coppola et al. (1974) *The Conversation*; Donen, Kelly, Comden and Green (1952) *Singin' In The Rain*; and Von Donnersmarck et al. (2006) *The Lives Of Others*. In these

movies, recordists are constantly faced with physical, scientific challenges – and more challenges to their beliefs and friendships – as they attempt difficult audio recordings. Then again, picture recording is explored in films such as Antonioni and Cortazar (1966) *Blow Up* and the documentary episode "Knowledge And Certainty" in J. Bronowski (1973) *The Ascent Of Man* (in Section-51). Both audio and motion-picture recording, and the writers, recordists and distributors who make news recordings, are examined in Pilger and Lowery (2010) *The War You Don't See*. The screen element of "place" is particularly critical for audio recordists. Recordists are mindful of a place's uncontrolled acoustics that may ruin meaningful audio that carries the film's argument. Screenwriters know this, and write with audio in mind. For example, having leveraged recording and performing techniques to removed the noise from scenes, writers may reintroduce the normal noise of a place into the argument to deny audiences hearing what two characters discuss.

Given that a film argument is very different from a written report, is there anything more we might learn from critical thinking's standard argument form? Let us take Lindy Chamberlain's actions in *A Cry In The Dark* (Section-47) as examples of two premises in a short argument:

> Reason 1: Lindy goes to her baby's tent and sees a wild dog run away.
> Reason 2: Lindy rummages quickly in the empty sleeping bags.

These two statements are reasonably precise and explicit. We are left in no doubt as to what Lindy does first and what she does next. But reasons in a screen investigation are not presented to audiences as written statements like this. Rather, what are called "reasons" here are movie interactions in a screenplay that are performed and recorded on screen as audio and motion-picture tracks. A glance at Lindy's Section-47 reveals that "coverage" differs markedly from prose writing or academic report writing, mainly in its emphasis on actions and its lack of explanatory notions, thought tracks, commentary and motivations. But assume

Reasons 1 and 2 above were the prose writing of literature, how might a report writer conclude the argument?

Reason 1: Lindy goes to her baby's tent and sees a wild dog run away.
Reason 2: Lindy rummages quickly in the empty sleeping bags.
Reason 3: *Therefore, Lindy concludes that a dingo has got her baby.*

If this short argument was written in a book, journal article or police report, philosophers would probably feel comfortable with the line of reasoning. But when moviemakers put an argument, they do so differently. What might be the form and style of such arguments? Movies formulate people's actions. In Section-47's *A Cry In The Dark*, the following actions were observed from the screen and written down as coverage:

Sequence 1: Lindy goes back to the tent, sees movement then a dingo running off; she cries out: "Dingo's got the baby!"
Sequence 2: Lindy rummages quickly in the empty sleeping bags.
Sequence 3: She chases the dingo, into the pitch-black night.

There are a few differences between the report giving reasons and the movie "argument" in the coverage giving actions. A first difference, this investigation calls "translucency". In movie Sequence 1 above, Lindy does many things in roughly the same time-place. She goes to the tent. She sees a dingo run off. She cries out. In her cry, she utters her tentative conclusion (her thought) that the "dingo's got the baby." Attending to a movie argument, we attend to more than one layer of action at a time: Lindy goes, Lindy sees and Lindy utters – all at the same time by the same person. These actions are "translucent layers" in the sense that we usually listen to or watch all these layers at the same time, rather than work through a reasoned list where we interpret Reason 1, then Reason 2, and therefore Reason 3). The writer and the performer in a movie propose actions that

are piled one atop another and we are expected to think through these "action and place" layers simultaneously. Hence the concept of translucency in layered screen arguments.

Moviemakers such as writers, performers and recordists use this translucency to pose many "statements" at once. Layers of translucent propositions are then sequenced, much as traditional arguments, with sub-conclusions and further syllogisms, much as Kaye says of critical thinking. But in movie thought, there is an overt emphasis on tentative beliefs uttered as speech or given in gestures and then *firmer conclusions or subconclusions enacted as actions*. In Sequence 2, Lindy goes into the baby's tent to search for the baby and affirm or deny her tentative belief that the dingo got her baby. Searching makes her more certain about her daughter's horrific situation: *therefore she puts her thinking into action* as Sequence 3. She chases the dingo into the pitch-black night. Sequence 3 is another action – and not a written conclusion as reported earlier in the written statement of reasons. In movie Sequence 3, we watch Lindy chase the dingo into the night, and by her previously gestured actions (her eye-lines seeing the dingo, seeing the empty bed), we conclude, along with her, that a dingo has got her baby. Although we are not privy to her definite belief (only to her uttered tentative belief), our assumption about her values and beliefs is confirmed when Lindy "initiates actions" in response to the tentative belief she utters. A word of caution here: the action is "recorded" action so it is, in fact an inscription of pixels and digital sound samples. The maker is putting a screen argument "about" actions – it is not the action per se. For ease of discussion, though, recorded actions on screen are referred to as actions, unless alerted otherwise.

Not only do film philosophers such as Mulhall, Falzon, Plantinga and Wartenberg suggest films can be arguments, but analysis of a movie such as *A Cry In The Dark* reveals the film to consist of layered sequences of people's actions. Given that movies do appear to evaluate people and places, and have serious, systematic

ways of arranging time, speech and actions, it may be worth further comparing literate arguments and screen thought.

03.

Words versus Complex Action Records.

Screen "arguments" – such as Lindy's movie, other movies or documentaries – do not argue in linear sequences of written or spoken statements (premise, premise, conclusion) that we observe in Kaye's useful *Critical Thinking* book. Moviegoers are not attending a lecturer's syllogistic speech argument. Nor do screen thinkers read a written text argument in the same way as we listen to the audio and watch the motion-picture layers of a movie. Moreover, people who contribute new thinking about our world, including *A Cry In The Dark's* region today, deal with many things (locations, casting, high finance, coronial findings, a real family's grief) that a logician's pared-back, crystal clear syllogism sets aside.

Complicated screen thinking occurs when, say, Meryl Streep performs the biographic role of New Zealander "Lindy Chamberlain". Her "Lindy" role is written by researcher and novelist John Bryson, and then rewritten by screenwriter Robert Caswell. Director Fred Schepisi is involved with the writers and distributors and he attaches and directs many performers and recordists in the project. Hundreds of distribution workers at Warner, Cannon and their downstream exhibitors interact with moviegoers who finally interpret Lindy's interactions for themselves. And let us not forget the real Lindy Chamberlain-Creighton and her family who suffered injury in the 1980s and subsequent decades from a predatory media-sphere and its consumers. Here many people think, relate and act – not just an isolated, hermetic individual. With so many complications to what we mean by thinking about people acting among each other in time-place, filmmakers find it useful to have a "standard form" – "a schema for identifying the steps of an argument" (Kaye) or as Mulhall says, analytical tools for "thinking seriously and systematically about" movies.

Philosophers have analyzed the dramatic actions and gestures put in theatre (if not movies) since before Aristotle studied Aegean dramatic traditions and wrote of "complex" action, "reversal" and "discovery," over 2300 years ago in *Poetics*. Like filmmakers and philosophers today, Aristotle is interested in the intentional motion of people in dramatic situations, that is, their "action." Moreover Aristotle and moviemakers are concerned with "complex" action:

> "by a complex action I mean one wherein the change coincides with a 'discovery' or 'reversal' or both" (1932:1452a).

Movie screenwriters use "complex" action thinking all the time. But complex action (in Aristotle's sense) is not a key concept in traditional critical thought. A traditional argument might say, "The basin held the baby's bottle" or "Lindy held the baby's bottle" and there is little distinction between the basin and a person. But screen thought strongly distinguishes between basins – which do not have expectations and cannot be surprised with complex reversals – and Lindy who, as a person, participates in drama. Lindy is a lively, thinking, social person with a husband and children. As a person, she has sophisticated expectations about what "a quiet night's sleep" means. But on 17 August 1980, Lindy's "action" (in Aristotle's sense) was complicated by a "reversal" of her beliefs about a good night's sleep for her and her family. Her beliefs and expectations are reversed when she "discovers" a wild dog running from the baby's bed and she further "discovers" the bed is empty. This guiding idea – discarding run-of-the-mill actions to investigate "complex" dramatic actions – moves screen and movie thought away from traditional critical thought as it investigates the world's upsets and challenges.

The term "action" is emphasized to alert readers unfamiliar with academic philosophy. "Action" is technical word in (film) philosophy. Philosophy, of the kind this study emerges from asks, "What is there?" and answers that people

(unlike rocks and sunflowers) think linguistically and act among others, as when Lindy cries out to her family. Philosophy in this inquiry distinguishes between electromagnetic or mechanical "motions" – motion-picture pixels flickering on screen, or sounds vibrating mechanically from speakers – and "what people do" which is "action." Electromagnetic and mechanical clockwork "motions" contrast with people's layers of complicated thinking, initiatives and "actions" among others in our world community. "Conversation, personal initiative and doing things co-operatively" are actions. In philosophy, when the term "action" is used, it carries the assumption that thinking individuals in the world are involved; rather than emphasizing a screen argument's background physical flows of natural "motion" such as our circadian (awake/asleep) way of life, or the motions of creatures and weather in the background ecology and cosmos of a movie scene. Many thinkers distinguished a physical universe and ecology "in motion" and reserved the term "action" for what thinking people initiate and deal with in their foreground interactions, including the complex actions of discoveries and reversals. When Peter Kosso or Zdenek Vasicek ascribes motives to people's actions in history, they do not additionally ascribe this human thought to the motions of gravity or bacteria (2009: L948; 2009: L1667).

But film writers, performers, recordists and distributors often use the "action" word in different technical senses. Distributors and audiences categorize what I call circus films as "action" films (Watson 1994a). Recordists may speak about the "mechanical action" of a film projector. But they are not ascribing thought and initiative to the projector's sprocket clockwork. If the recordist was asked about any intentional "action" in this device, they would reply that thought and action are qualities ascribed to people who engineer, maintain and operate the projector. When asked to think philosophically, most recordists would agree: intentional action is a quality they possess as people. Action is not a quality of devices. Filmmakers are not unaware of the difference between the "motion" of devices and the "acts" of people who co-operate together in film teams. Chaplin (1916) is an

early short film exploration of this distinction between the "motion" of devices and the "action" of people. The use and meaning of people's "action" among devices is further discussed later in this investigation. This study confines the word "action" to its philosophic use. So to avoid confusion, "screen actors" are referred to as "performers" who "perform" throughout this inquiry. Performance is a kind of sophisticated action, and filmmakers "act" in other ways such as "writing" or "recording" too. The technical focus on action becomes important later when haptic (touching, displacement) action is proposed as a key element of screen thought.

04.

Knowing Failure and Citing Research.

Usually when films are distributed to scholar audiences in an educational setting, the idea of a screen argument "failing" is far from people's minds. For example, Thomas E. Wartenberg argues the case for some films doing philosophy as screen arguments in his 2007 book *Thinking on Screen: Film as Philosophy.* Wartenberg explores five films that have been successfully made and distributed to audiences. Understandably, the idea that these famous films have emerged from a screen culture fraught with failure is barely a consideration. Another film philosophy book, Cox and Levine (2012) *Thinking Through Film*, is wary of filmmakers "doing philosophy" in Wartenberg's sense. They take a more accepted path in film philosophy, accepting films as examples and illustrations that aid the reader's exploration of analytic philosophy concepts. Again, Cox and Levine are not concerned about millions of film projects that fail to reach a cinema or their book. On the Continental side, the 2010 *Conference of the Australasian Society for Continental Philosophy* presented papers quoting film extracts, used to illustrate philosophical arguments from a continental standpoint. In all these cases, a common thread through all these presented films is that the films are successfully made and successfully distributed. The idea of a film argument "failing" to reach scholars and other audiences for discussion rarely emerges as an issue among academics.

Compare such appreciative attitudes towards screen arguments with the situation of people who research and develop these screen arguments in the first place. Exploring inside the global film industry, Altman and Tolkien (1992) *The Player* argues: filmmakers live with the specter of failure ever day. Even successful filmmaking teams, who are not subject to failure, have enough experience to

witness colleagues' screen thought and action failing in hundreds and thousands of instances. Performers live with failure, too. At the end of Anderson and Sherwin (1984) *O Lucky Man*, an impoverished drifter on London's streets wanders into an audition for a new movie film. He sits among a hundred other hopefuls. The starring role is offered to the drifter. The one hundred performers in the room fail to get the movie part. When we observe a leading performer in any movie argument, it is easy to forget that a dozen, a hundred or even a few thousand other performers – many as talented as the employed performer – have been considered for that role and have "failed" to gain it. In Chapter 3, this study explores a case where powerbrokers interconnected with film teams act to ruin a strong film argument in its writing, performing, recording and distribution cycles. Haunted by the specter of failure, a well-run studio or production team – its makers, such as its creative executives – work to reject screen arguments on paper that are likely to fail. Writers, producers, directors and executives work to develop arguments that are appreciated by their niche paying audiences. As a result, sustainable studios are constantly evaluating and rejecting almost all screen arguments put to them for development.

The Player demonstrates the overwhelming dominance of screenwriting "failure" when Griffin, a studio creative executive, receives a death threat from an anonymous, outside writer. Griffin consults a large studio diary and a computer file that lists the thousands of writers and producers whose arguments Griffin has rejected in the course of doing his evaluations and protecting the studio's business. Griffin hones in on one rejected writer in the diary – but we, the audience, also see the vast file of arguments that fail to reach production. *The Player* demonstrates that the culture of putting feature film arguments is a screen culture haunted by failure. Yet the impression we get as screen audiences is that films successfully arrive in cinemas or on the home screen as a given argument, and not as a strenuous emergence from an area awash with proposals that fail for many reasons explored in this investigation. Again, Von Donnersmarck et al. (2006) *The Lives Of Others* explores mass failure across the dramatic arts in circa 1980 East

Germany. Here, state bureaucrats drive creative thinkers to suicide and State political appointees collapse cultural innovation with ineptitude and corruption. Whether a capitalist, command or mixed economy, successful screen arguments emerge from a field of people taking the initiative who are everywhere threatened with thought and action that collapses arguments for many reasons. As philosopher Raymond Geuss writes:

> "In the historical period we can survey we find ourselves as finite, vulnerable, mutually dependent creatures who are also independent sources of action and judgment." (2008: 362)

In the media-sphere, the vulnerable are everywhere, yet occasionally mutually dependent creatures form teams that research and develop screen thought about heroic action and judgment, or heroism's demise. Geuss is talking about global politics, which, in terms of people's beliefs, is predominantly about putting public arguments on the screen in the media-sphere and either acting on those screen beliefs or denying them. The massive complications of putting any feature-length argument are woven with the screen's "mutually dependent" team requirements and interrelationships. Each large complicated team that makes a successful feature is documented in the names or company names that are credited to a film. When all those specialists are highly knowledgeable and smoothly managed, then the team is a tower of strength. Place a non-expert in any of these interconnected specialist roles, especially the top roles, and the screen argument beings to fail, as demonstrated in Godard and Moravia (1963) *Contempt* or Coen and Coen (1991) *Barton Fink.*

Failure is such an awful prospect for fresh, talented people who are trying to enter the media-sphere. As an outsider, it is easy to forget that many insiders were once on the outside and know the pain. For most of last century, film teams not only produced screen arguments, they also hosted master-and-apprentice educational

relationships in all the specializations in order to train up the next generation of experts – allowing people to fail and learn from their mistakes as an assistant who wasn't about to unravel the whole project. Apprenticeship still happens, but to a limited extent today. So *The Player's* creative executive Griffin has a screenplay assistant Bonny who is learning to do Griffin's job. She rises in her public career then is let go and her personal life falters too, although the argument suggests she will land on her feet in the future. Today, with the rise of universities funded for their teaching expertise in the media-sphere, the opportunities for new, talented filmmakers to join screen makers in production teams as assistants, has declined. Young talent today is more likely to study film in a university than in a production house or studio.

Problematic for new talented filmmakers in many university courses is that courses, especially non-production courses, treat movies or documentaries as givens. Movies or documentaries are used in schools or universities (and other workplaces) as attractive adjuncts that illustrate thinking about other disciplines. Movies and documentaries will always have this illustrative function, as filmmakers explore and develop screen arguments about these other disciplines and life in general. But scholars who desire to contribute to the next generation of screen arguments in response to the world's current media-sphere, might hope that university's film courses are grounded in the sensibility of filmmakers. That sensibility would include: not taking movies or documentaries as givens – and helping new makers to understand and overcome complex screen arguments that fail.

Leave a classroom, home or cinema venue that takes movies and other screen genres as givens and go into a studio or practice – then "failed" film arguments often dominate screen thinkers' day-to-day concerns. Recall the fear that grips Mark Zuckerberg in Fincher, Sorkin and Mezrich (2011) *The Social Network* when Eduardo Saverin withdraws financial support and Zuckerberg is terrified

that consumers will experience failure accessing the *Facebook* screen. Appended Section-50 lists over 170 successfully distributed films – the kinds of films that provide the example-types that are quoted by film philosophers and cultural commentators. Yet lurking behind this "success" list are thousands of other screen arguments – including superb, powerful movies – that failed to be written to completion; failed to be performed exquisitely; failed when the recording was substandard; or fail to be funded and distributed.

In a sense, what this Chapter 1 explores is thinking towards a "failsafe indicator" that warns the filmmaker or analyst when a key element is missing from their feature-length screen thought or argument. Possessing indicators of what elements comprise a screen interaction, and how interactions are shaped into a feature screen argument, might afford screen thinkers an analytical frame in which to build or reject screen arguments. For example, if a colleague proposes a screen argument about "loss, wilderness and hatred" and one has a ready indicator of the elements in screen interactions, one might suggest that the colleague's proposal does not touch on necessary elements in screen or movie thought – such as time, people and action. By raising questions of time, people and action linked to the colleague's notions of loss, wilderness and hatred, then a failed screen project might be avoided.

Besides its educative goal, screen thought, as it unfolds here, also desires to improve research. In asking what is screen and movie thought, the study is mindful of what Paisley Livingston calls the discipline's "overarching project" of education and research (2006:18):

> "inquiries into films' epistemic values can be a rational strategy in so far as they provide a useful complement to the overarching project of philosophical pedagogy and research."

Screen education that learns from failure as well as success has been discussed, but what has "research" got to do with movies? In this study, movies are divided up into four cycles of writing, performance, recording and distribution. We might expect the kind of research done by screenwriters to differ from the research done by performers, recordists or distributors. It may also differ from the screen research done in university faculties. If we observe the "research" done by audio recordists in Coppola's *The Conversation*, for example, they focus on the physics of acoustics and electronics. On the other hand, directors "research" the right performers for their screen arguments. Directors screen-test performers by watching and listening for actions that exhibit a "knowledge" or "body-memory" of a role (Watson 1994b). Directors also test performers for flexibility, so a performer may be asked to explore a role, based on a surprising new direction suggested by the director (*Hitchcock* 2012). The "research" that performers do between projects is focused on observing the body, actions, gestures, costumes and voices of people. This becomes highly specific once a performer is cast to a movie role. (Crowe 2007). Distributors do cultural, political and economic "research" and some of this research, in terms of aggregate box office, is readily available for anyone to follow at sites such as *Box Office Mojo*. Audiences also respond to distribution by publishing reviews.

As research and development is done before production in any field, core film research is concentrated in its foundation or first cycle: its writing cycle. At this early point in a screen argument, usually only two people – the writer and the producer funding the writer – have to be paid, and the resources of these two (a keyboard and phone, went the old joke) are minimal compared with, say, half a million per day to pay salaries and suppliers for a movie argument during its performance and recording "production" cycles. During the early, relatively inexpensive writing cycle,

profits are built in to the quality of the story and costs minimized.

What is the thing that writers research? Rarely does a screenwriter research the screen itself. *The Player* has been mentioned, and writer Michael Tolkien researched Los Angeles studios in order to develop that movie's argument about the commercial practice of screen thinking. In order to become screenwriters, writers need to study their discipline, and apply their studies to their practice – here is this "knowledge and experience" nexus for "wisdom" again. But having acquired the skills of a movie screenwriter, writers rarely investigate screen thought per se. Few of Section-50's 170 movies devote their inquiries to their making. In the four key movie scenarios in this study: *A Cry In The Dark's* writers conducted research into a horrific nationalist show trial, and trial by tabloid media. *Heaven And Earth's* writers conducted research into an invasion. *Evelyn's* research forms part of this inquiry into screen thought, compiling interactions from the resources in Section-52. If *Evelyn* is released as a recorded movie in the industry, all the writer's detailed historiography resources are not usually credited at the end of its movie. As a cultural business, movie projects are usually highly secretive of their research sources. Moreover, academic articles rarely credited movie writers, let alone their historiography sources.

Does this usual omission in the credits create a false impression that strong movie arguments are not heavily researched? The research is deep and wide for many movies but the research is usually kept from a studio's competitors and screen consumers, so there is a widely held opinion in the community that research is not taken seriously as the foundation of screen thought. Yet the writing cycle is dominated by research and development. In order to protect its intellectual property, the distribution cycle hides the writers' research and development from the public, and it protects its screenplays and synopses with legal sanctions. Section-25 and most of

Chapter 3 investigate screen research further.

In the cases of the thesis' four key movie scenarios, writers have "researched" a show trial, invasions and a family screen business, and then "developed" their research into four movie arguments. One danger of exploring the research and development of makers is that we might confuse a writer's explanation of their working intentions with the interpretations that audiences and spectators place on the finished screen argument. But this investigation is not interested in any exegetic explanation that a maker offers for a screen argument. Rather, the inquiry asks, how are screen arguments selected, built and "completed," during a project team's relay process?

Paisley Livingston and Carol Archer (2010:444) explore the idea of solo and team makers who decide when their creations are "complete". Unlike values, opinions and reactions to a film – which are the province of screen audiences – the decision that a screen argument is complete is the province of the maker, Livingston and Archer argue. Completion decisions, they argue, have three aspects. Completion decisions "need not be the product of some highly lucid process of conscious deliberation. Spontaneous, intuitive thoughts or decisions can do the trick." Secondly, a maker's completion is a private decision and the work may never go on to a distribution cycle. Livingston and Archer's second point can be taken up and elaborated here by considering completion of a movie's four cycles: a completed screenplay may never be performed. A completed performance may never be recorded. A completely edited recording may never be distributed. The finances of distribution may never be reinvested in the makers. While agreeing with the second "completion" point that it is a private decision to realize work publicly, this work, if it is a movie work, is decided in a team "relay" of internal decisions.

Finally, the decision that a film is "complete" is not a decision coerced by others, say Livingstone and Archer. Most movie arguments fail and are "not completed" while some are "completed" successfully. Livingston and Archer's third point – the idea and practice of coercion – permeates screen thought and movie thought in particular, and coercion is explored in later chapters. The world's first movie (1906) and other movies discussed in Section-41 have been banned. Despite this, the thesis is mostly concerned with the thinking that creates, not destroys original arguments. A realistic understanding of failure in screen thought is essential, though: it is out of the wasteland of failed screen arguments that this study highlights philosophy's overarching project of "pedagogy and research." How might the overwhelming yet hidden failure of most screen thinking, including movie thinking, be reversed? Would citing the writers and their sources help? Is it too much to hope that a greater variety and success in future screen culture will come to audiences and makers as education and research rethinks its screen approaches?

05.

The Screen Array is Hardly Spoken or Written Sentences.

This study explores the claim that screen thinking – and movie thought in particular – occurs in richly woven, complex screen arguments such as feature documentaries or movies. As discussed, screen arguments appear not follow the standard form of spoken and written syllogistic arguments that give traditional philosophical literature much of its strength. If movies and documentaries are arguments, then their development is very different from premises and conclusions expressed in sentences. If one investigates hundreds of feature audio motion-pictures, including Section-50's movies, then patterns emerge. Firstly, features are distributed into a global communication network such as a cinema chain, broadcast transmission frequency, media store or the Internet. Feature films are not a natural given.

Secondly, a feature movie argument is not an array of verbal sentences. One does not "listen to and watch" a screen array in the same way as one "reads" word strings in a verbal literary argument. A movie, news program, documentary or video game often includes spoken utterances (and occasionally written labels) in an argument's screen array. But the audio listened to, and the motion-pictures watched, total many magnitudes of data more than the argument's verbal strings. For example, Lindy only cries out a few words at the tent, as a fraction of her otherwise non-verbal actions: She eye-lines the shadowy dingo, runs to the children's beds, searches them, and chases the dingo. A download of the entire written dialogue in a feature movie is measured in kilobytes, whereas the audio and motion-picture data (eye-lining, running, searching, chasing) of the same argument is measured in

gigabytes. Movie thought is hardly an array of sentences.

Regarding the data-rich layers of a movie argument, the screen's audio tracks include what makers call the "M and E" tracks. "Music and sound Effects" tracks carry every scene's atmospheric audio and spatial reverberation. These layers deliver much of the argument to appreciators. Spatial reverberation or "reverb" measures and states the acoustic spatial dimensions of every scene. Not only does a room look like a room, it sounds like a room. Human voices slightly echo – without obviously echoing – in interior scenes, whereas the very same voices are absorbed by natural things such as grasses, trees and air in a natural exterior scene, so that the sound that reaches microphones (depending on their distance from people's lips) is a different recorded sound in interiors and exteriors. Why is this scene argued here and another scene argued there? The writer putting the argument posits a scene as "interior" or "exterior". Then this shape, the reflective hardness of its boundaries, and the scale of space in the scene is re-created by performers, set formers and recordists of the audio tracks; as simultaneously the team created and reshaped motion-picture space. Uttered sentences are but small strands woven into the movie audio layers' much richer tapestry of music, effects and reverb. Moreover, the layered argument simultaneously unfolds as motion-pictures. We watch the spatial dimensions of every scene that we hear. Unless audiences are trained to think in screen thought, they do no usually notice these background audio layers of the argument.

Often sound is layered into the screen argument to arrive at our ears before we watch the place, person or device that makes the sound in question. In movie arguments, audiences will hear a noisy airport slightly before the recordist cuts to the motion-pictures of the airport. This usual overlapping of audio and motion-pictures, from very different but adjoining scenes,

creates the screen as a cascading, layered device. Sounds and voices of places and people overlap regularly. We can conceive of this form of screen argument – standard for documentaries, news programs, television shows, video games and movies – as a "layered, cascading" argument. How the layers overlap varies in movies and news broadcasts, for example. Movie recordists have the time to nudge the M and E soundtrack back into the end of the previous scene, and so herald the arrival of the airport with its sound, for example. But time pressures in a newsroom usually mean that the audio and the motion-pictures of places will both cut at the same time, or often the audio is stripped from the actuality footage and replaced with the newsreader, reporter or narrator's voiceover. In tabloid news, layers of music and effects are also added to affect audience emotions.

People or characters arrive and depart from most layered screen scenes. Besides actions of arrival and departure, other significant changes in the unfolding motion-pictures include people's visual gestures such as their eye contact with each other, or eye contact with devices and natural or cosmic places in each scene. A visitor makes eye contact with the crowd they wave to, with the steps, with the trees and sky. The gestures of eye-line, face and bodily stance are gestured layers in the motion-picture argument. Significant also is what the writer and recordist choose to frame and argue further in each scene, and the juxtaposition of points of view (what characters listen to and watch) in scenes, and where we are taken to as the next scene, both as the new scene's audio, and its motion-picture layers. Usually the wide exterior and background of scenes are established before directing the audience's attention to the people and foreground of interactions. A wide (or long) shot of the airport states the element of place as being an airport, with runways, aircraft, control tower, terminal and ground transport all listened to and watched. Then the writer cuts to a mid-shot of the visitor descending the stairs. If the visitor's face immediately looms into the foreground of this

interaction, no proposition of "an airport" is made. Audio motion-pictures are built and argued in both foreground and background layers. The motion layers are watched while simultaneously listening to changes in the translucent audio layers. A similar argument can be made in literature by building up a "word picture" of, say, the airport, as sketched above. But the ontology of film and people who interpret is such that many layers of audio and motion-pictures are stacked as translucently – and are beheld at the same time.

Knowing the screen cascades as translucent audio motion-picture layers gives a reassuring measure with which to analyze literary arguments about the screen. Have colleagues "listened" to the screen argument they discuss? What have they "watched" in action and what, if anything have they not watched that is significant among the film's audio motion-picture layers? Scanning two almost randomly chosen film philosophy articles – Mulhall (2006:105 discussed already) and Dan Shaw (2012:13) "Submission to God's Will in *A Man For All Seasons*" – both articles very, very briefly highlight the use of audio in the movies they discuss. Mulhall discusses the use of audio/motion-picture synchronicity and collapse of synchronicity to shape the subjective understanding or misunderstanding of a person's personal time sense and history. Shaw discusses audio in *All Seasons'* leading character's personal, self-imposed silence on a matter of belief and morals – a silence that strongly controls the politics and culture of his place. But not all film philosophy articles appear to be aware – firstly, that audio always drives many layers of argument (even by its silences) – and secondly, that the very physics of people's bodies and screen culture always separates audio and motion-picture material, and runs these translucent layers in tandem. Half of any film argument is audio, yet discussion of audio is a tiny proportion of most academic film conferences, for example. In listening to and watching the various layers of movie

arguments, audio and motion-pictures greatly outweigh the thin stream of words. Words are a crucial yet sparse element – a tiny proportion of the data put.

06.

Audio Motion-Picture Layers.

A stark way to consider movie thought supervening on the simultaneous layers of audio and motion-pictures is to consider film people who are unable to listen to audio or watch motion-pictures. Blind moviegoer Marty Klein is not forced to attend the local cinema but freely chooses to go with friends, time and again, to relax and listen to screen stories:

> "I love going out to see the latest 'hot' motion-picture, feeling the same anticipation and excitement as anybody who can see. When something's going on that I'm not following, I'll either tap my friend on the leg – or whisper, what's happening?" (2003).

Klein reminds us that we live as a "self," our whole physical body and embodied mind – a self who communicates among other people in the cinema, home cinema or any screen venue where one's body is either comfortable or uncomfortable. One notices that touch and bodily comfort are a part of any screen argument, usually when there is unexpected discomfort, such as a blind friend who cues us with a poke to elicit a translation of the screen argument. When the audio layers no longer make sense to blind spectator Klein, then the film's message is carried unseen in its motion-picture layers. So Klein asks for sighted person's translation of the puzzling sequence.

This inquiry visits blind Marty Klein to highlight the dual dominance of screen thought's audio and motion-picture layers, but we have stumbled upon another essential thread of screen thinking that usually goes un-remarked. Touch and displacement of the body (such that one touches a

friend in the cinema or one makes contact with the sofa at home, or one acts and feels bodily discomfort) is called "haptic action" in this study. The screen element of haptic action is examined more closely later, in the context of developing a standard form for analyzing or developing movies.

Most people expect to be reasonably comfortable – unaware of any usual haptic actions – when we settle down in front of a screen. Comfort is part of the distributed screen experience for consumers. Yet on three occasions in Roman Polanski and Robert Harris (2010) *The Ghost Writer,* a contract writer is surprised when he settles down to watch and listen to his screen. On three unexpected occasions, aggressive people invade the writer's personal space and his ear. A phone caller reminds the writer that he is now implicated in the war crimes reported on the news screen he watches. Below a sports bar screen, a patron brushes past the writer and whispers a threat in the writer's ear. Thirdly, in the most powerful audio motion-picture and haptic intrusion of them all, a news network's helicopter invades the writer's privacy at an expensive, isolated rural estate. The helicopter camera hovers at the lounge room window, transmitting live motion-pictures back to the network center. The network recordists mix this intrusive broadcast (of the invaded writer in his lounge room watching the news item on television) with the network's studio story about terrorism. Having mixed these two positions together, the recordists broadcast this concatenation as the very news they distribute to the global media-sphere, including on screen in the invaded writer's lounge room. Here we are confronted with Aristotle's complex interaction: an act of discovery and a reversal of beliefs. When comfortable screen habits are overturned, as they are three times in Polanski and Harris, we discover that screen thought consists of translucent layers that include our emotions, the haptic touch of our bodies, and the haptic actions of aggressive people who arrive and depart from places that we erroneously assumed were comfortable.

Blind filmgoer Marty Klein does not watch any such events at his screen venue because he is born blind to motion-pictures. Like most blind people, Marty becomes much more attuned and sensitive to the translucent layers of audio, touch, and physical vibrations in the air and along the floor that also answer Edward Craig's question, "What is there?" Blind Marty has become unusually sensitive to audio layers in screen thought, actions and devices; just as filmmaking musicians, writers, composers, performers, sound recordists, sound designers and distributors of concerts, music files and movies become adept at "listening" to screen arguments.

Most people think through many "translucent" audio and motion-picture layers at the same time. We usually listen to devised arguments in a similar way to how we naturally listen "through" translucent natural soundscapes. Leaving unnatural cities, most of us easily listen through the translucent audio of a gentle breeze rustling leaves in the trees to hear, deeper into the audio, a bird song. We turn our head towards the song. In turning our head, we feel the touch of air on the forward cheek and know that the clean Earth's atmosphere is not a transparent vacuum but a translucent medium. Our eyes cannot see birds in deep shadows that dapple the scene. Shadow and intensity reminds us that illuminated scenes vary their light properties. Some layers are in focus, others not. Illuminated, air-filled scenes, in sum, are translucent. We watch "through" the scene to the bird or the shadow that hides it while listening through sound layers. Spectators and audiences usually take this natural translucency for granted. Perhaps it is only screen makers and philosophers who have to deal with it as a problem. For most of us, we touch our feet to the ground, hear a bird sing, turn our head in motion and watch the bird – all in smooth actions where we casually attend to all the layers of touch, audio, motion and pictures at the same time, naturally, without experiencing difficulty. Most, but not all, screen thinkers could

naturally hear birdsong. So where are the difficulties for makers? Often difficulties arise in screen thought when we select a particular microphone or test the capabilities of a motion-picture camera, when preparing to film a new screen argument. Devices have signal to noise ratios, and equipment introduces unwanted noise into a screen argument that has to be filtered out or leveraged as part of what is argued. But more than this, some screen thinkers cannot immediately make sense of audio tracks because they are hard of hearing or are physically deaf. Filmmaker Jade Bryan (2003) has not experienced new audio layers in her adult life:

> "Like the character in my film, Zhane Rain, I also endured a traumatic brain injury as a child. As a result of that injury, I also lost my hearing, so I know what it's like dealing with family secrets, or not having to know the cause of my hearing loss until very recently. While growing up, I felt like I was living my life with a big '?' over my head every time someone would ask me how I became deaf. I'd tell them that I had no idea. The film, which I wrote and plan to direct, is fictional, but I used some of my own real-life experiences while writing the script."

How can a deaf person like Jade expect to be a filmmaker? How can Jade argue her team's screen arguments in an intricate web of simultaneous audio and motion-picture layers? The answer in this study is both simple and complicated. Feature-length documentaries and movies are vast, interwoven, finely balanced, engineered, costly and multidisciplinary "recorded arguments" made by teams, as explored in Chapter 3. No feature filmmaker has ever "succeeded" to write, perform, engineer, record and distribute a whole feature without other specialists. And this "mutual dependence" on others, as Geuss puts it, is why a film community can happily include blind or deaf filmmakers and filmgoers. Makers contribute to the argument as

specialists. They do not have to do everything.

07.

Even Two-Second Dramas are Made by Teams.

Even when French pioneer Louis Le Prince engineered his own camera and created history's first short drama film – *Roundhay Garden Scene* (1888) – other filmmakers helped form the photographic materials. Other people performed the dance that Le Prince records. Other people performed the temp music for the little film. "Temp music" is makers' working music that is reformulated later in the final distributed screen argument. Before the 1930s, music, including temp music for the performers was performed live or run separately on gramophone.

Roundhay Garden Scene is a historical fragment that runs for less than two seconds of screen time, yet even this low-technology two-second historic breakthrough required the specialization of many people who listened better that others, people who watched better than others, people who built photographic film better than others, and people who costumed and performed their dancing better than others. *Roundhay Garden Scene* is downloadable for free from Archive org. Scholars refer to *Roundhay Garden Scene* as "Le Prince's film" because he did invent his recording device, he was the main initiator of the project, he directed the performers, and so on. But a more accurate citation would be "Le Prince et al." A team citation clarifies the essential co-operation that formulates films – even drama's first, two-second fragment.

The most "fragmentary" thing about Le Prince's early screen expression about people is that the audio has been lost. In the film, four dancers take up four different positions on a garden lawn. They face in four different directions, circle in different orbits at different speeds, yet they still create

an orderly whole. The performers are not linked together with haptic touch (they do not hold hands) or link their eye-lines (all four face in different directions), so it is a minor claim of this inquiry that in order for such choreography to be performed, they must have been listening to temp music that coordinated their actions and dance as a visual whole. The suggestion is that the performers are listening to another person perform the temp music on a piano, which is hidden off-screen inside the house that fills the left mid-ground of the film. What indicates this audio possibility is the unusual state of the sash bay window. Judging by the costumes, it is a cold Yorkshire day, and yet the large sash window has been raised and it opens the downstairs room onto the lawn. Is piano music wafting from the downstairs room?

Usually, audio (such as piano dance music) is woven throughout the planning, performing, recording and distribution of screen arguments, so how does a deaf filmmaker like Jade Bryan cope? Presumably she contributes her energy and growing expertise to her project's writing, directing performers, recording the motion-pictures and distributing her screen arguments – while also co-operating with sound composers, music performers and recordists who she trusts to do her listening for her. Bryan has her haptic actions, so she might tap out the tempo and rhythm of the temporary music she requires for her performers to follow, and a hearing assistant could select or perform music that fit Bryan's percussive yet unheard rhythm. This is not an utterly unusual approach to making a screen argument. Team co-operation is much of what successful filmmakers do to make films and put screen arguments.

Blind spectator Klein, deaf filmmaker/audience member Bryan and Le Prince's first drama film highlight that movie arguments are whole audio motion-picture arguments – neither audio nor pictures per se – and the arguments are interconnected via one's body among others. In order to

engage with a movie argument, an embodied sighted and hearing interpreter engages with all its woven layers – not just a part such as "the visual" that, disengaged and isolated from the maker's argument, is a different proposal. People disabled as regards either a film's audio or the motion-pictures co-operate to find workarounds to appreciate or make films too. Philosophers might consider film vocabulary when considering spirited screen people who are "blind spectators" and "deaf audiences." Film philosophers might reply the vocabulary means "people who both listen to and watch the screen" when either of these partial terms is used, yet there is plenty of evidence that audio is mostly ignored in film philosophy and, if anything, there is plenty of evidence that audio and not motion-pictures dominate the time schedules of screen makers. Usually filmmakers spend many "weeks" recording and editing the motion-picture layers of a long screen argument. But they usually spend many "months" recording and mixing the audio layers for the same argument as a whole. Where filmmakers buy in their songs and orchestral music for their motion-pictures, then the time that the music writers (composers and songwriters), performers and recordists spend making these layers should be added to the project time in question. Filmmakers know from experience that audio predominates in the making screen arguments, although the ratio varies between projects and genres.

Asking what is documentary and movie thought – and developing "critical thinking standard forms" in screen arguments – this study underlines screen arguments as both audio and motion-picture layers woven whole – without which, any discussion about film as argument becomes lop-sided. Filmmakers have developed a standard form called the AV script that clearly delineates the separate audio and motion-picture ontology of screen thought. It is considered next.

08.

Documentary Audio Motion-Picture Array and Scope.

In the documentary series Robert Winston (2001) *The Human Body*, recordists use the cameras and microphones that fellow recordists engineer for modern medicine. They use medical cameras and microphones to film a screen argument about the lifespan of people. They film people from sexual conception of a new person, a person's increasing maturity, competence and responsibilities through to decline, dying and death. In movie thought and interactions, this human lifespan is redescribed as a person's maturity, competence and responsibility curve or "responsibility curve" for short.

Winston argues that when a new person is conceived and their body grows, the body naturally divides into organs: ears listen to audio, eyes watch visual motion, skin, muscle and joint nerves feel an internal haptic disposition that is also aware of exterior action and touch. Our body's ears, eyes, feelings and thoughts naturally distinguish between listening and watching. Problematic for literary arguments about the world is that, in using verbal speech and prose writing, the "sentence" form does not clearly distinguish audio layers from motion-picture layers.

Filmmakers are aware of this audio and motion-picture vagueness in the sentence form. They are aware that, naturally, people behold and interpret a sound and an image at the same time. Filmmakers who plan documentaries and screenwriters who develop movies have two main styles of setting out their thoughts in AV scripts and movie screenplays. Movie screenplays are explored later in Section-11. Screenwriting always distinguishes between what is destined for the ear and what is destined for the eye. In literary disciplines, the term "writer" is familiar, but what does it mean for "a maker of the screen's audio motion-picture

arguments" to be a writer who always distinguishes between listening and watching? Documentary films are discussed first, because their commonly used "AV script" form clearly distinguishes between "audio" and "motion-pictures" – a distinction, this study contends, that improves critical screen thinking. A writer commences an audiovisual script by writing three column headings. The columns bracket the element of "Time" from layers of "Audio" and "Visual":

| Time | Audio | Visual |

The "Time" in question is argument's running time – its clockwork timing points along the length of the film. More accurately, each written time is the "time in" point of the audio and motion-pictures that are written in the AV columns. Notice that the AV script calls the "motion-picture" column "visual". This is because, unlike movies, documentaries often put a lot of still pictures, photos, graphics, maps, text, logos, diagrams and illustrations into their arguments, as well as motion-pictures. The "still" image is clamped on a rostrum and then filmed with a motion-picture camera, or the graphic is computer generated. Moreover, the frame in news broadcasts is often copiously over-written with (visual) words, titles, dot points, labels, dated news location bylines, and translated subtitles. These visuals, including motion-pictures, are all bracketed in the "V" column. Still images and other graphics contribute to stylistic differences between most documentary and movie arguments.

The AV script extract presented below is from the documentary: Pilger and Lowery (2010) *The War You Don't See.* Why did the study highlight this particular documentary in its investigation? In answering this question, the methods and research journey of this inquiry come to light. The investigation analyzed over one thousand films. It then selected over 170 movies and 40 documentaries for its Section 50 and 51 lists. Because film philosophy books like Wartenberg (2007), Cox and Levine (2009) and Livingston and Plantinga (2012)

entirely or predominantly give examples of movies with leading men, the decision was made to investigate three movies with leading women, to expand an equitable discourse in this field. Also expanding equitable discourse: all theory generated in this investigation uses the gender-neutral "they" rather than "he" or "she" to include all readers, makers and audiences. With a gender-neutral theory, all readers are equally welcome to read, without political bias, every instance of screen thought that may or may not apply to their particular circumstances.

Moreover, the *Evelyn* scenario developed in Section-20, being a theory template that welcomes any performers to perform, is also gender-neutral. This openness begins with the theory's character names for a capitalized alphabet, like E for Evelyn, which can be a man or woman's name. But dropping a level from theory to practical examples, all 170 recorded movies and 40 documentaries film sexualised individual people, naturally. So a decision was taken to provide some balance to film philosophy's overwhelming bias of male leading men examples at the practical level – and so three female heroines were selected.

Given that this inquiry also focuses on the holism of the mental – people's feelings, evaluations and beliefs among others – as explored and argued on screen, the analysis of over one thousand films brought A *Cry In The Dark* to the top as a movie about a woman's feelings, evaluations and beliefs. Section-47's coverage argues: Lindy Chamberlain was nationally attacked by millions of people. Interpreting their television screens, this "mob" had developed false and hateful beliefs about Lindy, a loving, hard-working and bereaved mother. In order to explore the idea of justified true beliefs in a place where national jingoism was exploited by tabloid politicians and their media; and having written preliminary analysis on this "national" witch-hunt movie – the decision was taken to find another movie beyond the limitations of nationalism, with a leading female that investigated hateful and loving beliefs and actions at the "international" level. The best film for this purpose among the thousand films screened was *Heaven And Earth* about le Ly Hayslip. Its actions unfold in Section-48's coverage. A brief synopsis is given here:

Heaven And Earth **(1993)**

Le Ly Hayslip is a healthy young girl on her family's prosperous farm in South East Asia. Her family and community are invaded by colonizing soldiers from France and America. When Le Ly's brothers leave home to defend their country at the front, teen Le Ly becomes a underground soldier using roadside bombs to repel the invaders. She is captured and tortured. Her family becomes dirt poor: paying the invaders to release their daughter. Le Ly is forced to become a maid and then a prostitute in the invaders' occupied cities. An American assassin, Steve, starts a family with Le Ly and they move to San Diego. Steve becomes violent at home, kidnaps their children and then commits suicide. Le Ly runs her own successful American business, eventually earning enough to take her children to visit their grandmother in Vietnam. Now middle-aged, Le Ly donates her profits to medical clinics. She feels that she lives between two cultures – somewhat an outsider in both. This movie contrasts an international invasion's foolish, anxious, cruel thinking and action – with Le Ly's pragmatic, meditative, loving thinking and action.

In expanding the investigation via the second movie, many barriers to understanding *Heaven And Earth* came up – barriers that had not emerged in *A Cry In The Dark*. The problem with *Heaven And Earth* is a problem that Aristotle identified in similar dramas millennia ago: "Stories should not be made up of inexplicable details" – he argues in *Poetics* (1460a). This study researched the film's inexplicable details and found that the movie *Heaven and Earth* is about the American invasion and siege of Vietnam between 1945 and 1994 – fifty years of horrific actions that Le Ly managed to survive.

But such clearer details of the film argument are not possible to transcribe from the movie, because its filmmakers hide so many details, especially political details – which is unusual for Oliver Stone. In other areas of the film's inquiry scope, such as inquiry into family and economy, more details are explicated, although often written in the credits: Through her own private enterprise and love for her family and friends, Le Ly eventually prospered among other good people in America. She used her prosperity to fund medical clinics back in war-torn Vietnam. The film resorts to writing what it didn't put on film. Much remains hidden: the movie shows puzzling glimpses of so many interactions among people during the invasion – glimpses this investigation could not understand. If this was not a philosophical investigation at the level of "world" screen thought, the study would have given up on *Heaven And Earth* and chosen a readily understandable parochial film with a less relevant, weak movie "heroine" who did not transgress the armed borders posted by military empires after "world" war in 1945. To shrink from worldly research to something narrow-minded would have defeated this investigation. The term "world" is a technical "people acting in time" term in this investigation. It refers to the whole thinking human population acting in our time. "World" and "worldly" is used over three hundred times in this inquiry and is discussed in the next Section under "time." If a non-international heroine was used, the worldly cast of this investigation would have withdrawn to vague, more narrow-minded, terminology. As another movie heroine of the order of Le Ly Hayslip did not come to light (which suggests a limit of Anglophone movie subculture) the decision was taken to continue the *Heaven And Earth* investigation, despite its "inexplicable details." In order to know more detail about this screen argument, many historiography sources (Section-52) and documentaries (Section-51) were investigated. For screen thinkers, it is not a problem to turn to non-screen resources because the object of screen thought is hardly a particular movie. The object of screen thought is the world of people acting in time-place. By withholding what history writer and movie director Stone knew politically, *Heaven And Earth* pulls its punches. It constantly raises

questions: "Who were the various sides, as thinking people, in these interactions? What did they believe, when glimpsed interacting so horrifically in Le Ly's biography?" Of the 330 documentaries investigated, Adam Curtis (2004) *The Power of Nightmares* and Pilger and Lowery (2010) *The War You Don't See* offered the most experts and insights into people's beliefs and their screen arguments in times of invasion – in times of world drama. This is why *The War You Don't See* surfaced as the top documentary AV script extracted below.

Just as the analysis of the movies about Lindy, Le Ly (and Alma in Chapter 3) began with writing all their actions as "coverage" (Sections 47, 48, 49), the analysis of Pilger and Lowery 2010 began by transcribing the whole ninety-six and a half minute documentary to an AV script. The script extract below is abridged with ellipses "..". Listening to and watching the data lines left to right, the readers' weaves across time makers to physically separate audio and motion-picture layers, back and forth, demonstrating that a screen argument is hardly a text read as sentences. The array is plotted down a time axis and plotted across audio and motion-picture interactions. So at time 0:02:51, screen thinkers hear a chord, hear Pilger say "Bernays invented" and watch a circa 1916 photo of Bernays:

Time	Audio	Visual
0:00:00	Silence. ..	*Graphic:* Black screen.
0:02:51	**Music**: chord. **Pilger**: .. *Bernays invented*	*Photo*: Edward Bernays c.1916.
0:03:00	*the term, 'public relations.' He wrote 'The intelligent manipulation of the masses is an invisible government which is the true ruling power in our country.'* ..	*Film*: American soldiers march with American flag. c.1916.
0:05:43	**Sound**: *Explosions*.. **Pilger**: *Iraq, March the 20th, 2003. The creation of illusions and the selling of war had come a long way since Edward Bernays. The selling of this invasion*	*Film*: Night aerial bombing of inner-city Bagdad 2003.
0:06:03	*depended on the news media to promote a series of illusions..*	*Film*: Saddam Hussein and his generals review a parade.
0:06:20	**Sound**: *Yelling, jet whoosh and explosion.*	*Film*: Second Saudi rebel-hijacked plane bombs New York City 2001.
0:06:23	**Ewin**: *A burning symbol entered into the stock footage of people's dreams.*	
0:06:30	.. *associations between the image of the world trade center and Saddam Hussein and Iraq.. Hussain had nothing to do with it but that didn't matter because when you start using symbols that have been separated from their meaning.. the facts don't matter any more.* ..	*Interview*: Prof. Stuart Ewin with Dr. John Pilger.
1:36:33	.. Silence.	*Graphic:* 'MMX' on Black screen.

Figure 1. Extract from a documentary AV script.

In terms of the screen element of "time," this extract gives nine "time-in" points linked across to other film components. At the start, 0:00:00, the makers record silence for the film's Audio and generate a Black Screen graphic for its Visuals. Our ability to think about time and geometric arrays in terms of zero 0:00:00 starting points was developed in India 1500 years ago and this scientific method spread to Iraq, the Mediterranean, Europe and America much later (Bala 2008: 12, 68). In Europe, Indian mathematics replaced Roman numerals, so science, such as digital calculations, made progress in Europe too. Thinking in Roman numerals held back science for 1500 years, but Roman numeral are sometimes still used for film Copyright dates such as the "MMX" at the end of the AV extract.

Reading down the time column, the total running time of the argument is 1 hour, 36 minutes and 33 seconds. The above extract only displays about three minutes, with most of the vision and audio omitted with ellipses. Investigator John Pilger and former C.I.A. analyst Professor Stuart Ewin speak between 0:02:51 and

0:06:30. Extracts of what they say are in the audio column, along with other sound such as the faint yelling, jet whoosh and explosion sounds under the film in the Visual column of the second aircraft hitting the World Trade Center in 2001.

A huge stylistic difference between movie arguments and this typical documentary AV script is that much of its argument is carried in its spoken narration in the audio column. When a movie screenplay page is explored later in Section-11, hardly any of the movie argument is carried in its dialogue. But the documentary "talks through" its argument – much like a professor presents a lecture and quotes other speakers. This study calls this style of documentary argument a "lecture-style" documentary. All the documentaries appended in Section-51 are argued in this lecture-style. Because of documentary's reliance on "lecture-style" audio, blind filmgoer Marty Klein could follow Pilger and Lowery's argument without relying on a friend to watch and occasionally interpret the motion-pictures in the Vision column.

Pilger does not just "lecture" or put the argument into spoken narration in his voice. Documentaries about people and their agendas usually include a lot of interviews. *The War You Don't See* interviews about 20 world experts. In this extract, Pilger speaks at first. Then Professor Stuart Ewin, responding in an interview, carries the audio argument from 0:06:23. At 0:06:23, we listen to Ewin say, "A burning symbol entered into the stock footage of people's dreams" but we do not watch Ewin's face in the Vision column. We hear Ewin, while over in the Vision column, we still watch film footage of the burning towers. The towers are one of five brief motion-picture films watched in the Visual column between 0:03:00 and 0:06:40, including the equally horrific Baghdad towers under attack from 0:5:43 to 0:6:03.

Ewin speaks in the Audio column while we watch the NYC film clip in the Vision column and then, from 0:06:30, the vision changes to *synchronized* footage of

Ewin speaking his words in interview with Pilger. By transcribing the screen argument to this AV script, the analysis demonstrates how "layered" a screen argument is. For example, at time 0:02:51, we listen to the music of a faint chord layered under the sound. The chord underscores the appearance of a photographic layer. We view the portrait photo of Edward Bernays as we listen to the audio layers of Pilger saying, "Bernays invented the term public relations." Layers of music, a person's speech and the still photography of another person's face – all these elements cascade through layers of the screen argument at the same time.

Pilger investigates and records a screen argument about deceptive film practices and screen beliefs in times of invasions. It is highly complicated. The layered quality of Pilger's screen argument adds to that richness and its power. The Schepisi movie about Lindy Chamberlain also investigates invasion, although this notion is easy to miss on a first screening: Australia ignored the evidence of experts because the experts were of Australia's invaded class. Ignoring the evidence on spurious racial grounds, politicians, media, judiciary and police preferred to attack Lindy with white fantasies about nature (the innocent dingo) and attack Lindy's religious beliefs (not conforming to the invasion leader's religion) in Section-47.

The Pilger AV script and the documentary itself are dramatic (and hence of interest to this investigation) but the power of their serious inquiry may be mistaken for rhetoric. It is worth crosschecking its facts in another independent academic source such as Susan A. Brewer (2009), before trusting its veracity. The careful audience would also compare other documentaries in the field, such as Adam Curtis *The Power Of Nightmares*. Comparison supports veracity judgments. It also adds relevant source interactions for use in rich movie discourses. It also highlights differences in people's actions: For example, Henry Kissinger promotes war in the Pilger documentary but by cross-referencing this argument with Curtis, another verified sequence (from earlier in Kissinger's

biography) shows him promoting peace. Being documentaries, the evidence for both these interactions is mostly in the audio layers.

The cascading quality of a film argument may appear daunting. But the documentary is a measured and seriously constructed argument that increases its force by running its audio and motion-picture layers in tandem. Yet a history series can undermine this synchronized relationship. For example, the audio layers and the motion picture layers in Edward Feuerherd (2008) *World In Conflict* frequently contradict Feuerherd's argument. Feuerherd is an expensive but systematically ruined world history series where hours of quality narration are read over fascinating but "unmatched" archival motion-picture footage. What is narrated in speech frequently does not match the motion-picture actions of the people and culture being "expertly" described. The mismatched layers often create a false screen argument, where what is said is not what is done in the world. The "disconnect" between the speech element and the action element in Feuerherd is a maker's mistake. Pilger and Lowery are mindful of what they put in the audio column and weave it across to the motion-picture action, and they do not make this mistake. Pilger and Lowery carefully collect and present evidence of disingenuous politicians and their media voices that present deceptive television "news" to their voters. As such, Pilger is a critical investigation whereas Feuerherd is flawed. Deceiving their voters, politicians in *The War You Don't See* act horrifically behind voters' backs in other people's countries. This documentary helps the investigation answer the question "What was the thinking of the various power-holders who invaded Le Ly's homeland?" Another source that helped contextualize *Heaven And Earth* was Hanks and Goetzman (2013) *The Sixties* which also explores the screen thinking of that time.

By analyzing *The War You Don't See*, we can distinguish the variety of screen elements that filmmakers put into screen arguments. There is a whole column of *time* elements that fix the order, speed and duration of the other elements. At a right angle to *time* in this brief extract, the *place* elements are edited in this order: America, Iraq, America. The whole film explores fallacious screen thinking about *time-place* worldwide, including 1945 Hiroshima and 2001 Afghanistan, but this small extract glimpses two places. There are two kinds of *people* element in the film, those like Pilger and Ewin who put the argument, and people like Hussein, Bernays and aerial bombers who act (in the philosophical sense of act) in the historical interactions proposed in this extract of the argument. *Device* elements include buildings, weapons and flags – split into their audio and motion-picture layers. The "device" element of screen thought is explored in Section-16.

The audio and motion-pictures layers are always physically separate for makers and filmgoers. The translucent layers are interpreted together in real life – and interpreted together in the cinema – but it is not possible to make a feature film argument unless makers bracket audio and motion-picture strata and practice separate recording skills. Makers separately record and distribute the layers via microphones and speakers and, separately, cameras and monitors – linked together with a control track. At any time, it is up to makers, audiences and spectators to interpret these different layers together as a translucent, cascading audio motion-picture from the screen's separate monitor and speakers.

Reading ahead to Section-11, a movie screenplay is not ruled into AV columns, so it is not as easy to grasp how audio and motion-picture layers are written separately in a movie. But audio and motion-pictures are made separately in movies too, and they combine the same elements (time-place, people, action and so on) in their arguments, although, as we have seen with the dominant speech element in *The War You Don't See's* lecture-style, some elements in movies are combined in different proportions.

What else distinguishes documentary from movie thought? In documentary teams, researchers are often credited with names besides "writer" – such as journalist, investigative reporter, content advisor, producer, researcher, archive assistant and so on. Another difference, in this thesis at least, is that "film" philosophers usually focus on movies. "Film" is the British term for movies; whereas Americans are more likely to call a movie a movie. Proportionally few philosophers explore the world via documentaries. There are notable exceptions to this movie bias, such as Carl Plantinga (2009 and 2006) or André Dias' 2011 study of Frederick Wiseman's *Primate*. University faculties often split journalism, history and science films off from drama filmmaking, but this study places all feature films on the same continuum, in order to explore modes and modal shift (Sections-29, -30).

This study selects a lecture-style documentary to first inquire into film's layers, clockwork running time, its matching of the argument across layers, its cascading quality and an early look at screen elements. As to argumentative style, documentaries are usually narrated by a combination of: narrator's voiceover, to-camera presentation, and judicious editing of interviews, other speeches and actuality dialogue into the audio narration. On the other hand, most movies "perform and enact" rather than narrate their arguments.

Further into this investigation, this study also distinguishes documentaries from movies because of their inquiry "scope," not just their style. What is meant technically by inquiry "scope"? By scope, this investigation highlights the range of inquiry areas that particular filmmakers investigate. Schepisi, Caswell and Bryson's *A Cry In The Dark* movie investigates the thoughts, body, intimate others, friends, family, economic circumstances, political maelstrom, cultural witch-hunt, and natural and cosmic environs of Lindy Chamberlain. This movie has a scope that explores the private sphere of a person's thoughts, body,

intimates, friends and family. Its scope extends into the public sphere of economy, politics and culture. In this study, these private and public spheres and eight areas of inquiry are called people's "worldly agenda." Furthermore, Lindy's movie extends into the areas of nature and ecology – with the dingo – and the physical cosmos of desert, sky and dashboard chemical spray patterns.

In covering such a wide scope in its screen argument, *A Cry In The Dark* shows itself to be a "movie" in its makers' inquiry scope. If we compare *A Cry In The Dark* with *The War You Don't See* documentary, the Pilger documentary does not focus on one leading person's thoughts, body, intimates, friends, family, nor her economy, politics, culture, nature and cosmos in the way a movie inquires. Instead, *The War You Don't See* narrows and deepens its scope to investigate the "politics" area of good politicians and their nemeses over a feature-length argument. Again Robert Winston's *The Human Body* narrows and deepens its scope to investigate the "body" and "nature" areas of all people, not just one leading character.

Two other documentaries that have informed this investigation are Brian Cox (2011) *Wonders Of The Universe* and Alice Roberts (2010) *The Incredible Journey*. Like Winston, Cox and Roberts are scientists of ecology and physics. Cox investigates the flow of time and energy from the big bang to the rapid destruction of our atmosphere today, and on to future extinction. Roberts investigates the flow of human migration and habitation out of Africa c.70,000 years ago and around the Earth by 13,500 years ago. Roberts does this via an archaeological, cultural and DNA investigation. *Wonders Of The Universe* narrows and deepens its scope to investigate the "physical cosmos" area and its flows. *The Incredible Journey* narrows and deepens its scope to investigate the "natural" human ecology area and its flows, as well as the "cultural" area of the human agenda. These arguments focus on living ecological or physical cosmic flows, and this study classes such documentaries as "flow" arguments. By contrast, *The War*

You Don't See and Adam Curtis (2004) *The Power of Nightmares* are both documentaries about people's worldly agenda – especially in the "political" and "cultural" areas of the public sphere. Adam Curtis (2004) *The Power of Nightmares* (BBC) is a free download from archive org. Its full transcript is also a free download. In three episodes, Curtis investigates the rise of modernity and religious fundamentalism in America, Britain, the Middle East and South Asia: how political philosophers change people's beliefs via the screen and the horrific invasions and civil wars consequential to such beliefs. What all these documentaries have in common, a commonality not shared with movies, is that documentaries narrow and deepen their inquiry scope to investigate an area of the public sphere or an area of natural/cosmic flow. Other areas of the inquiry scope's agenda and flow are ignored.

Compare the wide inquiry scope of movies: *Heaven And Earth* explores Le Ly's thinking, her body, intimate companions, friends, family, her economic odyssey, battleground-level politics, cultural genocide, and ecological poisoning and deforestation. The movie's scope covers ten areas of inquiry, if one includes its given tropical DAY/NIGHT flow. Notice that its political area is very shallow, it is politics understood from a naïve person caught up on an invasion battleground, without knowing the horrific politics that drive the day-to-day slaughter on the ground. If, as a reader, one scans the history bookshelf in a store or online store, history texts break down into three categories (not including biography). A few history books investigate the peacetime struggle to flourish in a place; while most history investigates invasion as either battleground level struggles or it investigates invasion at the political and cultural level. It is possible to read a great deal about battles and mistake or overlook the political and cultural forces that caused such horror. So Le Ly's story *Heaven And Earth* is followed on the ground as soldiers invade her family farm and she fights back, but there is no sense of the political and cultural forces that desired these attacks. This knowledge gap prompted this investigation to research and develop the *Evelyn* movie inquiry in Chapter 2. The overarching problem for any movie is its inquiry scope – by asking questions all

along the private and public agenda, a maker or audience can quickly identify what is missing from a movie that does not satisfy.

Some movies extend their inquiry scope further into the science of "flow." Soderburg, Grant and Brockovich (2000) *Erin Brockovich* backgrounds some "flows" of hexavalent chromium and human cancer ecology – while its heroine also deals with people's complex "agendas" that are "instigated" by poisoners, or "dealt with" by victims and lawyers. Mann, Roth and Brenner (1999) *The Insider* argues the biological "flow" of lung cancer, and worldly "agenda" of traditional drug pushers and investigative journalists. Because *Heaven And Earth* hides its political context, it ignores the post-1945 ruination of science and engineering as a result of that invasion. During the invasion, one third of all American engineers worked for prime defense contractors that attacked civilians in South East Asia, according to Seven L. Goldman in *Science in the Twentieth Century* (2013: Ch28). This "science and engineering" suffering is repeated in Russia, China and the U.K. too (Curtis 2004; Chang and Halliday 2005; Pilger and Munro 1994b; Wilkinson and Le Clézio (1983); Rhodes 2010). It is a perennial academic crippling in an anxious world. "The politics of xenophobia undermining 1800s science" repeats the theme in Reisz, Pinter and Fowles (1981) *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, too. How this distorted "science and engineering" cultural background layer affects Le Ly's husband Steve is that Steve is trapped by poverty and debt when he returns from war – and his only bureaucratically valued competence is to continue arming and killing people with the latest weapons. Le Ly's movie raises many unanswered questions like this, especially in its political area. Political ignorance is common in war movies such as *The Deer Hunter* in Section-37. Again, the production of Kubrick, Herr and Hasford (1987) *Full Metal Jacket* recorded a whole "political" middle about "the Marine Corps propaganda machine… journalism was all about falsification." But then Kubrick cut his argument's very core from the distributed film seen by audiences (LoBrutto 1997: 475). Deliberate silence or deception in the

political area – or any inquiry area – suggests to serious makers that further research is called for.

In exploring one style of "standard form" for screen thinking – the documentary AV script – two main strata of layers (audio and motion-pictures) have been bracketed and held together with plot time's column of clockwork. Into this documentary array, other elements of people, places, actions, dramatic notions and utterances are placed in the Audio or Visual columns, or placed across both. Being a documentary argument and not a movie, the element of speech or utterance dominates as a lecture-style narration. In order to expand from documentary's limits within screen thought, Chapter 1 now moves ahead to explore other elements such as people and gestures. It also expands from documentary to the whole dramatic inquiry scope that questions a few people's private and public agendas in each movie argument. With the full scope of drama in mind, the element of time is explored next.

09.

Time and Scope of a Person's Interactions.

The most dramatic actions of leading characters Lindy, Le Ly, Evelyn and Alma unfold in time, in Sections 47, 48, 20 and 49 respectively. All four characters are caught up in the drama of defending their thinking and action from the predation of some, while expanding their liberty and affection among others. To a great extent, drama of this magnitude concerns people generally in life and concerns those who develop movie arguments. How is drama developed? One approach, in Section-08, is to record how people speak and act over time, plotting what they say of drama in a documentary. Films, photos, writings, narration and interviews are arranged along a documentary's plotted timeline, narrating people's dramatic interactions. Documentary makers investigate the drama in people's lives much as moviemakers do. But, as Section-08 discovered, documentary makers tend to eschew a wide "scope of inquiry" for a narrow area of screen argument. Winston's *Body* mostly explores inquiry areas of "body" and "nature." Pilger and Lowery's *War* mostly explore media "politics" and "culture" areas.

On the other hand, if the investigation adopts a moviemaker's thinking about the drama of life, then it chooses to embark on research and development that is wide in scope. The movie scope inquires across thoughts (including feelings), body, intimate companions, friends, family (or household), economic circumstances and initiatives, politics, culture, biological life conditions and the physics and cosmos of person A – in relationships with B and C, and so on – triangulated. Drama's triangulation is discussed in Section-10. For parents M and F to relate to relate to each other and create another individual C, there has to be "time." Lindy Chamberlain's time is considered here first, and then Le Ly's time. Lindy, like any

person, is a thinking body in time. What time, exactly? Lindy was born in 1948 in New Zealand. In filmmaker terms, what distinguishes the time 1948 from other times? How did her parents dress? The costume question is a time question because writers and performers show the year 1948 authentically by dressing the performers in the clothes of 1948 appropriate to the place, and surrounding performers with the devices of 1948. As investigators, we redescribe the claim that Lindy was born in 1948 by filming the birth of a girl into a subculture that dresses similarly to people in 1940s. Our time research might be compiled by watching Section-50's 1940s movies such as (1942) *Casablanca,* (1944) *The Ministry of Fear,* (1944) *Double Indemnity,* (1945) *Spellbound*, (1946) *The Razor's Edge*, (1946) *Notorious* and (1949) *The Third Man*. Of the costumes and other devices of these movies, an investigator would research appropriate medical and day-to-day 1940s styles rather than glamour styles, on most days for Lindy's parent generation. A 1940s operating theatre and doctors' costumes are depicted in *Spellbound* for example. Was Lindy born at home? Research would answer this and dress the argument appropriately. These movies also indicate what Lindy's parents may have watched at cinemas in this period of time. As for the speech element, the vocabulary spoken in white New Zealand at the "time" was British English – in films like *The Ministry of Fear, The Razor's Edge* and *The Third Man* – rather than U.S. film vocabulary from the 1940s.

The time investigation may also include Section-52's written historiography sources: In her sixties in 2010, Lindy wrote an open letter to the world about her thoughts, her family and her politicized circumstances three decades after baby Azaria was taken by a dingo. If a movie investigator's inquiry extended from 1948 to the time of 2010, questions of what performers would wear differently in 2010, and the devices that surrounded them in 2010, would be relevant to putting the "time" of this movie argument. Lindy's open letter of 2010 is itself a resource into three areas of Lindy's worldly agenda: her thoughts, her family and her political circumstances. Writing of the way her thoughts changed over the years, she says:

> "Dwelling on the pain is only something that those who wish you harm hope that you will do. They want you miserable. I don't wish to be miserable. That is why I learned what forgiveness really is and put it in to practise" (Chamberlain-Creighton 2010).

There are many internal thoughts here that change over time. A movie investigator could develop these internal mental notions into the external actions, gestures, speech and place elements of a movie argument that explored, say, her journey to forgiveness. The researcher could introduce these notions along a timeline. First there are people who wished Lindy harm, much like the truck driver who opens Schepisi's movie (Section-47). He occurs in calendar or objective time in Lindy's life among her family and friends "before" the pain of baby Azaria's death and the pain of the irresponsible media attacks. "After" these painful interactions, Lindy decides she does not want to be miserable. Screen thought is very much about arranging decisions in time. "Further along" in time, she learned that by forgiving irresponsible media and audience ghouls, she could dismiss them from her thoughts and actions, thus improving her life with her family and friends at a "later" sequence of time. Her letter continues into the political inquiry area:

> "How many times do you have to be hoodwinked and led along by the nose before you demand something better from our courts, police force, politicians and media? There are good, honest, truthful people in all these fields. We need to support them in their struggle to clean up their profession and stand for truth and justice." (ibid.)

Lindy wrote her letter in 2010, decades after foolish and dishonest "courts, police force, politicians and media" ruined her family's lives in the 1980s – which is the argument put in Schepisi's 1988 movie. For a filmmaker today, Lindy suggests a few things have changed politically for the better over time.

But, over the same time, there are enough foolish and dishonest bureaucracies and businesses ruining people's lives today that cry out for exploration in many dramatic movie arguments. Such political interactions are located along a framework of time. But as shown later in Section-11, the time framework is different in a movie screenplay: there is no "time-in" column. Rather, people are known by their political actions that are placed in Action lines under a page number that is also the action's location in plot time.

Moving from dramatic political notions to another area in the inquiry scope, the movie character Lindy's "body" attracts questions. If a new movie explored Lindy from 1948 until 2015, then at least four performers would have to be cast to perform Lindy's body changing in time: a baby, a child (or two), a youth and an older performer. The concept of lifespan or a person's "maturity, competence and responsibility curve" has physical, casting consequences for arguing "time" in a movie. The youth and the older performer would be made-up and dressed at points along the timeline to extend the ages they could perform. So makeup is another *device* element that shapes the body inquiry area over the *time* element.

Performers, as living people, change over time too. In the *Timeline* in Section-50, young performer Harrison Ford gains a minor role as a young executive assistant, in Francis Ford Coppola et al. (1974) *The Conversation*. This won him public exposure. He made his way up into George Lucas et al. (1977) *Star Wars* and then the more mature dramatic lead in Weir, Wallace and Kelly (1985) *Witness*. Again, performer Malcolm Mcdowell is cast as a teenager in Anderson and Sherwin (1968) *If* in the U.K. Some months later, Mcdowell's "effortless" performance as a teen rebel in *If* helped him acquire the teen-youth lead in higher budget Kubrick and Burgess (1971) *A Clockwork Orange*. A decade on, Mcdowell's original director and writer cast him in the lead as a young salesperson. He experiences

many great problems of our "time" (corruption, structural unemployment, genetic research, nuclear weapons accidents, torture, colonialism and so on) in Anderson and Sherwin (1984) *O Lucky Man*. Ford, Mcdowell and all performers "age" into a variety of roles over time.

Along a timeline, an investigator (a screenwriter) researches and develops "interactions" that argue the case being put in the audio and motion-picture layers. Each "interaction" involves the holist thinking (feelings, desires, evaluations, beliefs, intentions interconnected with action, gestures and speech) of more than one person relating among others in time-place. With drama's triangulated relationships in mind, the researcher would not only time Lindy's thoughts in her letter, but also search out the other people whose relationships dramatize Lindy's life at various times. The element of time becomes important again for developing those interactive relationships with others. It takes time during a screen plot to perform an affectionate relationship that changes over time. The 1980s national media witch-hunt by "courts, police force, politicians and media" drove Lindy's co-accused first husband to distraction. The couple's affectionate relationship was destroyed over time. Eventually Lindy met another honorable and affectionate man, which is why her surname is hyphenated today. It takes plot time to explore such relationship changes. When did these changes occur in historical time? In terms of telling a story in time, the estrangement happened before her remarriage, and perhaps that ordered time sense is enough for an audience. But a filmmaker needs the precision of a historic timeline, in order to locate many more places, people and actions in the movie argument, even if these details are later dropped from the movie. Where do the interactions of "estrangement" and "remarriage" sit along the historical timeline and across all her main relationships and events? What interactions among people are selected for the plot? Moviemakers distinguish between these two kinds of time axes – life history and screen plot – and other related time axes such as

story, production schedule and film conservation.

Brian Cox (2011) *Wonders Of The Universe* argues the decay of all energy over "the arrow of time" since the big bang. Decaying time helps explain why we only move forward in historical time towards our deaths. The decay of films, people, cinemas, pianos and sheet music over time is one of the reasons why the first screen drama (Le Prince et al. 1888) and the first movie (Tait, Tait et al. 1906) and thousands of early screen arguments exist only in fragments, if at all. Besides physical decay, the other main reason for an argument's disappearance over time is that people with something to hide will ruin arguments, as discussed in Section-08's *The War You Don't See*. Combining these energy decay and political silencing reasons, if makers or audiences do not generate and switch energy through a film, then the film is less than a "timeless" shelved book – it is unwatchable. It is people (readers, makers and audiences) who make decisions to pick up devices like books and read, or switch energy through movies and listen to and watch them. There are many ways that screen arguments fail or succeed to reach audiences over time. Once an argument is screened, another key time sense emerges. An audience brings a "story" interpretation of time to message devices such as movies. Here is an example of these time axes, in the "friendship" area of the worldly agenda:

In the movie argument *Heaven And Earth*, main character Le Ly Hayslip meets her partner Steve and allows this strange enemy soldier to sleep overnight in the front room of her home. Historically in time, this scene really occurred in 1969 in Da Nang, Vietnam. The beginning of their friendship can be dated on a historical timeline from this event. Moreover, this event is also plotted in the movie released in 1993, twenty-four years after Le Ly met "Steve." (The makers changed his name for privacy and typology reasons, explained later).

From the plot covered in Section-48: Le Ly's first meeting with Steve occurs after giving birth to her Saigon lover's child and before she, Steve and their young family move to San Diego. This movie plot is a devised timeline under the control of the makers. As the plot is not shuffled over this sequence, an audience's interpretation of Le Ly's "story" also follows the plot's time order of: "1. Baby- 2. Steve- 3. San Diego." The plot is the makers' physical timing device. The story is a matter of people's thought: people interpreting history, personal experience and the movie plot rationally and chronologically to the best of our beliefs. In our thoughts, "time" is a story about Le Ly, for audiences of this movie. Their retelling of the story probably follows the 1. baby, 2. Steve and 3. San Diego of the plotted time.

Moreover, *Heaven And Earth's* history, plot and story occurs along a production schedule "time" for performers, Hiep Thi Le and Tommy Lee Jones. Scheduled production time is managed for years before the movie is released. As movies are usually shot out of plot order, Hiep Thi Le may have performed her first friendship scene with Jones before the birth scene as part of the project team's schedule. In scheduled or calendar time, on the day, hour and very moments of her performances, Hiep Thi Le performed the following in real-time:

> Le Ly invites Steve to sleep in her lounge room.
> Steve's sleep is disturbed by war nightmares.
> Le Ly comes from her bed to the lounge floor.
> She comforts Steve.
> They kiss and sleep together.

These five interactions put arguments about their worldly agenda: their brief platonic friendship, but also in the inquiry areas of intimacy and bodies.

Intimacy comes to the fore in the last three interactions where Le Ly comes to comfort Steve. The latter four interactions discuss bodies and nature too. Bodily, Steve and Le Ly are circadian (day and night) creatures. They are only awake with an "embodied sense of time" for part of each day. Bodies go through a cycle that includes sleep (where there is no sense of time) and dreams (with an uncontrolled surreal sense of time). From Hiep Thi Le's performance and our assumptions, we may interpret that Le Ly did not dream, but she slept a short period in her bed with no sense of mental time, until Steve's cries woke her. Audiences interpret Le Ly based on their own beliefs. People, who believe they have no time sense while they sleep between dream sleep, will ascribe this timeless experience to Le Ly too. Sometimes when we are awake, we are aware that when we slept we must have lost perception of time. If we are friendly, in the philosophical sense, we ascribe this belief to others like Le Ly too. Subjectively, from her point of view, her sleep is timeless.

What of Steve's dreaming or nightmare sleep? Again, as we know from our own experience, people have a surreal sense of time passing in dreams or nightmares. Steve's nightmare is depicted rather weakly in the film. Is this because of the makers' self-censoring that omits the politics of this argument or is it psychological, as Sigmund Freud would put it?

> "If anyone relates a dream, has he any guarantee that he has told it correctly, and not changed it during the telling, or invented an addition which was forced by the indefiniteness of his recollection?" (Freud 1920: L1132)

Steve recalls in ghostly black and white: a ruined tree and a war victim on crutches. This is a very weak substitute for the many people he has murdered in their homes and businesses – a masking of his actions and

people's horrified reactions in surreal "time." Events, people and roles may arrive, depart, speed up, slow down, shuffle in time, loom from different angles, change color, change bodies and so on, during a dream's surreal time sense. When asleep in this scene, Steve's sense of time and Le Ly's sense of time are very different. She has the control over time and timelessness that Buddhist meditation brings to her earlier in the film. Steve has little control over time during nightmare interactions with his murder victims. Woken by his cries, Le Ly resumes sensing time too. Woken, she listens, watches and acts again in her home.

The Sanskrit language has a compound term, V*ira-old* which means "heroes' era" or "time of heroic people" – people taking the initiative – as when Le Ly and Steve have the courage for peace rather than war. The Sanskrit term "heroes' era" or *vira-old* has been carried through the German "*wira-old*" into the English term, "*wor-ld*". Originally, "world" was a "people's action in time" concept – the age of heroes or the age of people taking the initiative and dealing with community problems like love in a time of invasion. While "world" sometimes means "the age of people taking the initiative" today, it has mostly shifted away from a "people acting in time" concept to a "place" concept. It has even shifted from being a place concept to denote "space bereft of people" or denote "thought" or "scenario" for logicians. Astronomers refer to "uninhabited worlds." Quine reminds us that Leibniz writes of "all possible worlds" (1961:1) – rather than "all possible scenarios" in our only world where people take the initiative now, recall the past, or think of the future in one world. In this inquiry, "world" is used technically to mean all people living in time-place. In 1969, Steve and Le Ly were sharing our one world with all the other people alive on Earth at that moment; much as all living people on Earth share the moment of world now, today.

Within this living real time of the moment, we are strongly or weakly aware of time passing. We may observe objects "moving" and people "acting" in time-place, including the recorded time-place of the screen. In Le Ly's town, rain falls in motion. Le Ly acts to approach Steve, who moans in his sleep on a mat on the floor. She smiles and kneels down. She may or may not be aware of time unfolding as she kneels down, but another person (such as an audience watching her action) can choose to be weakly or strongly aware of her actions passing in time. Steve is listening to and watching his internal nightmare, which no person except himself beholds. But film writers can write the reenactment of his nightmare, and Stone and Hayslip's team reenact and record his nightmare images as a plot sequence. Steve's thoughts are performed and recorded as his black-and-white nightmare. Unlike Le Ly's dreamless sleep, the nightmare has "time duration" and its images have a "time order" which is performed recorded and watched.

Le Ly appears to be unaware of how terrified Steve is, because he moans ambiguously. She misinterprets his action and utterance. She smiles at him as she kneels. (Section-13 discusses the screen element of "gesture" such as the smile). While Le Ly is asleep we can assume her sleep was settled and timeless for her. But what does Le Ly think, between the time she wakes up, hears his cry and kneels beside Steve? Perhaps she could have been thinking about other tormented cries that seized her thoughts earlier in the invasion, such as her brothers being tortured and killed, or herself and her friends being tortured. Anyway, we may assume she is conscious of Steve's disturbance – it wakes her. But as to other awake thoughts: we do not know if her thoughts are happy or fearful; biographical or fantasy; about time past or time present; or conjectures about other places or future time, because only Steve's nightmare thought is performed in this sequences. Her thoughts are indicated by her external, present-time actions, gestures and speech.

For the filmmaker researching and developing all these senses of time as a movie argument, there are some rules of thumb. People acting in their own history, biography and real time can be recorded with documentary's digital clockwork mechanisms, microphones and cameras. If performers reenact such actions (whether as facts or deceptions), these actions too can be recorded or developed in the writing of a plot. Later, Sections 29 and 30 discuss the shift from biography to other modes that argue people's actions – such as typology, conjecture, fantasy and surrealism. The modes of conjecture and surrealism include techniques for warping people's action and sense of time – as we see briefly in Steve's nightmare sequence. But slippage of time mostly occurs factually and externally. An example of slipping *time* elements appears in Payne (1994) *Pie In The Sky*. An escapee runs up the stairs in an apartment block, while portly detective Henry Crabbe rises adroitly in an elevator at a different speed and mass. Their different actions are a counterpoint in time.

Film is never living people breathing and acting in our time of now. Film is never people who fantastically step from the screen and greet us in conversation. A movie or documentary is never live performance, or people alive and acting (in the philosophical sense) of our personal space. If recorded characters were among us in the now of time and place, all would participate in the scene we share. A documentary recordist could record us preparing and sharing a sandwich together with the stars, or avoiding each other and so on. Pixels never do that. What we always listen to and watch on screen is a devised maker's expression, a movie, a documentary, a message device that carries recorded light and sound from now-absent people. As material expression, film is subject to the same truth conditions as a piece of writing or a person's utterances. It is subject to the same truth conditions Le Ly imposes on her thoughts. At the time she comes to sleeping Steve, she believes both her brothers are dead. She may re-imagine their deaths "in time," unfolding in her thoughts – as she crosses from her bed to Steve on the floor in 1969. But years later, in historical, biographical, external time, she meets one of

her brothers alive. He survived the invaders' torture and she is reunited with him. At this later point, Le Ly revises her thought and belief that this surviving brother is dead.

Hence, whenever filmmakers reenact people's thoughts on screen, a wise audience might recall that beliefs have truth conditions (weakly or strongly true or false) that attach to what people recall or imagine. Even though Le Ly's own nightmare (seen earlier in this movie) of her brothers being tortured and killed is constructed with the element of time, its unfolding along a timeline in the mind does not automatically justify its truth. Similarly, watching any film unfold along its time element does not confirm it as true. Makers and audiences have developed conventions that make filmmaking possible as a style of communicative expression, within human interactions. We first trust a filmmaker to film and explore facts in documentaries and movie biographies – and to indicate to us when the mode of the argument has shifted to from an honest and fairly selected biography or typology to other modes of exploration such as conjecture, fantasy or surrealism (Section-30). This investigation selected Lindy, Le Ly, Evelyn and Alma's stories after cross-referencing the stories with hundreds of screen and written arguments, and believes they are factual accounts of how people think and act today. But a disingenuous filmmaker would lie to an audience, or divert an audience from useful inquiry, using the very same elements of screen thought (such as people acting in time-place). Similarly, Steve disingenuously keeps silent about the fact that he is a racist killer for hire. As competent screen thinkers, we might reconsider how the horrors of historical time might be reinterpreted in a friendlier, wiser way. It is with this goal in mind that Section-20's *Evelyn* was researched and developed.

In order for filmmakers to argue a complex history-making action like a defender forgiving an enemy and making love to him in her home, moviemakers break down and analyze the element of "time." Although running parallel in time, audio and

motion-pictures are separate layers during the making and appreciating screen arguments, as we have seen. It is only when we listen to and watch people in real life, read a screenplay professionally, or when we attend to people and actions on the screen, that the layered, cascading, "translucent" qualities of audio and motion-pictures are interpreted together as one proposal after another proposal in time. The "historical" time and story time argued in a movie varies. Lindy's biography is only a window on a few dramatic years. Le Ly's movie covers scenes across a few decades. Coppola and Puzo's (1972, 1974, 1990) series *The Godfather* argues three generations of people over a century. Gorrie, Magnus et al. (1973) *Edward VII* argues a lifespan: from Victoria and Albert's lovemaking, to Edward's conception, his birth in 1841, to infancy, maturity, competence and responsibility, to decline of Edward's responsibility curve and death in 1910. Morahan, Whitemore and Powell (1997) *Dance To The Music Of Time* is a miniseries that covers most of the 20th Century as it explores a British novelist and the U.K. literati, in both their private and public lives. *Dance To The Music Of Time* emphasizes the agenda area of "friendship." Both Coppola and Gorrie's dynastic films focus on the "family" area of people's worldly agenda. Coppola and Gorrie mostly ignore these two families' public spheres – the Godfather's multinational organized crime and Victoria's colonial opium invasions that instigated devastation on millions of other families over time. While *A Cry In The Dark* does show the "times" of tabloid politics and culture affects on families, *Heaven And Earth* barely hints at the politics of invasion in Le Ly's "time." Kubrick and King (1980) *The Shining* only hints at centuries of colonial violence, with its hotel occupying a Native American graveyard. A very short "history" duration is Kazdan and Benedect (1983) *The Big Chill* which explores a reunion over "a long weekend" under the same roof, as friends are reunited by a loved one's suicide. It is their dead friend who understood the group's "time" in terms of global politics and history. A brilliant American physicist, he withdrew his skills from the military-industrial culture that invaded Le Ly's homeland. With his death a decade later, his historical thinking falls silent, too. History is barely

glimpsed in *The Big Chill*, although it motivates the whole story. Whether it is a century or a long weekend, time has both a physical timeline going forward and many kinds of mental timelines (back and forth) that contribute "time" elements to people interacting in a place. People's interactions may include: sleep without a sense of time; ordered durations of complicated thought and actions when we are awake; and dramatic dreams when time is watched without control.

All these time senses can be bundled along a layered time axis that intersects the next element: the "person" in time, who thinks in time.

10.

Each Person's Liberation, Affection and Death.

How is the element of "the person" or "people" argued in movie thought? Unlike nature films, the movies in Section-50 put people and personality at the center of world inquiry. For filmmakers who have studied the history of invasion (Kubrick) or have experienced people's folly and cruelty for themselves, as well as studied it (Polanski), the process of coming to see other people as similar to one's self and not "an animal," "collateral damage" or "one of them" comes from exploring drama in unfamiliar people's lives (1959 *Sparticus*) – and redescribing the drama of folly and cruelty impacting one's own life (2000 *The Pianist*).

Ignorance about people may breed fear, extreme defensiveness, enslavement and explosive violence. A movie can respond by exploring anxiety, folly and cruelty on a "homely" level, say, where: a gentle child is traumatized by bullying neighbors, makes friends with outcasts and happily gains liberation and affection among others – in Berri and Pagnol (1986) *Jeanne de Florette* and *Manon des Sources*. Or insights into people's beliefs and actions are explored on the "imperial" scale – in Clooney, Heslov and Willimon (2011) *Ides Of March*.

Insightful movies attempt to overturn ignorance and fear by arguing the element of "people" as a variety of individuals who are thrown together in unfamiliar, complicated knowledge journeys. Many scholars are interested in the novel; but people interested in the self and other people also develop movies that explore complex beliefs, values and emotions about people. In 170 movies in Section-50, what patterns emerge among these thousands of people, explored generation upon generation for over a century?

Other than movie characters that are only gossiped as hearsay, we come to know

each recorded "movie person" or "character" as a unique body and their actions. Each person emits traces of their human "body" – sound emissions of people's voices and reflected motion-picture light emissions from their skin and (usually clothed) bodies in action. Recorded audio traces include a body's "foley" sound effects, such as footsteps or clothing rustling – and the voice's reverb in an acoustic space. Motion-picture body traces include light reflected off: eyes, lips and teeth; a person's "face turning," or their "whole body" acting, or their "hands operating" as they consume or produce something. Usually these emitted sound and reflected light body traces are adorned with "device" elements such as clothes, makeup or the devices people handle. With light and sound and nothing more, filmmakers argue a thinking body as its recorded, layered physical body traces.

Along with each person's thinking "body," people "act." People act to consume, relate among others, and produce devised things. When one person is filmed, apparently without relationships – such as a solitary, seated hermit quietly meditating for 100 minutes – this action would be a feature film but not a movie argument. The 170 movies in Section-50 are all arguments about people's dramatically changing relationships in their private and public lives, even when they include meditation. Relationships in all 170 arguments readily unfold as the conditions of "affection" among people and conditions of "liberation" among people. By relating to Le Ly, Steve strengthens his affection strand. Unfortunately, his down-trodden liberation strand is trapped in his undisclosed debt penury and it eventually undermines his affection strand. Strong movie arguments triangulate and explore these dual conditions of affection and liberation amongst at least three characters A, B and C – and usually a few more foreground people.

If a movie is to be a strong argument, there is a numerical limitation on the element of foreground "people." All 170 movies only explore a few leading characters in foreground places. Movie thought sets everyone else into the background. An extreme example of foreground and background is the tens of

thousands of real individual extras that march behind the body of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi in Attenborough and Briley (1982) *Gandhi*. The movie investigates Gandhi's interactions with a few fellow lawyers, politicians, close friends and a smattering of violent attackers – because movie arguments only interconnect a few individuals deeply. Away from this foreground, movie thought interconnects a few more in an outer circle and then everyone else passes by in the background as crowds or featured extras. We follow *Gandhi's* foreground people over many scenes, places and times together. Grand projects are initiated among a few people, even as their actions and utterances are dealt with by hundreds of millions of background and off-screen people in South Asia and the world. If filmmakers desire to explore more than a few people carefully at a time – to inquire after "thousands or millions" – the best option is to speak and graph notions in Sectoin-08's lecture-style documentary, where the array of screen elements is set up for such a purpose.

Having placed thinking bodies in the foreground or background layers, each "person" in a movie is further distinguished by their actions. People either act to "consume" or "produce" in a time-place. The bias towards consumption over production is greatest in a baby or unproductive person whose competence and responsibility is, for many reasons, low on their life curve. Like any baby, Azaria in *A Cry In The Dark* only consumes and does not produce – except she engenders love of her family. Her parents' maturity, competence and responsibility curves are further along in time, so father Michael is productive in the community – he conducts "quit smoking" meetings. Mother Lindy is productive at home, making her baby's clothes. Both are productive in earning or saving money and raising their children.

Care should be exercised here around what is meant by "productivity" and "consumption" in screen thought. The terms apply to embodied people acting in the time-place of the world. A basic screen question asks, "What does A consume at the level of their healthy, living body?" The answer, observed in their lifestyle

actions, may include wearing thermal shelter such as a coat in winter in places that have a winter, and eating meals that sustained their health. But foolish actions, such as over-consumption of meals due to anxiety, or parading in a status coat in high summer in order to impress others is considered "waste" and "churn" rather than consumption in screen thought. Such actions against one's biology may be dramatic and hence of exploratory interest to moviemakers. Traditional economics did not emerge from modern biology. It is focused on devised money and does not make a distinction between healthy bodily consumption and churn or waste. It values, say, the production and consumption of cigarettes highly but devalues Michael's voluntary "quit smoking" meetings at zero or worse. Screen thought observes a person's body at the level of health over time, and has a more scientific or empiric understanding of bodily consumption or waste. This understanding is translated into movie arguments like Mann, Roth and Brenner (1999) *The Insider* where the leading character fights tobacco companies or Campbell and Tredwell-Owen (2003) *Beyond Borders* where the leading character supports a doctor who treats the starving victims of violent nationalism. People's anxiety, folly and cruelty – around money, promises, credit, wealth or poverty – are explored to a minor or major degree in all 170 movies in Section-50.

Screen thought's scientific focus on each "body" extends along the inquiry scope to the wider public "economy" inquiry area. So in *Heaven And Earth*, Le Ly comes from an entrepreneurial family and she is happily productive on her farm from an early age – until her home and business is invaded. Her traditional economy keeps her healthy. The arrival of war is a public health disaster and screen thought measures such ruined consumption accordingly. Early in the argument, children play together, go to school and work productively on their farms. Later in the argument, disabled, homeless children gamble and beg by the roadside as the military occupation rumbles past. But a traditional economist who denies people's health would "add" the consumption of, say, napalm to Ly Ly's economy and praise napalm's "added economic benefit" to the investors who pay

the economist (Ferguson 2010). Such inverted economics is frequently explored by screen thinkers, including: Gaghan and Baer (2005) *Syriana* – and Ford and Steinbeck (1940) *The Grapes Of Wrath.*

Turning to production: the idea of a person's action being "production" rather than "consumption" in screen thought is measured from "how the product is consumed" and what it costs to make. The robot produced in Alex Garland et al. (2015) *Ex Machina* is very expensive to make and yet it is, from many perspectives, wasted production because the product kills the foolish maker and traps the maker's apprentice. Traditional economic culture in the background of *Ex Machina* values the robot maker as one of the most productive and wealthy people in the world – but the movie shows this valuation to be false at the level of individual and public health for people's bodies, when the robot kills its maker, traps the apprentice and escapes into the wider world.

Because moviemakers inquire into "people's actions in time-place," there is little conception of a movie person as a timeless, fixed, un-located device, such as a painted portrait – unless this is a conjecture, fantasy or surreal movie discussed in Section-29. Rather, "people" live through their brief lives from conception to death. Their bodies develop thought and action. Thought and action develops people's bodies on a curve. Inside this trajectory, people observe, build and negotiate changing maturity, competence and responsibilities among themselves and others. This is a person's responsibility curve, discussed in Section-09.

Because movies argue "dramatic" time-places, people are explored co-operating in relationships together or injuring those relationships dramatically. Lindy feeds baby Azaria and Azaria co-operates by opening her mouth and seeking the milk. In *Heaven And Earth*, Le Ly and the Master co-operate to enjoy sex and intimate affection together. Relationships change during a movie argument: originally, Steve co-operates to have an intimate relationship with Le Ly but then he turns on her, as his relationship and actions become injurious. In movie arguments, the person is

not a fixed or certain entity. The thinking person's body, consumption, relationships, and productive actions change over time and place.

If we watch and listen to all the movies listed in Section-50, every movie has three or more leading characters. They triangulate dramatic relationships with each other. Many movies have more than three leading characters but movies triangulate at least three. *The Hundred-Foot Journey's* three leading characters A, B, C are two young chefs A, B who fall in love with each other, and restaurant owner C who treats A as an enemy and later rewards A as her star chef. *Underground's* three leading characters are A (one of the world's great young computer prodigies), A's pregnant common law wife B, and a detective C. Detective C takes A into protective custody before foreign assassins can injure A. *Great Expectations* has A, an heir to a secret colonial fortune. A is blindly in love with debutante B, who is pandered into wealthy society by C, a crazed victim of the same predatory sexual politics she now exploits. *Hitchcock* argues that filmmaker and lover A interacts with filmmaker and lover B to run their global entertainment business by sidestepping the religious fundamentalist censor C.

A Cry In The Dark explores a highly rational and affectionate mother A, who is attacked by a state criminal prosecutor B. B's attack is supported by many other triangulated characters including mercenary media who instigate trial by media. B deceives a judge and jury who imprison A for her natural life on trumped-up charges and no evidence. This injures the sanity, dignity and family life of A's co-accused husband C. In *Heaven And Earth*, farm girl A defends her self, her family (including mother B) and their family business by killing invaders S who act like C. When A becomes a destitute young mother, she agrees to partner C, have his child and escape C's war zone. Later, A survives C's domestic violence. When indebted C commits suicide, A returns home to B and brings B's grandchildren to see their maternal family for the first time. The over one hundred and sixty movies in Section-50 all have leading characters whose dynamic relationships are

triangulated in this way.

In a screenplay, a writer can introduce a simple marker for each individual character A, B, C and so on, and begin to build relationships with action words or shorthand that links these people. Novelists Graham Greene, Virginia Woolf and Franz Kafka introduce individual "people" into their development notes and their literature as D, X, K and so on. As writing develops, details of each leading character's body are introduced. Character B in *Underground* is a woman, as is character A in *Heaven And Earth.* We know these people by their actions. They both have affectionate relationships with men, both get pregnant and have babies. The babies create new triangulated parent-child relationships. The creation of parent-child movie relationships includes child "Amelie" in Jeunet and Laurant (2001) *Amelie*. Amelie grows into a teenager during the early plot minutes of the argument. The child "Annie" in Campbell and Tredwell-Owen (2003) *Beyond Borders* is all her father has to remember Annie's courageous mother by. Children "Sam and Henry" in Roach, Glienna et al. (2000) *Meet The Parents* emerge to change this movie series' family dynamics. Child "Edward' in De Niro and Roth (2006) *The Good Shepherd* grows up in Orwell's Cold War secrecy, embraced at the top of the UKUSA alliance until an adult friendship betrays his father's concepts of nation and security. (UKUSA signals intelligence politics is assumed in *Sigint* in Horner 2014).

Screen thought understands people A, B, C as dynamic over a lifetime, with changing responsibility curves. Movie thought takes a strong interest in conception, pregnancy, birth, infancy, childhood and adolescence in ways that theorized fixed, non-dynamic conceptions of "person" do not. Often adolescent movie characters question people's changing responsibility curves: Richard Kelly et al. (2001) *Donnie Darko* questions concepts of mind, authority, time, maturity, friendship, intimacy, solitude and death, for example.

Interactions between people set up many kinds of detailed, particular relationships in movies but it is possible to discern two broad strands of relationships that run through 170 movie arguments in Section-50. One strand argues a movie's "conditions of affection." In *Underground* (2012) teenager Julian has differing affectionate relationships with his mother, his little brother, his girlfriend, his two friends and the detective who pursues him. The second relationship strand in all the movies in Section-50 argues the story's "conditions of liberation". Again in *Underground*, teenager Julian fights for his liberty against his estranged father who is a Melbourne white supremacist Nazi, he fights for world liberation against colonizing powers and he fights for his personal liberty against Melbourne's secret police. By enacting both these duel affection and liberation condition strands over the 100 minutes of a movie, any movie argues what it means to be a person, rather than an object, in the drama of life.

Fred Schepisi introduces Lindy Chamberlain in *A Cry In The Dark* as a mother who is affectionate towards her family. Then baby Azaria is killed by a dingo. Lindy and husband Michael are witch-hunted by most Australian screen believers. The massive witch-hunt impacts on Lindy and Michael and destroys their affectionate relationship. As for the "liberation" strand in *A Cry In The Dark*, Lindy and Michael start free: their privacy is respected in their home, they liberate their children to be rational investigators by answering the children's questions – often with actions that furnish evidential proof. Lindy expands her son Reagan's affectionate relationship with the neighbors by leading him next door to check on the neighbor's sleeping baby. The family liberates their bodily health by eating sensibly and healthily. Michael contributes to the public sphere's liberation as a counselor who helps addicts give up smoking. But this liberal life comes crashing down, thanks to the national media witch-hunters who expose the private family to fallacious public shaming and approbation. Australia's 1980s corrupt legal processes take away Lindy's liberty.

A very different affection strand and liberation strand entwines Le Ly in *Heaven And Earth*, yet once again, all Le Ly's interactions include changes to her affection strand, her liberation strand, or changes to both strands in the same scene. When Le Ly is tortured in a secret prison, her conditions of liberty hit rock bottom, as do her conditions of affection. When Le Ly seeks refuge outside Steve's embassy, they embrace as a family, they fly out to safety, and her conditions of liberation are briefly on the rise – as are her affection conditions. Answers to the question: "What is a 'person' in a movie argument?" – include the person's conditions of liberation and affection triangulated in action relationships among others.

When a writer introduces and explores a screen person, the character has the potential for scenes shared with other people, as discussed above, and some scenes where individuals act alone. In Gilbert and Russell (1983) *Educating Rita*, there are three triangulated characters A, B and C who interact in scenes together but who sometimes act alone in private scenes. Privately, Rita controls her fertility by taking the contraceptive pill against her authoritarian husband Deny's orders. Alone, Deny demolishes and rebuilds his residence. Alone, lecturer Frank secretly drinks alcohol to drown his lonely life. It is in the actions of liberation (taking the contraceptive pill), liberation (building one's own residence) and tragic affection conditions (getting drunk) that people's relationships with selves alone open insights onto character that are unknown in group scenes. People acting alone also contribute to movie thought.

In order to understand what a person's "body" is in screen thought, one might refer to Winston et al. (2001) *The Human Body* or more recent documentaries about the thinking body. Winston carefully explores a person's thinking body interacting among other bodies – from fertile sexual intercourse, gestation (when many embryos die naturally and never grow into people) to birth, infancy, childhood, young adults (who are the main audience for cinema movies) and so on through a curve of maturity, competence and responsibility conditions which naturally decline to incapacity and death among all people who die naturally. As

an adjunct to Winston, the dead anatomy of the no longer thinking or acting human body is dissected in Gunther von Hagens (2005) *Anatomy For Beginner*s. The human brain, nervous and muscular system, the cardio-vascular system, the digestive system and reproductive systems are cut open and laid on trays. Anatomy helps people understand the physics and ecology of metabolising bodies (Nuland 2008). In Winston (2001), the bodies are living. They think and act, so Winston is both a "biological flow and a peopled agenda" documentary (in Section-08). Winston argues people as bodies who take the initiative or shed tears. What such documentaries do not do well, and what movie arguments do extremely well, is to explore a few people's relationship strands of liberation and affection over dramatic passages of their lifetimes.

Given anatomy's external concepts of "body," Whale, Sherriff and Wells (1933) *The Invisible Man* is an interesting early movie. *The Invisible Man* introduces and develops a person's body from almost no body at all. Performer Claude Rain's invisible character is not named for many scenes, but this investigation notes him as "J." *The Invisible Man* conjectures: "what would happen if J accidentally made himself invisible – but not without bodily disposition, touch and voice?" (J cannot entirely disappear or the movie argument would disappear). J embodies "haptic touch" so that clothes and bandages adorn and touch J's invisible body. J's costume encloses his disposition and his muscular action. We listen to J's embodied voice speak J's mind, but we can no longer watch J's invisible face and surface. J has become somewhat like the vacuous cypher J. In order to know more about J's body and mind, the filmmakers build this "person" like any other in Section-50's movie thought: J is known by his interactions.

"Interaction" is a *thinking person* in *time-place acting* haptically (touch, disposition and body awareness), along with *gestures* and *utterance*, among other people and *devices*. "Thinking" is broadly given in movie thought to include feeling, desiring, believing and evaluating. Philosophically, haptic actions, gestures and utterance are all "actions" but this inquiry uses the technical term "action" to

mean haptic actions – what embodied people do intentionally – other than gesture and speak. Nor is "action" used in the film production sense of all recorded movement and audio during a take of persons and other things. Section-14 expands on haptic actions, roughly what people do. The element of a "person" is woven with the seven other elements in an interaction, not a sentence.

The Invisible Man introduces person J at night. J walks through snowy farmland, wearing winter clothing, including gloves, mask and goggles. J enters a crowded, working-class English rural pub. The pub predates feminism or equity so it has a men's public bar on the street and a harem under the stairs. Although J is invisible until the argument is resolved, we "watch J" instrumentally via J's clothes. J is never entirely un-embodied because we listen to his lungs, vocal chords, tongue and lips ask for a room and food. On hearing J's voice, audiences usually interpret J to be male. This has already been telegraphed in the film title. Yet we do not know J's name: we hanker for his handle so that we can think more clearly about the "person." After many pub scenes with this stranger J, we cut away to J's scientific colleague, who works at home. The colleague utters his daughter's name, "Flora." Flora calls her father "father" and she utters the invisible man's name: "Jack."

Visible people in a film argument are built up from the blank page in the same way. In research, recollection, or a dream, we listen to a person call another's name; we watch an adorned or furnished body act in scenes. Body sans device is rare. Beineix and Djian (1986) *27° Betty Blue* has Beatrice Dalle and Jean-Hugues Anglade perform sex to somewhat orgasm adorned only with Betty's watch and unobtrusive camera makeup – but this lack of costume is unusual in movies.

Makavejev and Reich (1971) *W.R. Mysteries Of The Organism* is one of Section-50's most interesting movie arguments to focus on bodies, sexual relationships, violent relationships, intimacy, and the leap to political inquiry. Both its thinking,

sexual bodies – and its sexually-suffocating, uptight bodies – interact across private scenes and public scenes in Soviet Eastern Europe and Vietnam-era America. Antonioni, Gardner et al. (1970) *Zabrinski Point* also explores an interweaving of sexual bodies in nature amid the political upheaval of America at war.

Usually, movie audiences watch clothed people's faces and hands protrude from the performers' costume devices, while listening to the bodies' tonal gestures and speech. Interpreting *The Invisible Man* Jack's "invisible" body acting among English working-class people of a certain time, we still come to know much about Jack the person. Aloof from the pub crowd, Jack is abrupt, impatient, snobbish, rude and hermetic in his actions, gestures and utterances. Jack is anxious as he tries to reverse his invisibility. The frightened village people turn against Jack. He fights back, first defensively – and then Jack uses his invisibility as a weapon. Via actions that change affection and liberation conditions, Jack gradually comes to life as a "person" both for audiences, and for characters in the argument reacting to Jack. Any person is a work in progress in a movie argument. To know a person A (including one's self in real life perhaps?) one must initiate or deal with people A, B, C – their actions, gestures, utterances and devices cascading among time-place – in one translucent interaction after another.

People in movies mature, gain competencies and responsibilities among others – or they instigate immaturity, incompetence and irresponsibility over their life curve. In Roach, Glienna et al. (2000) *Meet The Parents*, Pam Focker's maturity emerges alongside her mother Dina's maturity, as both women deal with father/husband Byrnes' comic immaturity. "Conversation" for Jack Byrnes is an opportunity to puff up his unquestioned loyalty and supposed authority over one young man (Dr. Bob) who later betrays Byrnes' daughter Debbie. Jack Byrnes incessantly interrogates and treats another young man (Greg Focker) as a national security enemy – when in fact Greg is the loyal and caring intimate lover of Byrnes' other

daughter Pam. Byrnes' immature spying and interference almost destroys Pam and Greg's common law marriage.

In *Heaven And Earth*, Le Ly mostly discovers husband Steve's immaturity, incompetence and irresponsibility when she migrates with Steve to his homeland. Le Ly discovers Steve's untravelled, narrow-minded family, his debt penury, duplicity, and his friends who aid and abet Steve's drinking, assault weapons cache in a residential community, domestic violence, kidnappings and suicide. The shaping of a person's responsibility curve such as Steve's emerges among earlier interactions with other people – in what filmmakers call the writer's backstory. The writers of *Heaven And Earth* know what people mentored Steve's maturing childhood and youth, and what other people in his backstory deceptively preyed on him, across Steve's friends, family and public agenda. By the time of the screen argument, Steve's liberty is trapped and his affection is poisoned.

The actions of people's thinking bodies "as a movie" can be divided into actions of consumption and production. By "consumption" is meant eating, protecting the body from ecological extremes, sleeping, and the body's other metabolic flows. Such consumption holds little interest for movie audiences. A sign of weak movie writing is "cup of tea" scenes and dialogue where drama is set aside for ordinary meals or drinking that do not advance the liberation/entrapment and affection/hurtful conditions of the leading characters. Consumption only becomes philosophically interesting in movies when characters' normally low and regular metabolic requirements are replaced by starvation or over-consumption, greedy extremism and waste, including addiction. Exploring these dramatic imbalances brings people's consumption into the purview of movie filmmakers – say, in *Beyond Borders* about the world's public health disasters and famine caused by contemporary colonial economics; or Seed, Dobbs and Davies (1990) *House Of Cards* with power, cocaine and alcohol addictions; or Stone and Weiser (1986) *Wall Street*; with similar addictions.

When people's bodily actions are not consuming, their actions are producing. Once again, a strong moviemaker has little interest in sane, non-harmful levels of production that satisfy or save for the characters' normally low and regular metabolic requirements over a lifetime. Normal workplace scenes waste paying audience time and undermine the argument. But moviemakers do explore greedy extremism and waste, including addiction to productive actions that were once sane and beneficial levels for everyone. In Hallström, Knight and Morais (2014) *The Hundred-Foot Journey*, a business competitor buys up ingredients in the market to force a new restaurant's people out of business. The invaders of Le Ly's farmland in *Heaven And Earth* spray it with toxins in order to enslave the population, forcing locals to eat tax-funded government handouts in concentration camps. Welles, Mankiewicz et al. (1941) *Citizen Kane* concerns a highly competent producer addicted to political lobbying for monopoly power over the media-sphere, thus destroying knowledge and democracy. In Kane's private sphere, his lingering death is without affection or friends. When movies turn to the conditions of productive people, writers explore imbalanced addicts and other extremes, rather than everyday production.

People who instigate diseconomies and household turmoil become philosophically interesting to moviemakers who write and cast these characters into Section-36's "development shape." The notional shape first familiarizes audiences with characters A, B C and so on, in their "normal" relationships. Then the writing throws A, B and C into highly challenging circumstances that would attract a paying audience to the cinema; culminating in a climax of all the movie conditions under inquiry such as affection, liberation, maturity, competence and responsibility (and their negatives and counterfactuals). Leading characters who learn from their challenges initiate the climax and resolution of the argument towards its end. Given the shift out of a posited "normality" and into a challenging second act's unknown and unexpected "shadowlands," movies in most genres explore unnatural deaths or the threat of unnatural death instigated by

others. Such threats are extreme challenges to both the affection conditions and liberation conditions of any film character.

If we take six recent movies in Section-50, (*Ides Of March*; *The Tree Of Life*; *Tinker, Tailor, Soldier, Spy*; *Hitchcock*; *Underground*; *Great Expectations*; and *The Hundred-Foot Journey*) much of each argument is motivated around unnatural deaths or related calamities, that is, death or threat of death or entrapment instigated by persons – rather than dying from old age in comfort in an affectionate private sphere. Because Beau Willimon's argument is enmeshed in leadership politics and unnatural death inside an elite, *Ides of March* is particularly Shakespearean:

> "It stemmed out of all my experiences working in the political world. The characters are fictional amalgamations of the hundreds of people I ran across during those experiences." (Willimon 2011).

As an amalgamation, *Ides of March* is a typology. Lindy, Le Ly and Alma's movies are biographies and they also introduce unnatural deaths or related calamities. Almost all the *Timeline* 170 movies explore unnatural death. But most movies are not distributed as "unnatural death" stories. Usually, audiences consider movies in terms of heroes (of any gender), rather than killers and victims, even though many arguments turn on heroes who take initiatives to stop unnatural deaths. Sometimes, these peacemakers fall victim to the killers themselves, say, in *Underground*. Colonial "anti-heroes" instigate many unnatural deaths, such as Werner Herzog (1972) *Aguirre, Wrath of God* or Steve in *Heaven And Earth*. Colin McGinn's *Shakespeare's Philosophy* explores the scores of deaths in tragedy (2006: 86). The comedies listed in Section-50 dramatize sex more than unnatural deaths, but even *Bridesmaids* has leading characters who instigate violence, if not death. Unnatural death in comedy includes the wacky succession of drummers in Reiner and Guest (1984) *This Is Spinal Tap*. In comedy *Mean*

Girls, a school bus smashes the nemesis. The father in *Meet The Parents* is a retired commander of assassins. *Amelie* meets her lover "Death" on a carnival ride. Most detective series are about unnatural death, such as Bernth, Foss and Sveistrup (2008, 2010, 2012) *The Killing (1,2,3)*. Happily, *Pie In The Sky* is not.

Most movies argue unnatural deaths where some "people" in each movie are killers, victims and heroes explored by their writers. Betrayed by her cold political colleagues, Molly overdoses and dies in *Ides Of March*. Betrayed by an amorous fellow landlord, *Great Expectations'* Miss Havisham asphyxiates in her house fire. "Bates" stabs *Psycho* and *Hitchcock's* "Marion" in her shower. Politically and economically motivated state killers kill: youth R.L. in *The Tree Of Life*; Irina in *Tinker, Tailor, Soldier, Spy*; hundreds of women and children in *Underground's* civilian shelter; Magwitch in *Great Expectations* and mama in *The Hundred-Foot Journey*.

Depending on their time-place in real life, most people die a natural death from old age or traditional diseases that are not yet mitigated by public health measures. Such natural deaths – and even instigated, unnatural public health disasters – are more clearly explored in documentaries rather than movies. Movies explore the whole private and public agenda of a few people's dual affection and liberation strands where people's initiatives improve lifestyles – or anxious, foolish and cruel people ruin lives or instigate unnatural deaths. When a foreground person in Section-50's 170 movies dies naturally or unnaturally, each movie explores leading characters' reactions to the death. Because movies explore dramatic passages of people's responsibility curves or lifespans, it is common for moviemakers to inquire into deaths, especially unnatural deaths, such as Lindy's sentence to lifetime entrapment, Le Ly and Evelyn's home invasions, and Alma's *Psycho* death.

In sum, each "person" element in a recorded movie has traces of a human "body" recorded to film. The recorded bodily traces may be audio (such as voices in animation) or the traces may be motion-picture reflected light of the – usually clothed – body in action. In movies, each leading person is argued from their active relationships, including relationships operated instrumentally via devices such as cinema, phone networks, drugs, robots and transport systems. However relationships among others are built: strong movie people initiate or deal with actions that improve or collapse their liberty and affection conditions among others.

Leading people have to be unusual enough to attract paying audiences to the public cinema. Writing dull, ordinary actions of meal "consumption" or workplace "production" deflate movies. People are challenged at their limits in movie arguments so that unusual consumption such as addiction to power or unusual production such as monopolizing media; or other extreme relationships such as invasion diseconomies; unnatural death; or repressed sexual desires – make for strong movie arguments. Movie arguments develop characters that either deal with, or fail to deal with these dilemmas across all inquiry areas of the agenda. Unlike a portrait painter's conception, a movie "person" is never a timeless, fixed, un-located entity (delightful as an iconic portrait might be). Rather, movie characters live through a curve of their brief lives from conception to death. This trajectory unfolds as each person's changing maturity, competence and responsibility conditions – both in their actions and in their thoughts. At the climax of strong arguments, on-screen "people," and not other movie elements, resolve their own human challenges and arguments. Even in *Ex Machina*, it is people who resolve their curves by walking into the deadly mechanical traps that they themselves have set. As such, movie thought is an exploration of "world" in its original Sanskrit sense – an exploration of people acting on their initiatives and others' initiatives in time.

Investigators explore what it means to live in the world by following people into complex movie situations. How do moviemakers cope with the massive data of people's layered, time-urgent complexity, in uncertain private and public places? Filmmakers cope with movie inquiries into world drama by arranging elements in the next Section's screenplay array.

11.

Arranging Elements in a Movie.

When we turn to the standard form of movie screenplays, the audio and visual thinking is not as obvious as Section-08's AV script. Despite their different layouts, both documentary and movie writing refer to the same film layers and elements. In fact, some movies are also documentaries because they are real-life biographic reenactments – such as the world's first feature movie, Tait, Tait et al. (1906) *The Story Of The Kelly Gang*. An AV format script readily translates into a movie format screenplay and visa versa.

Why have two formats for what is basically a similar form of argument? Answers are to be found in the different working styles of documentary makers and news-gatherers; compared with how moviemakers put arguments. Documentary makers tend to incorporate lots of extant source documents such as photos, maps and interviews into their array, whereas most movie makers recreate each scene from the page, and prefer to divide their writing into "scenes" rather than divide collected source materials into audio sources and motion-picture sources. It is a matter of convenient arrangement in thought rather than a different ontology that motivates moviemakers to plan their screen thought as a movie screenplay.

What follows is a page transcribed from Gregor Jordan's thriller romance *Two Hands* (1998 Australia: Becker Entertainment). The movie stars Rose Byrne ("Helen" in *Bridesmaids*) and Heath Ledger ("The Joker" in *Batman: The Dark Night*). Their 1998 movie is before they worked in the U.S. In *Two Hands*, Ledger performs a friendly but foolish young Sydney hoodlum "Jimmy." Byrne performs a country-girl tourist "Alex." Jimmy takes a photograph of Alex with Alex's camera. We listen to and watch Jimmy and

Alex fall in love with each other, as they take photos of each other in Sydney's morning sunshine. How do filmmakers argue a complex notion like "falling in love" in a time and place, such as "Sydney in the 1990s"? Director Jordan wrote the original screenplay, while Cezary and Jan Skubiszewski wrote the music. An asterisk marks the point where the music score fades up in the story. The direction BEAT means: "dwell on the performances at this quite turning point." The script page is page 12. Under industry standards, the 12 is also a timing number. 12 indicates the plot is about 12 minutes into the film. Alex asks to take Jimmy's photo. We pick up the movie as Jimmy reciprocates and tries to take a photo of Alex:

12.

EXT. SYDNEY STREET – DAY

Jimmy leans forward pointing the Minolta SR-T camera at Alex. Alex laughs, cringes and shies away from him. Jimmy gives up with frustration.

JIMMY
Well, you've got to do something.

ALEX.
What do you want me to do?

JIMMY
I don't know. Something.

Alex looks away and composes her self. *She looks back up at the camera.

Jimmy puts the camera to his eye. BEAT. He slowly lowers the camera, his eyes fixed on Alex.

Alex stares steadily at Jimmy. Her lips relax and part.

Jimmy stares at Alex over the top of the camera. Alex stares back. BEAT.

Distracted, Jimmy lowers the camera, still staring at Alex. He clicks the camera, realizing he's tilted the shot. He laughs and returns the camera to her anyway.

JIMMY
Here's your camera.

ALEX
(laughs)
Thanks.

Alex takes the camera and shies away from Jimmy's gaze, her face beaming. They laugh.

Figure 2. A movie screenplay page denotes movie thought.

If this page is about "falling in love" where is the word love? "Love" is never mentioned in words in this scene. Instead – because this is movie thought – he writer gives about 30 action directions to the performers, such as the first action direction to Ledger: "Jimmy leans forward". "Love" is not written in

the action lines of the screenplay. "Love" is not spoken in the dialogue. While not spoken as a word, there is an implication written into movie screenplay subculture that every speech line is spoken with a particular tonal delivery such as a loving tone, a yearning tone, a playful or violent tone and so on. Years ago, writers often stipulated the tone of speech lines throughout their screenplays. But this practice was stopped as it often distracted performers and directors from organically developing the demeanor of all the characters in the performed, on-screen argument. How then do performers and the director come to understand what the screenwriter implies in the screenplay? How does Byrne master the correct delivery of tone in this scene, and how does Ledger? On a first read-through of a screenplay, performers often speak and then, halfway through the scene, they realize their audio delivery sounds absurd in the context of the unfolding scene and who they are speaking to. This realization comes about because the movie performer (and the character they perform) is always exploring the scene they find themselves in and is always finding out more about the other characters they share this journey with.

To give a real-life example, if a sales assistant recognized a long lost friend leaving the store, the assistant would call to them loudly to attract their attention and the assistant's tone would communicate enthusiasm, surprise and joy at rediscovering a long-lost friend. But what if the "friend" turned around, on hearing the shout, and their turning face revealed them to be another person – a startled and perturbed stranger. On seeing their mistake, the assistant would surely modify their tone of delivery as they expressed apology and sought to put the unknown and startled customer at their ease. So it is with performing a writer's screenplay. These days, for movie performers to know the precise tone of audio delivery that best empowers their performance of any speech line, the performers read and reread the screenplay, rehearsing at home, perhaps rehearsing on the set, and then,

along with the other characters, treating every take of the scene's recording as an ongoing, deeper exploration of their intertwined deliveries. In this way, the precise audio tonal layers of the screen argument are developed and performed organically in natural conversations appropriate to the dramatic circumstances that the writer has imagined in audio and motion-pictures written as a screenplay.

By questioning the lack of the word "love" in the above scene, the inquiry has uncovered the writer and the performer's method of developing the tones of any speech line in a movie argument – including the tonal gestures Byrne and Ledger discovered together in this scene. This tonality is an essential element of movie arguments because movies are explorations of people in dramatic, worldly circumstances, explored from within and without their experiences. Speech tonality is, in some genres of documentary, performed in the style of delivering quality academic lectures – friendly, inquisitive, engaged in exploration, empathetic with others, but not violently or sexually engaged with others, nor deceptive, nor out of control. For reasons of exploring the scope of the human condition, movie speech tonality is frequently delivered in the whole range of tonalities whereas documentary speech – particularly in its presenter's narrative and questions during interviews – adopts an academic style. For this reason, it is easier to build a performed movie argument using the essential, albeit implied, "gesture of speech intonation" in a movie screenplay, rather than a documentary script.

For this reason, next the investigation turns to the element of audio "gestures."

12.

Silence, Audio Gestures and Recognition.

Movie screenplays do not make complete sense unless they are imaginatively listened to and watched in full. By rehearsing a whole argument, an entire unseen element of screen thinking – audio intonation – makes itself heard. A reader of Section-11's screenplay will never read "love" on the page, but in a rehearsed performance of the whole argument, performers come to hear what the writer hears: Alex and Jimmy profess love through the intonation of how they speak, not in any vocabulary on the page.

Performers are challenged by a movie screenplay to explore and answer what their character would do in each scene and how they would express intonation. Sometimes a funded writer-director with access to leading performers develops a sketchy, exploratory screenplay and then develops its scenes, dialogue and action with the performers on set. Ingmar Berman et al. developed such a movie with (1966) *Persona*. Bergman asked performers and recordists to help develop the words and action of the argument. Moreover its distributors translated and wrote censored and uncensored English subtitles, and other subtitles for this Swedish movie (Strick 2003: 2). Like any movie in Section-50, *Persona's* people think, speak or write words. This investigation divides the speeches into two elements: what is said – and intonation or "audio gestures." More speech is investigated in Section-17, but here the intonation or audio gestures are explored.

Persona concerns two women: an actress, who takes a rest cure (Liv Ullmann) from her stressful life, and her nurse, who does most of the talking (Bibi Andersson). Resting, silent Ullmann only whispers or shouts three or four tiny phrases during the 79-minute movie, whereas her nurse Andersson

speaks, and gestures with her breath, for full 70 minutes of the argument. In dividing the women's speech in this way, Bergman explores "silence" and speech. Resting actress Ullmann is silent – and nurse Andersson converses, chats, confides, raves and is generous, loving, angry, remorseful, defiant and, ultimately, silent too. Persona's opening montage reveals the kinds of things that have driven Ullmann into silence: sex inside the film industry, inevitability of death and dying, injurious cruelty, repulsion from bodies, having children and loosing one's professional career and calling, and the horrendous American invasion of Le Ly's homeland, which was escalating when images of a Buddhist monk protester meditating and burning to death in Saigon were filmed and inserted in *Persona's* opening.

For Ullmann taking a rest cure at the sunny seaside, her leisurely silence improves her health. Ironically, for nurse Andersson, the isolated seaside becomes a long, uninterrupted psychoanalysis session where she pours out her measured, insightful, loving, anxious, foolish and cruel thoughts and actions to her patient. For people who control screen thought – filmmakers – silence is crucial. Silence is the blank page of the screenwriter – the unencumbered page that allows any possible scenario to be argued. Silence is the recordist's notional base line to which signals (the recorded argument) and noise are added. For performers, silence is a relationship they establish with other characters. Ullmann is silent with nurse Andersson. But, in a shocking reversal for nurse Andersson, Andersson assumes she has intimately befriended the silent Ullmann. Andersson confides personal secrets to the resting actress, telling her that she enjoyed sex with three men one day and later aborted their embryo. She assumes that Ullmann will safeguard her privacy. Then Andersson discovers the actress is only silent with her. Outside this relationship, Ullmann writes about Andersson's private, intimate actions to Andersson's boss. The triangulation of patient, nurse and head doctor creates this dramatic political workplace reversal for

Andersson, who responds with violence.

In investigating screen thought's inquiry scope from the private sphere of thoughts, body, intimacy and friendship – to the public sphere of workplace, politics and culture – silence can be health-giving for the embodied mind but actress Ullmann politicizes that silence and injures another. Ullmann is silent to a person she believes is "below" her, her nurse – and, for her own private chatty reasons, she feeds the nurse's private information "up" the public workplace hierarchy to Andersson's boss. Silences allow friendly people to co-operate with each other, as when Andersson and Ullmann hug and touch each other. In the public sphere, quietism among free and friendly people is often productive but when silence is used to injure other people whose expectations are reversed in complex interactions, then the injured either rise to the challenge of injurious silence or they retreat from being "merely decent human beings" – as Schepisi, Stoppard and Le Carre (1990) argue in *The Russia House*. In *Russia House*, two spy networks enforce political silence on communities "under" them, and the productive, honest people "under" them break the injurious silence. In the last episode of Takahashi, Arakawa and Hasekura (2008) *Spice and Wolf*, spice trader Lawrence twice confronts his two female companions who keep silent about their underlying private and public intentions. Movie leads may also emerge from conflict craving silence for themselves, such as Ullmann – or the air force combat pilot in Goulding, Trotti and Maugham (1946) *The Razor's Edge*. He renounces a post-War peacetime career to search for inner peace in France and India. He finds inner silence in the Himalayan foothills, returns home and retains that calm, clear, comforting demeanor among his troubled North Atlantic friends.

The combat pilot only reaches that position of inner silence and peace after talking with companions who are themselves embroiled in peacetime injuries – car smashes, addiction, loneliness and so on. Key to his getting over the

War that slaughtered people all around him was his liberty to talk over these unnatural deaths with his peacetime companions on his way to inner silence. On the other hand, when conflict arises and some parties suppress the truth, the injuries are only compounded. In *A Cry In The Dark,* screen-believers deceived themselves by silencing a coronial court's findings (that a dingo took Azaria) and open a fallacious trial accusing Lindy of murder. The political silence about why Le Ly's home was invaded in *Heaven And Earth* was, and is today, almost deafening in its silence. Raymond Geuss writes of the U.S.: "the political class in power [to a large extent prevented any significant, long-term lessons from being drawn from the defeat in Vietnam" (2008:5).

Heaven And Earth's political silence is symptomatic of half a century of suppressing facts, including screen arguments, about the elements of time, people and action in South East Asia. Political silence forces ignorance and cruelty towards others, leading to the wars of today. Having invaded Iraq, writes Geuss: "Iraq would begin fighting, and the United States would find itself in the middle of a civil war that it would not begin to understand" (2008:5). Five years before, (2003) *Wire In The Blood: Sharp Compassion* broke that silence. Other insightful filmmakers have broken that silence – that suppression of knowledge – in six movies and series like: *Syriana*; *State Of Play*; *The Killing 2*; *The Ghost Writer*; *Ides Of March* and *Underground* (2005, 2009, 2010, 2010, 2011 and 2012). But these movie arguments are but a small part of a media-sphere where distributors mostly suppress knowledge of real, extreme drama and unnatural deaths, and the ignorant are led to repeat history (Kull, Ramsay, Subias et al. 2003).

In breaking the audio silence about critical issues, filmmakers give voices to their characters embroiled in drama. What is key about breaking silence and speaking knowledgeably of a place or people is the "tone," or how it is said,

as much as what is said. In any dramatic argument, each character has desires and hopes to co-opt other characters to do things that support their desires. An element of these dramatic screen conversations is delivered in the "tone" of the voice. Does the tone attract another person to the speaker? Repel them? Chastise them? Inquire after them? Mutually fall in love, as the other reciprocates? Share an easy platonic friendship? Order them to do something? In Wittgenstein (2009: §2, 8) – does the architect's tone encourage the apprentice to bring the stone carefully – or loyally – or with renewed vigor? Does the apprentice state in their voice tone that they are sick and tired of carrying slabs and pillars to the building site? Like other obvious acts and vocabulary of "co-operation" such as sharing a stone in (2000) *Islam: Empire Of Faith* – or obvious "injury" like throwing stones – tonal delivery also helps or harms people in drama or in constructing a way of thinking.

How does the element of tonal gestures control the media-sphere? If, in Section-11's screenplay, Ledger had *screamed* "I don't know" and then further castigated Byrne with an out-of-control, *lunatic shout* of "SOMETHING!!!" then it is most unlikely that Byrne would have responded positively as written in the screenplay: "Alex looks away and composes her self" is Byrne/Alex's co-operative action. The beautiful music score (indicated by *) would not have entered at this point in the argument either. Alex would not have gently turned up her face to meet Jimmy's eyes. If, in our "shouting" hypothesis, Byrne was totally responding to Ledger, as great performers do, Alex would have snatched back her camera and run away, or just run away – probably back to her cousin who accommodates her in this seedy part of Sydney.

So voice tone – how things are said, more than what is literally said – is an essential controlling layer of a screen array. Tonal gestures push and pull the

argument and plot as characters listen to each other, and audiences listen to music. Critically, vocal intonation in screen arguments, such as the delivery of Jimmy's lines, is essentially about "recognizing" or "not recognizing" the self and the other as two people – self and other – who are valued for their affection and their liberty. These affection and liberation qualities of friendship are discussed in Section-10 but my point here is that the tone of Ledger/Jimmy saying – "I don't know. Something" – in a loving way is critical. The loving tone (not to be seen in the text) is critical because the tone recognizes Byrne/Alex as a person. Jimmy's tonal recognition of her then influences Alex's response: to meet Jimmy's eyes in a loving way too – to afford Jimmy mutual recognition. If nothing were to be learned from this scene, if violence and not love was to flourish, then silence, and other ways of not recognizing people, would be imposed.

If one accepts tone as a gesture of recognition, then the search for a possible way to simplify the concept of speech tonality in movie arguments would allow the analyst or creative writer to attend to the network of gestures in interactions. This would mean that a movie analyst who listened to the great cornucopia of speech intonations in one movie argument (startled, sneering, castigating, out-of-control, lunatic, perturbed, enthusiastic, joyful, warm, happy, delighted, sexy and so on) could register the tonal layer of people's relationships at each point in time, as either affording "recognition" to the other or "de-recognizing" the other – attracting the other into an easy, non-clingy friendship – or pushing them away and breaking the relationship. This inquiry considers that it is in the subtle motions of such intentional actions that screen arguments turn.

This recognition or de-recognition is argued in the audio layers of a movie or other screen argument such as a news program. If a deaf audience member such as Jade Bryan watched only the sequence where Jimmy delivers his

speech, "*I don't know. Something*", then Bryan would not have heard Jimmy's tone that recognizes Alex as a friend. She would not have immediately understood this shift in the screen argument. Missing an essential layer of the screen argument, deaf people rely on the development of their other senses, rely on their friendships with other film appreciators and makers, rely on the motion-pictures in order to weave together their growing understanding of a movie or documentary story, as we all do. This investigation, in asking what is screen and movie thought, has started to unfold and distinguish some essential elements of screen arguments, such as time, audio, motion-pictures, people, and people's audio gestures of recognition and de-recognition. These gestures are intoned on the audio layers, yet, as explored below, similar "gestures" are also subtly argued on the motion-picture layers too, such as: lifting one's face to another; or meeting another's eye-line in a friendly way.

On the audio tracks, it is gestures of intonation – how things are said, not so much the vocabulary of what is said, that puts the argument. Vocal intonation – and other tonal forms such as the soundtrack's music and its effects "M and E" tracks – predominantly answer the philosophical questions "What is there?" and "What do we do?" in the audio layers. There is audio and we sing or intone. Another thing people do is: have emotions. Emotion in the world and in movies is predominantly argued with audio, voice and musical tones. The "emotional arc" of a movie argument (or any screen argument) is an overall writing or performance – a "strategic shape" – that is discussed later in Section-35.

Audio gestures offer or withdraw recognition between people acting in time-place. Next, motion-picture gestures are introduced into dramatic interactions.

13.

Smiles and Eye-lines that Recognize and De-recognize.

Is there a "motion-picture" layer that is like the tonal gestures in audio? Do people recognize each other or derecognize each other with "visual" gestures too? Section-11's extract of Byrne and Ledger's screenplay demonstrates that there are motion-picture gestures. Alex does not respond to Jimmy's friendly tone of voice – "Something" – with a reciprocating audio tone. Rather, she responds with some "motion-picture gestures" of her body: "Alex looks away and composes her self." Then her face and body looks up and meets Jimmy's eyes. By turning her face and body towards Jimmy and lifting her eye-line to meet his eye-line, Alex returns her own gesture of friendly recognition, not on the audio layers but on the motion-picture layers. If a blind spectator (such as Marty Klein) listened to this scene, he would not immediately understand Alex's proposition at this point because her argument is being carried in the motion-pictures. Klein would not understand Alex's visual "gesture" that recognizes Jimmy as a friend.

Often highly skilled theatre performers who work on a movie shoot for the first time, (or politicians who work television's news cycle for the first time), are surprised or even impatient with the amount of time that fellow performers and recordists spend refining their performance and recording of eye-lines. Eye-lines are important in legitimate theatre too, but in screen arguments – because of the recordist's close-up and because characters' eyes usually travel to what is watched in the next edited shot or scene change – performers' eyes actually control and link together the motion-picture layers of the cascading screen argument. Take for example, the opening of the "Exterior Sydney Street Day" scene extract earlier, and its layers of visual, motion-picture action:

> "Jimmy leans forward pointing the Minolta SR-T camera at Alex. Alex laughs, cringes and shies away from him. Jimmy gives up with frustration."

A writer, performer, recordist or distributor imaginatively watches such screenwriting carefully to track down every gesture of "eye-lines" in every action line of the argument. Unlike speech lines in movies, the action lines are read and "watched" extremely literally. The quoted lines are plans of action agreed to by specialists in Jordan's screen team. If Jimmy leans forward, pointing a Minolta camera at Alex, then Jimmy's eye-line connects with her face and her eye-line, through, or over, the camera viewfinder. Just as "sincere friendly intonation" gestures recognition to the other as a friend, so too a friendly or "co-operative offer of an eye-line" to another person gestures that recognition is being offered and established. Alex's response is partly gestured in layers of audio: she laughs. Simultaneously (translucently), Alex partly gestures in layers of motion-pictures: "Alex laughs, cringes and shies away from him." Visually, a laugh is a kind of smile, and the gesture of the smile is considered shortly. But the makers indicate another shift in the eye-lines of the screen argument at this point: A "cringe" tends to narrow or close the eyes. To "shy away" is to turn one's eye-line from visual contact with the other person's face and eyes. Alex's eyes contact other, often out-of-focus, things in the scene that are not the other person.

If one is the recordist responsible in the team for editing the scene's dailies (or rushes, or original footage), then Byrne and Ledger's eyes actually control and link together the motion-picture layers of the argument. One's contribution as the editing recordist is to select, time, and if necessary reshape, the best shots that link changes in Ledger's eye-line and changes in Byrne's eye-line to form the motion-picture layers of the project's translucent argument. If Take 1 of "Jimmy points the camera at Alex" has Ledger's eyes stare into the background for whatever reason, then Take 1 would be discarded for Take 2 where Ledger looks

at Alex. The performed eye-line gestures direct the plot and story and are edited accordingly. Jimmy's eyes in the first Take 1 begin to veer off into the Sydney Street background and put a different argument and a confusing story. Having edited Take 2 into the argument, the recordist investigates takes of "Alex shying away" which are also very much about Byrne's eye-line gestures. Hypothetically, say Alex shies away, slightly overbalances and then tenses her body to correct her stance in Take 1. Like Ledger's hypothetical Take 1 that flips his stare into the background, Alex's first take is an uncomfortable re-correction of her gestured disposition: it is not the argument that everyone is trying to position. Instead, our imaginary editor selects Take 2 of Alex's shifting eye-line where her re-correction is more a gesture of graceful arousal than urgently correcting her balance.

For the logician who watches a finished movie and is bored by its "simplistic" conjunction of one shot after another conjoined shot, the fallacy is to assume a film argument is not a highly complex and challenging, branching logical array. For makers, screen thought is about choices between alternative Takes 1, 2, 3 and so on, at forks or switches in the recorded line of reason. Logical arrays and their branching disjunctions permeate movie thought. Filmmakers ask philosophical questions about indistinct things on the paths we make and travel, contemplating directions and preferring one eye-line take and not another (or one shy act and not another act) at thousands of audio and motion-picture crossroads and disjunctions that writers, performers and editing recordists discard or develop.

Movie arguments are not only edited with the most preferred intonation and eye-lines gestures, arguments are also edited with the elemental gesture of the smile. It is perhaps surprising that the most wonderful gesture of them all – people's smiles – has not attracted much attention in thinking about thought over the millennia. Yet the gesture of the smile is frequently used to weave human thought and communication together in the novel and the movie. In 1025, the court

novelist Shikibu Murasaki introduces the gesture of the smile 38 times into the *Tale Of Genji* argument. Here is one such occasion:

> "And if even stony-hearted warriors, or bitter enemies, if any such there were, smiled when they saw the boy, the mother of the heir-apparent, too, could not entirely exclude him from her sympathies." (2006: L394)

Novels are a rich trove of arguments woven together with many kinds of smile. Like eye-lines and intonation, a person's facial gestures tend to either posit friendly recognition or posit the closing down of recognition of the self and others. Often the full import of a "smile" is only understood late in a long-form argument, such as a witness to unnatural death in Chapter 3 who reports a murderer's "a sly grin which bothered her but otherwise he was personally clean and always agreeable". In Jane Austen (1813) *Pride and Prejudice*, the gesture of the smile is explored 69 times. Each time Austen introduces a smile to the face of one of her characters, the gesture of that particular smile is woven with other elements, such as people's eye-lines and haptic actions (dancing in a room or walking in a garden). In Jordan's Sydney Street scene, the argument's facial gestures, such as the smile's infinite combinations, are shaped and positioned four times by the team's writer, performers, recordists and distributors. Writer-director Jordan researches people (including characters in dreams) and he writes a crafted "dance" of smiles over the course of this minute and the whole argument. Performers read the screenplay. In performance, they re-explore personal embodiment and co-operative, relational forces woven in this layer of smiles and other motion-picture gestures. Recordists reshape the visual argument with light and digital code. Distributors support these makers and deal with the argument in public culture, global politics, economic negotiations and archival preservation. The distributor's advertising displays the faces of Ledger and Byrne smiling out at the public – where the smile is mainly in the eyes. Ledger's is a friendly and lost smile; Byrne's is a friendly and critical smile – so emblematic of their characters in this film.

Because this is an investigation of screen thought, the element of audio and motion-picture gesture has been emphasized ahead of an element more commonly associated with film. But having considered a movie interaction's time, people and their gestures – of recognition or de-recognition – the next element to explore is action.

14.

Dealing with Unexpected Dramatic Actions.

There are many screen genres such as new web pages and short films but what makes a movie argument special (besides its circa 100 minute length) is that it explores the "intentional actions" of a few leading people against a background of other people's actions. Movies explore the "actions of people" in the philosophical sense. That is, thinking people intend their bodily movements and expect a physical result when they act forward into the near future of time. Movie thought is not about unintentional motion such as motion in physics or natural flows that are explored in Cox, Winston and Iain Stewart's documentaries in Section-51.

Of course, when people intentionally enter most movie scenes, there are also a lot of unintentional physical and natural motion going on – such as sunlight radiating on the landscape or wind rustling the trees. The person who intends, expects and acts is also a living body that metabolizes – and metabolic changes in a person are unintended. These changes are motions – but they are not actions. Natural background changes in forests, oceans and grasslands are the places out of which thinking people as a species emerge and intentionally "act." Given the distinction between natural motion (in some documentaries) and people's intentional actions, it is the latter actions that movie arguments are well suited to argue.

Most of our intentional acts throughout life make for very dull watching and listening. Consider meditation or contemplation. While meditation is wonderful for bodily health and for the mind, it makes for a dull drama film – recording someone's body at rest or peace with life. Meditation is explored in the audio lecture series by Pema Chödrön (c.2005) and the seminars by Jack Kornfield (c.2000), or the book by philosopher Thich Nhat Hanh. Meditation is very healthy, powerful, intentional "action" in the philosophic sense of the person's

intentional control over their mind and body but its methods are not well explained in a 100-minute "movie" argument – even in *Persona, The Razor's Edge* or *Heaven And Earth* – three movies that include meditative actions in their explorations.

Again, everyday acts of meal consumption or workplace production are not movie arguments either. As explored in Section-36, audiences expect a "dramatic" argument that first familiarizes us with a few characters we empathize with, and then the argument is complicated by unexpected dramatic actions and challenges to the everyday. In *A Cry In The Dark*, a family's normal vacation turns to killing and a witch-hunt. In *Heaven And Earth*, a prosperous faming valley is destroyed by colonial war. The kind of actions people do in a movie are, at first, actions we quickly understand and expect people to do. Even in we ourselves have never been on holiday to Central Australia or worked on a farm in pre-war Vietnam – we readily understand what the characters are doing and, if we are to follow the argument. If we are attracted, sympathetic towards, intrigued by, fearful of, excited by, or otherwise feel strongly about one or more of the characters, then we follow the characters as they face the overwhelming challenges of the movie argument.

Characters such as Lindy or Le Ly are challenged by massive shifts in personal and political circumstances. If we are attracted to friendly, no-nonsense heroines, we do not abandon their story but follow them into this challenging second act "shadowlands" or ordeal where other people's intentional actions either help or harm them (Campbell 1949: 212; Vogler 1992: 71; Robinson 1993-1997). Leading characters like Lindy and Le Ly are not impersonal flotsam that is simply pushed and pulled around by motion. When movie characters are thrown into challenging circumstances, they respond with their own initiatives and actions. In (2014) *The Hundred-Foot Journey*, a refugee Indian restaurateur's car breaks down in a French village. The village has a vacant business property on the market. He

decides to open a restaurant, despite the massive challenges of ethnic suspicion, no home, an unknown market and vicious competitors. These are intentional actions of people with expectations into the future – not the motion of flotsam in the universe. In (2012) *Underground* an early Internet prodigy is home-schooled in mathematics, science, the humanities and ethics, only to discover that inhumane and unethical bureaucrats dominate1990s cyberspace and the world. He sets out, as a journalist and digital press agency, to expose the unethical to the world's public. Again, these are intentional actions with expectations into the future. Strong movie arguments have characters that struggle with life as best they can (audiences relate to this). Then they are thrown into extraordinary circumstances that surprise their expectations. If they continue to act as they acted in the past, the new challenges will overwhelm them. They have to experiment and learn new actions in order to meet the challenges. They make mistakes and learn from those errors. They co-operate with old or new friends in order to make the challenges work for them and not against them.

In Gilbert and Russell (1983) *Educating Rita*, external undergraduate European Literature student Rita forms a platonic, scholarly friendship with her tutor Frank. In their familiarizing first act, what kinds of actions does Rita's tutor Frank do? Frank *walks* through cloisters; he *removes* a shelved book; he *discloses* a hidden bottle of whiskey. He *attends* his tutorial, he *admits* he is drunk, he *suggests* the students should leave and make love. By his everyday familiar "actions," we come to know who Frank is. What of Rita's actions? Rita *wobbles on stilettos* in the cobbled cloisters. She *overhears* postgraduates' sneering; she *struggles to enter* Frank's jammed door; she *prowls* his office, *speaking her concerns* about British social classes that deny her affection and liberty. She *shares* a pack of cigarettes. She *mistakes* Frank's laugh for derision. She *rephrases his definition in her own terms*. By her everyday familiar actions such as wearing glamour fashion (stilettos), saying the first thing that comes into her head, pushing on regardless – we come to know Rita's fighting spirit when she is challenged by this surprising

place (cobblestones, un-maintained door, drunk tutor, sneering middle-class students, a vocabulary she is unused to). By her "actions" that deal with challenges, we come to know Rita as a person.

Everyone's actions gradually change during the *Educating Rita* argument. Rita's husband Deny *burns* her university books, insisting she become an ignorant pregnant housewife. Later Rita *burns* an unsatisfactory draft of her *Macbeth* essay and rewrites it from scratch. Here are two "actions" of burning text, and in a third scene, Frank *burns* his poems. Taken out of context, the acts suggest the puzzling brief destructive act of burning itself, unconnected to Rita's story. This returns us to Section-01's idea of holist thinking. The meaning of a screen interaction, the content of a screen belief or desire, is not a thought that attaches to "burning" in isolation from other interactions in the movie such as Deny's assault on Rita, Rita's visit to her first Shakespeare performance and Frank's migration to Australia.

Rita's movie is based on Willy Russell's very talky stageplay, which is full of people coming and going, meeting or leaving each other, as the main "actions." In adapting to film, the significance of Rita's growing grasp of knowledge is still communicated by changes in her "gestures" and "utterance" more than her gross actions such as waiting on bistro tables. It is a very chatty movie. As the argument resolves, Rita calmly assesses her achievements as an academic and calmly criticizes her limitations as an innovator. At the beginning of the movie her actions and gestures were anything but calm. Now she *hugs* Frank *in silence* at the airport. Her actions would not have included a hug in the early argument, nor would she have just enjoyed comfortable warm silence with him. Audiences cannot understand any one of these actions unless they have linked all the actions together in the whole argument.

Why does screen thought separate such haptic actions from gestures and utterance? After all, much philosophy includes eye-line gestures, intonation and utterance under the rubric of intentional action without distinction. But as we have seen, eye-line and intonation gestures are important enough in screen thought to allocate an element of their own to these subtle acts. The element of "gesture" does not move, reshape, create or destroy external objects in a way material to the argument. Rather, gestures communicate recognition or de-recognition of the self and other people. Section-17 gives reasons for separating "utterance" as another element too, even though, philosophically, it is a action. If we sort gestures and utterance as distinct elements, this leaves haptic "actions" as the element of "actions" in screen thought. "Haptic" actions include a character's actions when they touch a place with their feet (standing, running) or body (lying down): touch a device when they grasp it in use (drive a car, use remote controller, turn a page, catch a ball); touch another person (Rita hugs Frank) or touch instrumentally (Le Ly blows up invaders); change their body position (Steve wakes and sits up); and do other actions (other than gesture and utterance) that rely on feedback about touch, body tension, disposition, gravity, motion and fine motor skills. Audiences have watched these "haptic actions" in *Educating Rita*: F *walks* through cloisters; F *removes* a shelved book; F *discloses* a hidden bottle of whiskey. R *wobbles on stilettos*; R *burns* a draft; R *hugs* F *in silence*. These actions *move things about* (we walk or wobble from one place to another), things are *removed and uncovered*, things are *destroyed* (burned) and bodies *intend to get close and hug* for affection. Actions may also create, as when Rita devises a good *Macbeth* essay, or her husband Deny remarries and has the child that he desires.

Literate thought quickly darts through a scenario of action after action – looking for themes, contradictions and so on – and moves on. But to shift to abstract notions such as theme or contradiction is to shift out of the actions central to screen thought. In screen thought, it is not what is summarized or evaluated that has gravitas but what is enacted and done in response. A filmmaker doesn't argue

that "Frank is an alcoholic" or that "Rita's knowledge of *Macbeth* improved" by uttering these notions. The claims in screen and movie arguments are put as action after action: "F *removes* a shelved book; F *discloses* a hidden bottle of whiskey and so on" (therefore Frank is an alcoholic, is implied). "Rita *burns* an unsatisfactory draft of her Macbeth essay and *rewrites* from scratch" (hence her improving knowledge is implied).

The strongest actions in a movie argument are the actions that change relationships between two or more leading characters. Rita offers her cigarettes to Frank, he offers his whiskey to her, the two hug at the end – these actions argue their dual affection and liberation relationship conditions. These offers of simple sharing are the movie's key actions about increasing affection and liberation. He *refuses* her cigarette and eventually she *quits* and *improves her health*. Whatever they do "creates and supports" their lives or "harms and destroys their lives". A movie is an argument in such actions that either create and support (conditions of affection and liberation) or harm and destroy (conditions of affection and liberation). Frank harms his health with drinking and diminishes his liberation – although he finally cuts loose and has the courage to make a new start. Rita hurts herself a little when she is too fearful to meet privately with Frank and Elaine's friends; but almost all of Rita's actions create and support her new academic life with Frank. She is not a character that acts to harm and destroy.

In movie thought, the element of action (whether harmful and destructive; or creative and supportive) is always external and physical – an action is always something solidly displacing the space and doing something intentionally with expectations into the future. As such, real actions are an element that cannot be negative for filmmakers. People can think and say negative things such as "I don't understand" or "Don't walk!" but it is impossible to do a negative action like "not walking" in a movie scene. There are no negative actions, only negative logical operators in thought, speech and inscriptions. All actions exist as they are done.

They are not notions of negation or things that disappear in our dreams. Walking is acted positively. Burning is acted positively. When Rita burns a paper, the haptic action of burning can be positively touched just as the action of hugging Frank can be touched. Her husband Deny may believe she is "not" burning the paper – that is, in belief and speech or writing, a person may think, speak and write about negation – imagining or denying that something is true. But no person, not even a film performer, can do a negative action. If Rita is not burning a paper, in screen thought terms, she is doing something else, such as oiling a door or waiting tables. In terms of the screen element of "action," it cannot be given a negative value. For people used to writing prose, prose frequently negates actions in sentences. But for filmmakers used to writing, performing or recording action, there are no negative actions in real-world interactions.

The distinction between "actions" and elements that can be negated (such as notions, speech and inscriptions on devices) is key to thinking in screen thought. On a movie set, or in real life, if Rita doesn't touch Frank, she does something else in the office, such as prowl around. "Don't touch Frank" is a speech line a screenwriter can give a character but it is not written as an impossible negative action. Imagine a weak screen thinker who writes, "Rita doesn't touch Frank" as a supposed "action" in an amateur screenplay. Imagine screen thinkers attempting to put this argument. During performance, the "Rita" performer will turn around and address the writer or director: "I don't touch Frank in this scene?? Well, what do you want me to do??" Writing negatives in the element of action wastes time and wastes creative resources. The useful way to argue action in a movie is to carefully state each action as it happens with its most precise present tense verb. Action always happens in the present time of the cascading scene. Precision such as "wobbles on stilettos" creates the argument on the screen in the way that imprecise actions (Rita arrives) does not. The only time a maker would move away from the precise action word *wobbles* or *burns* or *hugs*, is when high speed analysis is being applied to sequences of actions, in which case a writer might use

shorthand notes for "co-operative, creative and supportive actions" or "injurious, hurtful and destructive" actions, and two symbols for arrival and departure. Importantly, all the verbs in precision screenplays denote specific present-tense actions. A performer (or a person in documentary actuality footage) does each present tense action in "the present" of their "current scene." There is no past or future tense in actions, either. The notions of past or future are time elements, not action elements. Time elements are expressed in numerals, the running time of the plot, an action's position in the screenplay. Time elements are expressed in period speech, costumes and other devices – which is why a historical understanding of the world is crucial for filmmakers if they desire to argue past and future.

In terms of getting one's bearings in a movie argument, the cardinal actions of, say, Le Ly "injures" and Le Ly "co-operates" roughly sort all actions for performers. A performer can walk on to set – onto any devised place – and be given an answer to: "What do I do here among these characters and devices?" In roughest terms, a role and action either "co-operates with others, or injure others." If this act is strongly physical, it is an "action" such as burning a paper or hugging another person. If the injury or co-operation is more subtle and telegraphic of intentions, then it is a "gesture" of recognition or rejection. In practice a director will encourage precise, calibrated, freshly explored actions. But when performers are improvising at drama school, these rough categories guide performance training, roughly shape movie plots and shape emotional arcs.

These polarities of movie action – co-operation or injury – around which conditions of liberation and affection vary for each character, are often best understood by muting all the audio layers of a movie and just watching the motion-picture layers. If one watches (without sound) all Le Ly's childhood and teenage actions in *Heaven And Earth*, her actions are all co-operative acts growing up in her community until she explodes a roadside bomb to defend her family from a colonial attack – that is her first injurious action. Before this, we watch the

local children "play" a mock battle of co-operation and injury – learning how to defend themselves and their families. Aggressive "play" is an interesting action in movie thought because it falls under co-operation, and yet is sometimes rehearses injury and how one deals with injury. In (2010) *Norwegian Wood*, students play around, transferring ice candy from mouth-to-mouth – a rehearsal for their sexual explorations later in the movie.

A lot of drama school is improvisation of actions, and action-based games which somewhat resemble play among friends, but are, in fact, part of the training work of performers leading to rehearsals and professional work on stage or set. Most of the training to "perform" is training to co-operated bodily with one's fellow actors – to dance in choreographed groups, to keep a group's volley ball in the air while calling a telegraphed name order from the group, or saying yes to challenging impromptu improvisation directions from a fellow performer who puts you on the spot. Rehearsal is also training in how to "injure" one's self and fellow actors safely: the safe way to fall or safely drag another performer up by their hair, non-corrosive, edible artificial blood, break-away furniture, sword-fighting, chivalry, sports, giving and taking a slap, weapons safety and so on – in order to learn how to perform the "injury" side of dramatic actions. Perhaps the best way to understand the element of action in movie thought is to participate as a student of "co-operative and injurious" actions at drama school. When the notional terms "co-operative" and "injurious" are used in this inquiry for "action," this is drama shorthand for a theoretical class of actions that, translated into precise actions in a movie, are labeled with precise present tense concrete verbs.

Heaven And Earth's actions were precise but the plot glaringly omitted its political area of the movie's inquiry scope. It was obviously an even more politically charged drama than *A Cry In The Dark,* which openly discussed its political area, but Le Ly's story suppressed what it knew. This is explained later in Section-19. So this investigation researched and developed another screen

argument, *Evelyn*. *Evelyn* researched and developed historical actions in response to *Heaven And Earth's* suppression. The opening action in *Evelyn* is the same as its closing action: In 1777, Fred is "rowed" to a beach. The rowing "action" is part of the movie's first "interaction." The whole interaction has time, people, actions, gestures and "place." When Rita prowled around Frank's room, she acted at the time she first visited her tutor. Again, a movie interaction consists of people, actions, gestures, time and "place." Given the holism of the mental on screen, the element of "place" is explored next.

15.
Researching Dramatic Places.

The element of "place" in movie arguments should not be mistaken for pleasant fine art "landscapes" or restorative holidays – nor is "place" unoccupied mathematical "space" in the cosmos' flowing arrow of time. Place contains space: any space where people live; and people only develop and live long in a healthy ecology among the private and public agenda of self and others. "Place" can be day-to-day or it can be selective and heightened in strong movie arguments as the location of gripping, attractive, complex drama (even comic drama or comedy) among a few foreground people.

For audiences more used to serial television's interminable, low-level drama, the strong level of drama and its climaxes explored in cinema movies can be unsettling and controversial. The kind of places that prosaic television serial writers develop – and the kind of places that movie writers research and develop – are usually far apart. Not much happens in long-running serial "places" because the serial doesn't come to a climax and conclusion for many years, if ever. The power of a strong movie argument is that it does come to a dramatic climax and conclusion in a matter of hours. Movie writers, then, are interested in places of intense, problematic drama all along the scope of the private and public agenda (thought, family, politics, culture and so on), where high stakes are at risk. As one might expect, the places of movie drama research are often controversial in their time of research and development.

Dramatic places like Lindy's witch-hunt media-sphere, or Le Ly's invaded home, are places where people with power make horrendous mistakes. People fail their selves and others. Heroic characters deal with that failure and those errors. As Nuland points out, people who desire knowledge and improvement in a happier world learn from mistakes and failures (Nuland

2008: L1053). As dramatists, movie thinkers do not absurdly attempt to pretend that "disagreement and error" do not exist. Filmmakers research "awful places where mistakes are made" as a movie argument – but the people who put the argument or interpret the argument are not repeating the actions of that place. The actions are researched, developed, performed and recorded safely. The aim is for audiences to watch the recorded argument in comfort. A movie "argues" people's "performed" actions in time-place as a devised recording. Motion-picture recordings [of people performing on screen] are almost entirely "devices" – hardly real "people" or real "actions." The recorded device is a light and sound argument that puts a proposal for interpretation. But as Section-35 discusses, mistaken people anthropomorphize the screen as another place and person – and they waste their time believing fallacious screen thought and acting on those fallacies. Hopefully, a "recorded place on screen" sets an argument that we learn from, but without mistaking our place for anything other than our comfortable room and armchair – with its window on distribution and its door to our worldly future.

Real people instigate dramatic places among self and others in real life – invasions, witch-hunts, family breakdowns or business conflicts such as the four key movies in this investigation. "Drama" (what people do that concerns audiences) is not the same as motion in a natural space where the Earth's physics flows as a landslide, earthquake or other natural disaster. A natural disaster is not a drama, unless people are dealing with it. A reader familiar with the 170 movies in Section-50 will recall that they all argue, without exception, places where people act co-operatively and injuriously. The screen arguments all refer to dramatic places where people deal with unnatural death or threat of unnatural death caused by self or others. Out in the real world, people responsible for such real-life dramas usually do their best to create ignorance about the awful dramatic places they have instigated. Historians Richard J. Evans and Margaret MacMillan point to

Germany's suppression of rational thinking about its World War One invasions. Suppressing discussion of conservative German actions creating World War One gave rise to Nazism, detention camps for scapegoated people and World War Two. Evans labels the conservative, and later fascist suppression that leads to World War, "a fateful myth" (2003:L1491; cf. MacMillan 2003:21). Many arguments in Section-50 expose that myth. The collective suppression of knowledge about invasion was instigated again in post-1945 Australian and American myths. For example, in Nicole Kidman's Duigan, Noonan et al. (1987) *Vietnam*, its Australian filmmakers replay newsreel footage of Americans incinerating civilians alive with napalm. The filmmakers edit the footage to claim this is a North Vietnamese invasion rather than Australian and American invasion (Section-50). American academic Lien-Hang T. Nguyen grew up in America in the 1970s and 1980s when most people involved in the invasion of Vietnam were collectively suppressing "knowledge of that place":

> "I grew up in a working-class neighborhood in post- Vietnam War America during a time when that episode in the nation's past was being collectively suppressed. My family and I were shameful reminders of a war that should have never been fought. The war was both distant and proximate; I did not live it but who I am is a direct result of it" (2012:14).

Suppression of thought about place also occurs in the economic area of the inquiry scope. Wilder, Brackett and Marshman (1950) *Sunset Blvd.* follows an unemployed, indebted writer in Los Angeles who accepts work on a wealthy, long-retired performer's obsessive vanity project. *Sunset Blvd.* explores the all-too-common distortion of the global economy when wealthy people or wealthy groups outside their area of expertise and experience invest in the wrong projects. It explores anxious, impoverished makers who submit to these doomed projects in return for food and lodging. *Sunset Blvd.* warns writers and their producers, investors or distributors not to get too personally caught up in an investor's pet,

personal project if the project has lost track of what democratic audiences (or audiences large enough to repay the costs) desire to watch. One of the awful ironies in *Sunset Blvd.* is that the investor has an intensely personal perspective and fanatical belief about characters and scenes that drives her to seek a writer who will renounce drama's triangulation of people (in Section-10) for her monomania. The investor believes that all the scene interactions revolve around the motivations of the one character she desires to perform. The writer diplomatically advises the investor that this egotistical perspective quashes the writing, but to no avail. There is debt penury and powerful lunacy in this place, argue its makers. Powerful suppression of knowledge and its injurious consequences is a common argument in the 170 movies of Section-50.

Coen and Coen's *Barton Fink* (1991) is another movie argument about public (economic) failure in the writing cycle. Notice how a shift from one place to another place puts the drama: *Barton Fink* opens on a successful up-and-coming New York City theatre playwright. Young playwright Barton's problems start when he is lured to Los Angeles. He cannot think in terms of the actions and gestures of screen thought – which is not a problem when writing theatre in New York, but his lack of screen competence becomes disastrous in Los Angeles. Here it is not the studio or politicians suppressing thought but the writer's anxious incompetence in a place, that collapses knowledge.

When competent filmmakers decide to collect audio and motion-pictures about a place, it is often because information about the place has been suppressed. According to music writer David Stubbs, young German composer Florian Fricke and young filmmaker Werner Herzog were typical of postwar makers who resisted public amnesia about occupied place:

> "Both were concerned about the 'Americanisation' of West Germany, a sort of cultural occupation, with landscape and existential uncertainty. Both stood in contrast to banally amnesiac strains in their chosen media - for

> [*kosmische* musicians] it was the hideously kitsch form of [easy-listening pop] known as Schlager, for filmmakers it was "Heimatfilm", a form of cinema which offered a bucolic, nostalgic view of a never-never Germany in which the Third Reich had never happened. And, despite [their different materials, the artists'] common characteristic was a desire to innovate, to find new modes of self-expression at a vital point in German cultural life." (Stubbs 2014:1).

On bucolic, nostalgic Australian and U.S. screens, their invasions and sieges of South East Asia only vaguely happened, or are deceptively rewritten. Along with Herzog et al.'s German new wave, many French, Italian and Swiss filmmakers also resisted the cultural occupation of Western Europe after war, in such films as Godard and Moravia (1963) *Contempt* starring Brigitte Bardot and Fritz Lang. *Contempt* explores a failing 1960s movie project team whose American distributor gives a Nazi salute. Ongoing French colonialism in North Africa is decried in Pontecorvo et al. (1966) *The Battle Of Algiers.* Eastern European artists decried Soviet occupation of their "place," in innovative controversial films such as Makavejev and Reich (1971) *W.R. Mysteries Of The Organism.*

In 1935, filmmaker James Whale turned his camera on the mostly hidden "place" of human medical research in *Bride Of Frankenstein.* More recently the Coen brothers turned their microphones on the mostly hidden "place" of absurd paranoia in Washington DC, in *Burn After Reading* (2008). Both these screen arguments open by stepping back from their mysterious places and locating the arguments in their wider landscape: "the Earth in space." In these opening sequences, both Coen and Whale introduce the Earth's globe lit by the sun's light. Movies are arguments recorded in light. Screenplay scene headings for the Coen and Whale openings can be written: "**EXT. PLANET EARTH IN SPACE – DAY**."

The writer's lighting-camera term "**DAY**" indicates the lighting geometry of the scene: the sun's position is more behind the camera and less behind the Earth. The

sun shines past the camera to light the face of the daylight Earth. A **NIGHT** argument puts the Earth between the camera and the Sun. From this distance "**IN SPACE**", planet Earth appears without life, only cosmic material such as clouds of particulate chemistry. As the camera (and writing) moves closer to the clouds, our living ecology – photosynthesising vegetation and oxygen – appears and flows. Coming closer again: people's architectural devices and people's bodies emerge. People live their lives among Earth's illuminated, sound-transmitting global envelope of air, which allows voices to transmit.

Our necessary solar time and Earth place are crucial elements in movie thought. Variations on this basic setting have framed every scene heading in a century of movie arguments. Even Kubrick and Clarke (1968) *2001 A Space Odyssey* has people millions of kilometers from Earth who spend the whole argument in the Sun's rays, generating extra light from devices brought from Earth; breathing the Earth's air that they carry with them. The space crew who are not in induced comas, follow their usual "day and night rhythm of place." In some science fiction conjecture, fantasy or surreal films for example, our Solar Earth place may well be distorted for the purposes of these arguments. But naming a place in Earth's global air envelope and positioning the sun's light for the scene heading are the usual settings of place in screen thought.

In Section-11's movie screenplay extract of a Sydney street, we read that the element of place or scene is given second position in a standard form screenplay, after the element of plot time. The movie's plot time is its page number "12" that indicates the roughly 12th whole minute of running time (0:11:00 to 0:12:00) of the movie argument. This is plot time, not the story time that characters in the place of the scene might have on their watches. The next element in Section-11's formal array is the time (DAY) and place of the Sydney Street in the story:

EXT. SYDNEY STREET – DAY.

How do makers know that "Sydney Street" is a "place" and not another element, such as "utterance"? Why do screen thinkers not think this is a reference to a street "uttered" at the North Pole, nowhere near Sydney? The latter place, its arctic speaker and utterance might be written thus:

EXT. NORTH POLE – DAY.

AMBULANCE DRIVER

I've dealt with more ice on a Sydney street.

How do we know that the words "Sydney Street" are not inscribed on a map or other device denoting a non-existing but planned street name? For example, an argument might be put that the place is a forest track away from Sydney. Again, the place is in the heading, the word "Sydney" is not in the place heading but inscribed on a device:

EXT. FOREST TRACK – DAY.

A PROSPECTOR hammers a new signpost "Sydney" into the dirt.

How do we know "Sydney Street" is not a person with surname Street living in Moscow or Mexico? People are introduced into the argument by writing their names once in capitals, and thereafter in capital initial and lower case. Given the holism of the mental, place, time, person and action are argued together:

EXT. MOSCOW – DAY.

SYDNEY STREET folds a newspaper and crosses the road.

It is a convention of movie thought that the specific "place" element (Sydney street, North Pole, forest track and Moscow) is written into scene headings in capitals, after the place architecture (EXT./INT.) and before the story time DAY/NIGHT. No other element is introduced and marked thus in a screenplay. On its own the word "Sydney" possibly denotes many screen elements that have different layouts and fonts in a written screen interaction, and therefore different meanings and ontologies. Again, this is a point about the holism of the mental: in order to understand "place" words and other isolated words about elements, a filmmaker or audience has to be familiar with how screen elements work together in various positions in a screenplay. If the screen thinker creates screenplays, it is other formatted messages – head position, capitalization, placement (next to another place condition **EXT.**) – that denote "Sydney" as a "place" screen element. If Sydney were a person on the same page, the person would have their name "Sydney" written in the action line part of the array that indicates "people." When screenwriters write professionally, they "write" in the screenplay's standard form layout, or they take notes defining every unambiguous element as a place, utterance, written device, thought or person in a real-time high-speed array such as a "notation" shorthand. We have seen Greene, Kafka and Woolf quickly sketch D, K, X and so forth for "people" in a place.

Screen thinkers listen to the acoustics of a place and watch the colors, grey scale, contrast, textures, shapes, and motion of the place's motion pictures – unencumbered by words. Word elements often run interference on screen thought, as when cascading elements are clearly interpreted but then side-tracked by a superfluous label. Often labels argue fallaciously from authority, as when text is jammed on mobile phones in Mann and Yerkovich (2006) *Miami Vice.* Or text is added to clutter the frame a television show to fallaciously increase the visual tension without investing in the time to think through a serious argument. Bombarding with texts distracts from on-camera argument and the cluttered program ends up fallaciously arguing from ignorance. Makers rarely need the label

"mosquito" placed in front of a mosquito. Forster and Helm (2006) *Stranger Than Fiction* use this overlaid clutter to argue the excessive logical flow chart labeling occlusion or character flaw of its leading character. At worse, spectators lose sight of the object if a label is stuck over it. Audiences don't hear mosquitoes hum if a narration voices over a loud "mosquito" discourse. So place is critical, not just in the semantics of a screen argument (what is being argued) but also in how screen elements are placed within the syntax or array of movie thought.

Presented with a worded explanation inside a movie argument such as "Berlin referred to Sydney in Paris after India spoke of Berlin in Sydney" – a reader might be forgiven for thinking these words denote "places" Berlin and India when no such claim is made. Berlin and India are not places in this quote. Unlike prose writers, a filmmaker cannot afford to jumble other elements with place elements in this way. If a film crew mistakes a place element in screen thought, the result can be chaos and million-dollar budget overruns. So where is the first place and scene in this "Berlin" quote? It is not in Paris. The quote's two time-places are not clearly in a plotted order, in the way that screen thinkers lay out some distance and order to the two places, one after the other in plot time. Screen thought formats elements in their filmic relationships. The two screen "places" SYDNEY and PARIS are clearly separated with scene headings in the standard form below. Perhaps the two people, India and Berlin, are on the phone together, with one calling from Sydney and the other listening in Paris:

```
EXT. SYDNEY – DAY.
                    INDIA
              I'm referring to you
              as a person, Berlin.

INT. PARIS – NIGHT.
                    BERLIN
              Thanks India. When I
              referred to Sydney, I
              meant – your place.
```

Figure 3. Screen thought formats time-place, persons (India and Berlin) and their utterances.

Notice too, that in speech Berlin refers to the past. Past and future tense can be spoken of in screen thought but actions always occur in the present tense of the scene's place. When the writer sets a scene in particular location, the choice of place is usually related to the actions of foreground people. The live telecom conversation of Berlin and India pushes both characters into the foreground of this argument. The place is both Sydney and Paris, linked by the action of making a call. Again, if Kubrick and Clarke (1968) desire to explore the actions of people dealing with a booby-trapped computer in space, then the intuitive course of action is to set the argument in a spacecraft. Actions motivate the selection of place in screen thought. If one's intention is to explore lovers who escape from Sydney's criminal underworld, then, similarly, the intuitive approach sets the argument in Sydney. When analysts investigate the writer's motive for exploring computer people or underworld criminals, usually what transpires is that the writer grew up among such a community, traveled to such a community, or had the community thrust upon them for a variety of reasons, some of which are explored in the argument. Often there is a symbiosis between writers, the real places of their lives, and the screen places they put in arguments.

Performers may well interpret the argued element of "place" somewhat differently from writers. For a performer, there are real occupational health and safety considerations that overarch negotiations for every performance location. A "location" is the real place that a "scene" is performed and recorded in. It may be that "Exterior Sydney Street – day" is built on a sound stage in another city, where high voltage electricity, trip hazards, and other dangers of the stage are carefully controlled. But as film's light sensitivity increased and camera weight decreased, scenes could be located in the real places of the argument. Filmmakers call this "location shooting." In the real location case, "Exterior Sydney Street –

day" brings another set of occupational health and safety considerations for performers. If performers are mentally "in the zone" of performance, crew need to protect the performers from, say, running onto the street as part of the written scene and being injured by the real world. Competent teams deal with all these potential problems that overlay every written scene. With careful planning, friendship, experience and knowledge, location scenes and soundstage scenes inspire performances and recordings, rather than endangering the unprepared.

For recordists, the element of scene or place is almost a whole way of life. If a scene is an interior (INT.), then sound recordists are fascinated with the problems, solutions and opportunities of the building's air conditioning that hums under the location's sound, or the variety of footfalls and sound-reflective surfaces. If the scene is an exterior trafficked street scene, will the audio people (including the director) fade down and filter the extremely noisy traffic? Just as we shut off audio psychologically when we sleep, most town people psychologically no longer hear the constant high levels of city noises they instigate in their lives and thinking. But when a sound recordist opens a microphone in most people's homes, streets, offices and factories, then the movie sound equipment captures the city's enervating, noisy ghastliness in all its detail and force. Usually filmmakers remove the real traffic sound from their edited recordings, and, as a matter of habitual screen thinking, audiences choose to believe their city streets sound as quite as they do in the "edited sound" of movies and news, rather than hear the real traffic noise's physical impact on pedestrians and residents. The annoying noise of an aircraft anywhere in the sky over towns where filmmakers create screen arguments interrupts the town for peaceful, aware, rational thought and communication too.

Moving from the ear to the eye, a motion-picture recordists' primary tool is light. A scene's general lighting conditions, "day" or "night," or cosmic variations (dawn, twilight, moonlight) always head each movie scene – along with "interior"

devised lighting or an "exterior" natural illumination. A key question for lighting recordists is: how does my shaping of light illuminate the faces and bodies that act in this place?" The centre of any movie argument is its people. The recordists shapes the place with lighting, photographic and motion equipment on set and computer applications during editing, in order to deliver the lit bodily actions and gestures of the performers. Ingmar Berman's motion-picture recordist Sven Nykvist lit the performers' bodies in red interiors for (1972) *Cries And Whispers* and lit both people and their place in black and white for (1966) *Persona.*

Chapter 3 focuses on distributors and their way of thinking "place." The distributor questions the film's locations, scenes and places thus: "Will this place or places attract my target audience segments?" As discussed later in Section-36, a plot's "first act" is a place made familiar to the distributor's audience. For example most Anglophones live in urban areas. The extent that they have been brought up to feel that farms are familiar, these farms are mostly European-style farms or ranches. But the non-Anglophone audience in rice-cultivating regions is larger than the U.S. and U.K. So Le Ly's rice farm in *Heaven And Earth* is a deeply familiar place to more spectators, but paddy is an unfamiliar place to most Anglophones. Even so, watching this farm girl, many of her actions are familiar to audiences that might otherwise consider paddy exotic: Le Ly helps her parents on the farm, she plays with neighborhood children, she asks her mother where babies come from, she shares a meal or laughs with family members. There are still plenty of screen elements that are familiar to audiences before her "place" is radically changed by invasions. It is the shift to invasions that make Le Ly's place an "unfamiliar second act" shadowlands for most audiences. With invasion, her place becomes unfamiliar. Places change dramatically during a movie argument.

Similarly, Lindy's familiar first act finds her in a modest middle class home,

working hard to raise her children in a well-managed, happy home. It is only when her family is attacked by a wild dog – and attacked by exploitative media, politicians and judiciary – that Lindy is thrown into a "shadowlands" place that poses existential arguments about her character journey. She is no longer in "this familiar place here." An existential crisis has thrown her into "an unfamiliar place there." An argument about a gentle fool who is thrown out into the public media-sphere even inscribes this existential shift as its title: Ashby and Kosinski (1979) *Being There*. What kinds of shifts occur in the second act place? A useful list is provided by Thomas E. Wartenberg (2008) in his book on existentialism. The shift to shadowlands raises questions of a character's existence, freedom, others (companions and strangers), anxiety, finitude (limitations and mortality), absurdity, authenticity and oppression, in the minds of moviemakers – and these are Wartenberg's chapter headings. Dramatic places that throw up these questions as visceral dilemmas for embodied characters are the kind of places chosen by strong filmmakers who explore the human condition.

In order to shift the "place" mindset in film philosophy, this study looked for places rich in questions about people's thought and action that were not necessarily Anglophone North Atlantic places, although they could be, as part of a collection of "world" films. The initial wider inquiry studied mostly U.S., the U.K. and some European films like *Educating Rita* and Godard and Moravia (1963) *Contempt*, but as the inquiry narrowed, it seemed important to concentrate on places that usually remained silent and dark in Anglophone film philosophy such as South East Asia, including Australia. Interestingly enough, although Australia is a highly urban population whose average streetscape looks like suburban California, but with people's attitudes more akin to Britain's – there is a whole parade of movies (set in North Atlantic places) that reserve the place "Australia" or "Australian" as a strange destination or a mild term of abuse. Abuse flashes by in: Aldrich and Marcus (1968) *The Killing Of Sister George* and Reiner

and Guest (1984) *This Is Spinal Tap*. Exotic beliefs are in *Educating Rita* and Berri and Pagnol (1986) *Jeanne de Florette*. Their North Atlantic characters mildly denigrate or mystify Australia. Malick and Jones (1998) *The Thin Red Line* manages to omit the battlefield's colonial Australian status. But other screen minorities in many Anglophone movies are subject to much harsher trivializing abuse or obscurity. If one reads collected papers on film philosophy under the assumption that Anglophone "film philosophy" is a "world" view, then its mostly narrow focus on North America and Western Europe soon revises that assumption. Academic efforts to broaden film philosophy's view of "place" include Adrian Martin et al. (2011) *World Cinema Now*. Again, *The London Film and Media Conference* attracts film papers from around the world but its inaugural 2011 Conference publication followed the North Atlantic habit of summarily cutting and overwriting un-attributed U.K. or U.S. views into a paper on Australian innovation and censorship, ironically (Watson 2013: 299-307).

In discussing the element of film "place," this study turns from Anglophone film philosophy's focus (Western Europe and America) to explore Australasia and South East Asia (population 633 million) – roughly same population, yet almost non-existent on the Anglophone screen (United Nations Population Fund 2011: 116-121). But background movies for this inquiry were drawn from a library screening mostly U.S. and U.K. places. So South America, South Asia and Africa are mostly mute in this study – although documentaries of place, such as *The War On Democracy* (2007, about South America) are dramatically stronger that the same movie place in the library.

Recordists and theorists will be disappointed that pioneering Soviet motion-picture editors Kuleshov, Pudovkin and Eisenstein are not in this study, which falls down as a "world" inquiry. In Section-50, there is a bit of Iran, with Granaz Moussavi et al. (2010) *My Tehran For Sale* and Asghar

Farhadi et al. (2011) *Nader And Simin: A Separation*; and some East Asia such as Takahashi, Arakawa and Hasekura (2008) *Spice and Wolf*, Miyazaki et al. (2001) *Spirited Away* (with their pedigree in Utamaro's prints) and Lee and Wang (2000) *Crouching Tiger Hidden Dragon*. African places are argued in O'Ferrall, Dalrymple, Storm and Greene (1953) *The Heart Of The Matter* and George and Pearson (2004) *Hotel Rwanda*, fifty years apart. Scandinavia is there with Ingmar Bergman's *Persona* (1966) and *Cries And Whispers* (1972), and a series, Bernth, Foss and Sveistrup (2008, 2010, 2012) *The Killing*. Section-50's 170+ films form a historical timeline of screen arguments over screen thought's first century and beyond. The film "place" of most movies in Section-50 has – by Anglophone habit – been North Atlantic, although the key Lindy, Le Ly and Evelyn scenarios have all emerged from South East Asia and Australasia, as a counter balance to the common place.

Since 1945, South East Asia has been subject to invasions (*Heaven And Earth, The Killing Fields, Mr. Pip*), fascism such as Indonesia's Orange-shirts (Oppenheimer 2012) and what multi-millionaire Academy-Award winner Charles Ferguson (2012) calls predatory economics. These three dramatic actions rely on deceiving or silencing people. By silencing the filming of these places, it makes it very difficult for researchers to contribute to a serious ongoing public factual discourse about the region, outside a limited academia and the private families affected. Filmmakers who research and develop serious public arguments about drama in this region are often in danger of losing their livelihoods or lives. For example, the Oppenheimer, Anonymous and Cynn (2012) *The Act Of Killing* documentary follows "American cinema gangsters" who committed Indonesia's 1965 genocide of over one million civilians. "Anonymous" – one of the Danish documentary's directors – cannot be named even today, for fear of assassination.

The British television public was complicit (through their government) in the region's genocides. Audiences were deceived about Cambodia during the 1970s. Britons had little idea that they, and their allies, were laying siege to Cambodia. Le Ly's people, the neighboring Vietnamese, broke the siege (Niall Ferguson 2006:Ep.5). In one of the most powerful documentaries of all time, Pilger and Munro (1979) researched and developed a non-trivial public argument about the siege. *Year Zero: The Silent Death Of Cambodia* reported to British audiences from inside the siege as anthrax rotted war orphans to death. Children die on camera right before the viewers' eyes. As a result of the documentary's screening in the U.K., ordinary television viewers sent money for food and medicines to relieve the siege – without being begged, but out of compassion, prompted by Pilger and Munro's argument. 45 million dollars was raised for the stricken people. The U.K. government, allied with Pol Pot, was forced to modify its policy. This documentary helped cease a modern national genocide – making Pilger and Munro (1979) one of the most historic films of all time. *The Act Of Killing* and *Year Zero: The Silent Death Of Cambodia* both exemplify the tiny trickle of well-researched Anglophone screen arguments to emerge from Ly Le's regional time-place with arguments that press the limits of human drama. These films were background research in this study that help break *Heaven and Earth's* political silence about "place."

Pilger provides many frontier research documentaries on this vast little-known time-place: Pilger and Monro (1970) *The Quiet Mutiny*; Pilger and Monro (1978) *Do You Remember Vietnam?*; Pilger and Devenish (1982) *Frontline: The Search For Truth in Wartime*; Pilger and Munro (1994) *Flying The Flag, Arming The World*; Pilger and Munro (1994) *Death of a Nation: The Timor Conspiracy*; Pilger and Munro (1995) *Vietnam: The Last Battle*; Pilger and Munro (1996) *Inside Burma – Land Of Fear* and Pilger and Lowery (2001) *New Rulers of the World*. Like Oppenheimer's Indonesian

genocide film, Pilger's *Inside Burma* film includes "anonymous" credits to protect many of its contributors from state murder. Yet drama of a place emerges from inquiry into other areas of the worldly agenda too. An economic nature film argument about wealthy, nutrition-rich Cambodia as the largest city in the pre-industrial world (much, much larger and more prosperous and healthy than medieval London, Paris or Rome) is given in academic Iain Stewart (2011b) *How Earth Made Us: Water*.

Besides documentaries, rare Anglophone movies in Section-50 have emerged from the region to address its ongoing dramatic conflicts. They include Adamson and Jones (2012) *Mr. Pip* set on Bougainville; Lee and Shute (1956) *A Town Like Alice* set in Malaya; Joffe, Schanberg, Robinson and Pran (1984) *The Killing Fields* in Cambodia; and Weir, Williamson and Koch (1985) *The Year Of Living Dangerously* in Indonesia. Weir's *Living Dangerously* suppresses the genocide that *The Art Of Killing* investigates, even though it alludes to the same events. The White House's National Security orders (published in Weiner 2007: 258-262) help explain Washington's origination of the region's extreme dramas. By studying over a century of "Anglophone" movie arguments, this inquiry gives no indication of the non-English movies and television that over 600 million locals make and watch – and this limits this investigation.

Unlike history documentaries, the inquiry scope of movie arguments is more than politics. What of culture? Reuters investigative journalist, fluent Indonesian speaker and long-term resident Elizabeth Pisani (2014) *Indonesia Etc.* lived inside many families across hundreds of Indonesian islands and subcultures to weave her account of Indonesia. Her full agenda explores: thought, intimacy, friends, family, economics (Pisani was an economics correspondent), politics and culture. Creative people unfamiliar with the region's cultures might find Watson (1994b) *Visions* (Australia: Curriculum Corporation) a useful illustrated, practical introduction to its great variety: batik surrealism; satirical woodcuts; contemplation of landscape; *Ramayana* drama and so on. In Australia (which is part of this time zone),

relatively few people know much about the wider region, having consumed decades of mostly U.S. and U.K. television. For example, of 46 university screen examiners offering academic expertise in Australia, only one lists Asian expertise (ASPERA 2014). Given Australia's colonial traditions, average young Australians today know about George V's April 1915 invasion of Turkey, more than their own grandparents' military incursions into Australia's northern region. How Australia is politically "integrated" into other countries' conflicts and signals traffic is explored in Wilkinson and Le Clézio (1983) *Allies*. In *Allies*, Australian and allied politicians, academics and soldiers talk openly about: changing Le Ly's region into a "place" of conflict; changing the world's press into a "place" of "disinformation" about the 1965 Indonesian genocide – supporting the military takeover of place: "we mapped the whole country for them" – and American-run Australian satellite ground stations that are "also used during the bombing of Cambodia". The Australasian region is high drama and yet most Australian and Anglophone screens are blank or jingoistic and apologetic.

The world's first movie was about Australian colonial violence (1906 *The Story Of The Kelly Gang*) and it was a blockbuster – large audiences are interested in the abuse of power as screen drama. But conservative censors in Australia banned it after it made vast opening profits and attracted large audiences (Bertrand and Routt 2007). Today, the recent violent history of Australasia's regional "place" is a strong and complex drama field for moviemakers and audiences – but its research and development is strongly discouraged in conservative circles. The political silencing of Australasian public discussion about the region is recently exemplified by Scott McIntyre's sacking from Australia's SBS public network in April 2015. Rather than tweet about George V's invasion of Turkey in 1915, McIntyre tweeted about civilians bombed in Australia's time zone in 1945. The Australian communications Minister responded by tweeting his followers and communicating with SBS management. McIntyre was sacked (Greenwald 2015:1).

The attempt by educators, politicians, businesses and filmmakers to mentor future generations to know their own time-place is a minority pastime in the shadows of Australia's ongoing colonial legacy. For example, in a feature science fiction adventure movie George and Watson (1992) *Kewen and Blue* funded by the Queensland Government, children's director Joanne George explores co-operation between different languages and children of the region, including China, Burma and Australia. *Kewen and Blue* is a bilingual educational resource yet it is almost impossible to source today.

Given this politics of silence about place, the average Australian public "understanding" of Pacific Asia is very limited. This ignorance is gently satirized in P.J. Hogan et al. (1994) *Muriel's Wedding* movie, where young Muriel's corrupt politician father is constantly caught doing deals over lunch in Australian Chinese restaurants. At a more sophisticated level of visual culture over two centuries, Australia's leading fine art painters (including Streeton, Fairweather and Whiteley) have pioneered visual inquiries into East Asian scrolls, brush painting and the calligraphy of Japan, Korea, China and Vietnam – hybridising visual culture at the apex of innovative painting traditions. Other arts and artists have enthusiastically explored their region's Aboriginal painting or Indonesia's batik, shadow puppets gamelan and Japanese koto.

For a moviemaker, these fine art devices are part of a place's emotional and intellectual richness. Not only do movies explore the powerful drama of a few foreground characters in a high stakes "place" of so much tragedy like South East Asia, but the pleasures of batik color or koto sounds form layers that cascade among a movie's frightful, dramatic layers that demand our "pity and fear" (Aristotle 1932: 1449b20). One listens to the zither in *The Third Man's* bombed out capital; or watches Japanese winter landscapes unfold like scroll paintings in *Norwegian Wood*, for example (1949, 2010).

The Aristotelian way of developing drama underpins most screenwriting (Edwards & Skerbelis 2005:55). Aristotle underpins the "writing of place" in most

of the 170 movies in Section-50. The selection of places awash with "pity and fear" in this study follows that model of movie development, up to a point. An Aristotelian perspective results in investigating conflict documentaries like *Allies*. But having unearth the factual horror of fearful, powerful people's actions in a place that has been "collectively suppressed," to quote Nguyen, what is a maker to do with these (f)acts? Developing honest Aristotelian tragedies about a region may well lead to censorship and silence. Aristotle himself retreated from Athens soon after writing *Poetics.* It criticises Athenian drama's decline into shallow spectacle and epic serials (1450a; 1456a). Aristotelian drama argues the "expulsion of a main character" from the argument, and moviemakers usually follow this pattern. Innocent Lindy was jailed for her whole life. Le Ly was expelled from many groups and scenes before escaping to the U.S. and its like-minded businesswomen. Journalist McIntyre was sacked for tweeting problems in his time zone. Australia's UKUSA secret police were specifically tasked with spying on taxpayers in "film societies" and "New Theatre" (Horner 2014:207).

As is explored later in Section-32, this inquiry decided to go beyond Aristotle's interpretation of dramatic place (an interpretation this study names the "expulsive milieu") and develop the idea of Australia/South East Asia and the world as an "inclusive place" or "inclusive milieu" while developing *Evelyn's* movie argument. To make this leap to an inclusive place, it is necessary to learn from the past of a dramatic place, otherwise we continue to repeat its history. But first, the inquiry turns to the argumentative element that people make from natural and cosmic places. People take resources of natural and cosmic places and produce "devices" that are investigated next.

16.
Devices.

Chapter 1 has identified some elements that, when arranged together in a film, can express research about "people acting and gesturing amongst each other in a time-place." This arrangement has been named "an interaction." In one such interaction – minute 12 of the "Alex and Jimmy" street scene – Alex carries a Minolta camera. Her camera is not a person, an action, gesture, time or place; and so this inquiry adds another element to thinking about film as interactions. Her camera is a "device." This camera is more than a cosmic or natural structure, like sunlight or a piece of beach driftwood that might be collected under the element of place. Her camera is an object made by people at the Minolta factory. The camera device has been devised and shaped by people using cosmic material like iron (Cox 2011) and natural material like petroleum plastic (Stewart 2011a). In this inquiry, objects formed by people are called "devices." Person-made devices include clothing, architecture, towns and makeup. Devices are ubiquitous in millions of film sequences and so they are considered another element in screen arguments.

Some documentary arguments, like J. Bronowski (1973:Episode 11) *The Ascent Of Man,* explore physical matter and recordists' recording devices such as radar and electron microscopes that engineers make from matter. With these recording devices, scientists explore the energy spectrum from very large to very small objects. But moviemakers explore the human condition, so the recording devices most suitable for moviemakers are cameras and microphones that detect "macroscopic physical objects" such as people. When devices like traffic lights or mobile phones are seen or heard in a movie argument, these are background elements because, as Section-10 discusses, the movie genre is a screen argument focused on what people do in their interrelationships. For example, Wartenberg (2007) discusses Charlie Chaplin (1935) *Modern Times* about a factory worker who is dominated by the industrial devices of others. For both filmmaker Chaplin

and philosopher Wartenberg, their focus is on the human relationships that characters have with self, among other people, in the modern age of factory devices. *Modern Times* is not a training film documentary that elaborates the technology of a device. The factory devices are on screen to argue something about the people connected with the factory and their human conditions.

Having said that, filmmakers, especially recordists, are keenly interested in and contribute to discourse on technological devices. After all, a new screen argument cannot be put unless the screen team knows how to innovate, build, test, operate and maintain microphones, musical instruments, costumes, makeup, studios, cameras, computers, global networks and income streams. When a share trader in (1986) *Wall Street* gains a high income stream, the argument is about how gaining this device affects the trader's intimate friends, family and workplace colleagues, rather than how this financial device is affected. When screen thinking turns from devices towards the human condition, then arguments about screen and other technologies shift into the background layers of a movie. People are emphasized in the foreground, and their devices are not explored in detail as working technologies. Screen devices become theatre stage props in human dramas. Does the Minolta camera in Alex and Jimmy's scene work? The question is irrelevant to writer-director Jordan's argument. The Minolta is a prop, a handle, around which two people forge a loving friendship. What is seriously argued is that Jimmy's "smile" works. Alex's "intonation" works. It is people who matter first in movie arguments. People include the audience. Audiences matter to filmmakers. So recordists refine how they use their recording devices to provide demanding spectators with the most attractively devised movie or documentary argument's recorded locations, dressed sets, lighting and sound.

Often the question of ownership – "which person owns this device?" – becomes an issue in movies. Ownership is related to each person's maturity, competence and responsibility curve, as well as relationships in the time-place of history. Alex

has the maturity and competence to size up Jimmy, believe him mature and competent enough to have responsibility for briefly possessing her precious camera. She hands over the device into Jimmy's care. Jimmy is so smitten with Alex's friendly gestures that he incompetently miss-takes her photo. Yet this incompetent action is more than compensated for by the big increase in maturity that both people initiate by falling in love and co-operating together to leave Sydney's criminal underworld. Devices in movies are shared handles around which people increase or deplete their responsibility curves.

In a movie argument or an interaction, we can usually distinguish between the element of people and the element of devices. Devices are not people, although many filmmakers explore the conjecture that devices are people – such as the computer that "replaces" librarians in Lang et al. (1957) *Desk Set*. In this conjecture, filmmakers Lang et al. hide the people who built the giant computer and set its clockwork switching mechanism in motion. The filmmakers hide answers to "who realistically benefits from this device?" and in doing so, they obscure rational discourse about the computer's development and ownership by people whose programming filibusters a newspaper's archives and library.

When filmmakers or characters argue that devices are people, ask: who stands to benefit from this fallacy? The question shines light on people's responsibility curves. *Desk Set's* computer upset is background to an amusing foreground Kate Hepburn feminist or equitable romance. In *Desk Set*, librarian Hepburn is responsible for information flows in a large corporation. Efficiency expert Spenser Tracy is responsible for cutting costs by installing a computer system in the firm and trimming staff. Unfortunately Tracy has not taken into account the human interface costs of using the computer compared to consulting Hepburn and her staff. It is Tracy's competence to do the efficiency job responsibly that is overstated. Both Tracy and Hepburn learn from this in the end: their responsibility curves increase and they find a way to keep the librarians and use

the computer device in areas in which it is useful. Whether it is a computer device in *Desk Set*, a shotgun in *Heaven And Earth* or a camera in *Two Hands*, devices in movies are props or handles that decorate and facilitate inquiries into people.

The fact that Alex's Minolta is a 1990s photochemical camera and not a digital camera leads to Alex's film being processed in a public shop. Passers-by view the photos as they emerge from the shop's processing machine. Later in the movie, Jimmy's criminal gang sees the public photos and this leads them to injure Jimmy and Alex. A similar plot twist occurs with public photos in Boulting and Greene (1950) *Brighton Rock*. If *Two Hands* (1998) was remade today, then today's devices would likely reshape its story but not its underlying argument. Alex would email copies of her photos from her phone to Jimmy's phone, and the gang would not see them. To remake the movie in our different time-place, the gang would hack into Jimmy's phone to keep tabs on him. Investigating "young love escapes a criminal subculture" using its place elements and device elements (costumes, telecoms, photo data storage) changes trivially from *Two Hand* to *Two Hands Updated,* while the very same human drama of people's thought and action unfolds. Alex is still embodied as Alex. Jimmy still consumes photos taken by the pair. The criminal gang still instigates injury on the couple's privacy and affectionate relationship. The productive co-operation between the lovers – escaping to a better place – is the same argument in the low-tech film and its high-tech update. People's embodiment, consumption, relationships and productive co-operation among familiar devices and places are the interactive baseline from which challenges and initiatives are taken up in screen arguments. As background, devices do not usually change the argument per se.

Devices in movies are stage props, graphics and prosthetics, and two devices are key to the shape of the argument. It has already been noted that some devices are telecoms that link people in "conversations" between different places at the same time. In contrast to "telecoms" (such as phones) this study identifies recorded

"screens." On documentary, news and movie screens, no one who wrote, enacted or performed the argument is present to engage the listener in a conversation. Movies, news campaigns and documentaries put "no one present" screen arguments. Rather than conversation, we behold a film or news report on our phone, where the telecom device simply runs the fixed argument or "message" for our interpretation, pleasure, information or instruction. The term "message" is used in a weak sense. There is no claim that anyone will notice, understand or act on a devised message running on a device. At least with a telecom conversation, either party can ask and answer questions if one does not understand.

A screen message or feature argument is, for normal purposes, fixed. If you ask the fixed device a question, another writer is not necessarily going to do more research and development, and answer your question. As a fixed message, it can fade in the sun (a book cover), it can explode (an old celluloid nitrate film), it can be ignored, misunderstood, destroyed, reshaped, or the writer may well be writing a sequel to the partial argument – but the movie is not a living conversation. A screen argument becomes an "understood message" when it is both distributed by makers and interpreted by an appreciator much as the makers intended. Hieroglyphics were just precious fixed squiggles, not messages, for many centuries until a code breaker realized an ancient maker's intent. The ancient maker both carved a sun and also spoke "Ra" in their ancient oral traditions – traditions separated from the code breaker over time-place (Hindmarch 2008). "People's intentional interactions over time-place" make a devised movie or documentary argument a message device and not just a device.

But basic, design-for-purpose devices are primarily non-messages: spades, basic architecture, utility clothing. People who believe a spade is a device, make or use the very spade for digging. In use, the spade is a device. People who believe x is a device, make or use x for x'ing – and so x is a device. We call a spade a spade. Of course, any design-for-purpose device can have a message layered over the basic

device, and then the device has both its utility function and its message function. A car will get you from a to b in time t with energy footprint c and comfort d but it will also "say" something to fetishists.

Message devices may carry strong traces of a person or group of people, such as a recording of a loved one's bodily traces and personal devices such as their clothes. A shocking example of strong traces occurs in *A Cry In The Dark* when a news company broadcasts baby Azaria's bloody and torn clothing to the unsuspecting, grieving mother (and maker of the clothes). Azaria's knitted jacket has been discovered after being chewed up and buried in the desert by a dingo. The filmmakers broadcast this image without warning into Lindy's home, a thousand kilometers away. The bloody clothes are not in the room but a message device (motion-pictures of Azaria's bloody jacket) is suddenly in the room. Filmmakers are capable of placing devices like light traces of a victim's bloody clothes in a screen array and distribute the array into people's private homes. If that studio were run by mature, competent and responsible filmmakers, their assault on the grieving family's home would not have happened. Friendly officials would have visited Lindy personally and taken her with Michael to view the discovered jacket, perhaps at first showing an undamaged part before showing the ravaged neck of the jacket. It is a corrupt media culture that first broadcasts the distraught mother's property for the network's monetary and political gain. And a corrupt politics, including tabloid audience that lets them get away with it. The distributors would have tied up a revenue deal with the victim's message device, just as the courts were about to earn income from the real jacket "device" in a fallacious murder trial. As filmmakers or politicians or audiences, we are all on our maturity, competence and responsibility curves. How we use any device to initiate a better place for self and others, or instigate injury on self and others, is our decision, intersected by the decisions of others.

Screen devices are of philosophical interest to filmmakers in so much as devices are used in relationships of affection-harm or liberation-entrapment among other people. By broadcasting the bloody jacket the news team pandered to their audience of ghouls and did harm to Lindy's family in their home. The irresponsible – even babies – without maturity, competence or responsibility – are attracted to unusually shiny or noisy devices in view. Devices that rivet the eye or ear – screen spectacles – are hardly the point of a screen argument among responsible people. How we make and deal with devices in a mature, competent and responsible way is often the burning question in a screen argument.

In Alex Garland et al. (2015) *Ex Machina,* a maker leads his multinational company to devise an artificial brain and human-like body. The robot runs on decisions and notions selected from people's searches on the maker's global search engine. Much as makers and users of energy today destroy the global envelope's air, water nutrition and beauty for upcoming generations, *Ex Machina's* maker and his apprentice allow their devised "ambition and desire" device to ruin their futures. Whether one anthropomorphizes a device like Ava in *Ex Machina* – or one dehumanizes others as desirable "objects" in Miller, Frye and Futterman (2014) *Foxcatcher*, an expulsive milieu leads to unnatural death or injury. This, and the inclusive milieu, are discussed in Section-32.

So far, Chapter 1 has explored six elemental parts of interactions we listen to and watch on screen as: *people acting* and *gesturing* among other people and *devices* in *places* over *time*. Such "interactions without speech" are watched in Charlie Chaplin (1916) *Behind The Screen: The Bewildered Stage Hand.* The element that is missing from Chaplin's silent film is "utterance" and the investigation turns to speech next.

17.

Utterances, Audio and Dialogue.

Writers usually write the dialogue in movie screenplays last. Speech, for moviemakers, is a low-priority element in screen thought – whereas speech in a documentary (or a university lecture) is usually where thought's argument is shaped, as read in Section-08's AV script extract. Generally speaking, when a documentary's voice tracks are compared with movie voice tracks, what is spoken in documentaries is closer to traditional academic writing. So much so, this inquiry calls the usual style of documentary a "lecture-style." Some very simple documentaries actually record a philosopher lecturing from the stage, such as Marianne Talbot (2010) *The Nature of Arguments*. Even in more sophisticated documentaries (Cox, Winston, Roberts, Curtis and Pilger in Section-08) the voice tracks in these physics, biology and history arguments are, in every case, discernable as "lectures." But the voice tracks in movie arguments are not like academic lecture and documentary voices.

At first listen, a documentary like Pilger and Lowery (2010) *The War You Don't See* is not a "lecture" in the traditional sense. If one analyses it thoroughly by transcribing the film as a documentary AV script in "time, audio and vision" columns, then the "lecturing" quality of the audio column becomes apparent. John Pilger presents a complete, logical verbal argument that does not necessarily rely on the pictures, graphics, interviewees' faces, and actuality news footage in the vision column. If blind Marty Klein listened to this documentary, Klein would understand almost as much about the topic as a sighted spectator. Presenter Pilger narrates some of the verbal argument, but much of the time, Pilger records twenty world experts (and some tabloid pretenders) and their testimony about war crimes and the media's role in war crimes. Their replies are woven into Pilger's narrative to put the lecture-style argument. Utterance, in this style of film, carries most of

the argument, while its message is backed up with sound, motion-pictures, still pictures and graphics in other layers.

How different is the purpose and use of utterance in movies. In Section-11's movie screenplay scene between Jimmy and Alex, their total combined dialogue spoken over the course of a minute of screen time is:

> "Well, you've got to do something. What do you want me to do? I don't know. Something. Here's your camera. Thanks."

That is the sum total of the verbal element over one minute or so of film. Not only is it sparse, it is entirely dependent on the motion-picture layers to deliver its meaning. The very same dialogue can been spoken among spies in a war movie:

> "Well, you've got to do something. What do you want me to do? I don't know. Something. Here's your camera. Thanks."

The very same dialogue can be spoken by surgeons during keyhole surgery:

> "Well, you've got to do something. What do you want me to do? I don't know. Something. Here's your camera. Thanks."

The elemental words can be spoken by filmmakers in a slapstick comedy, a child and parent in a coming of age drama – or any genre of movie. The vocabulary is there to add rhetorical authenticity to the action. What counts in movie arguments are the different actions of spies, the different actions of surgeons or lovers Jimmy and Alex, or comedians or parent and child as they interact. As already discussed, the critical element in most movie dialogue is the audio gestures of the words and sentences – how words are "gestured" to negotiate recognition – not what is literally said. A movie is a long and complex argumentative expression told in

people's gestures and actions. Unless one follows the intonation and the actions, Jimmy and Alex's above quoted words do not make sense in isolation. This returns us to the idea of the holism of the mental as it applies to the elements of movie thought.

We can watch and listen to the world's language emerge from the physical body, actions and facial gestures of a baby, in the care of its parent or carer. Babies around the world in all communities biologically "exercise" the full opening of the mouth with an "aah" sound and exercise the tight closing the mouth with a nasal "mmm" sound, just as they stretch and relax their limbs. Combining and repeating this exercise, the sounds ma-ma are produced by people at the beginning of their maturity, competence and responsibility curve – all around the world's global envelope of sound-transmitting air. These are the biological limits to every human's language sounds, and all other speech sounds are variations of the body between these two extremes.

Babies naturally practice all human sounds, but, depending on the carer's time and place, only some of the sounds will be responded to. People everywhere respond to "mm-aa mm-aa" or mama – and the parent, nurse or carer assumes the baby refers to the listener, although the baby is not aware it has spoken "mama" as vocabulary. As babies anywhere on Earth, we start with the same range of noises but then one subculture has the habit of referring to a book with "b-oo-k" noises and in another place, a book is associated with "sh-u" noises. Two babies may babble away, practicing all the sounds between mmm and aah – "ma, b, oo, sh, u, k." In one place, listeners respond to "mama" and "book" and another place, adults respond to "mama" and "shu." Although we start our responsibility curve by uttering our shared biological range of human sounds, within a few years we speak "book" or "shu" and stop speaking unrewarded sounds of parochial, non-cosmopolitan places that do not speak many sublanguages, like English and Mandarin in this example.

A movie that explores the origin of utterance, its parochial "place" limitations, and the celebration of affection and liberty, is de Heer et al. (1993) *Bad Boy Bubby.* Bubby's family has imprisoned him since he was a baby, and he thinks his mother's early reference to him as "Bubby" (baby) denotes his personal name, whereas his immature and irresponsible parents haven't bothered to name him personally. When he escapes into the world as a young man, his few infant speech sounds that his mother and itinerant pop have uttered are the only vocabulary and verbal thoughts that he has. Occasionally filmmakers (like De Heer) take an interest in language as a philosophical inquiry. The more usual language question for filmmaking distributors is financial: how is the project team going to fund the movie's sublanguage translations or text inscriptions in English, Spanish, Russian, Hindi, Mandarin and so on? (All intelligible languages are "sublanguages" or constrained selections of the full range of natural infant sounds). By dubbing a film's original language track or adding layers of subtitles, a distributor can reach a larger audience base and hopefully return revenue to the makers. Delightful exploration of language within the argument of a movie is rare, and Bad Boy Bubby is certainly that. Bubby's sounds emerge from his body but they also supervene on the bizarre actions in his long-term prison home and the interactions in the outside world. We all practice saying mama everywhere in the world when we are infants, but then we restrict what we say and think in vocabulary, restricting thought to the sublanguage of our parents, carers, families, workplaces and media. This parochial use of sublanguage creates a challenge for people who desire to live peacefully in the world – Bubby's words involve him in many extreme confrontations. Some film innovations, like the layering of many dubbed and subtitled sublanguage selections in movie files, helps to bring knowledge of other speakers closer together. Most of the movies in Section-50 are distributed in a variety of sublanguages like English, French, German, Spanish, Russian, Mandarin and so on. In switching between these audio layers, we are reminded of

the cascading, translucent "layered" quality of screen arguments. Speech layers are also a reminder of self and people's existential journeys in the world.

This study follows philosophers like Martha Nussbaum who point to language, thought and sublanguages emerging from people's long-term actions. Although Nussbaum writes on the literary narratives of novels, she thinks past a person's worded vocabulary in speeches and literature to interpret the more powerful long-term feelings, initiatives, values and actions that build (or deplete) a person's sense of self among others:

> "literary narratives display long-term patterns of character, action, and commitment, while investigating the relevant passions with acute perception. They show us, in a way that isolated philosophical examples cannot, what it means to organize a life in pursuit of what one values, and what conflicts and obstacles beset such a search." (1999:175)

Patterns of long term "action" are foregrounded in movie thought. For this reason, writers usually write all the actions in a feature screenplay before returning to add the utterances that emerge from foreground actions or gestures. In movies – as in life – friendly wise people judge their self and others primarily by what people do, hardly by what they say, especially when what they say contradicts what they do. An isolated, pithy repeated sound bite in a forceful multinational media campaign cannot show audiences what it means to organize an affectionate and liberated life – only an honest range of actions argued over a long screen story among others either justify the sound bite or deny it. Not just in advertising campaigns, but also in ambitious personal campaigns, an individual who repeats a slogan may have that speech judged against their actions. So Steve's protestations of love to Le Ly are repeated hourly, but torment and hatred infuses his actions when they move to San Diego. In Chapter 2's *Evelyn* scenario, three friends pledge friendship with Evelyn, yet Evelyn observes the way these so-called

friends "act" to undermine each other (let alone Evelyn) behind each other's back. The spoken pledge is a lie in Evelyn's eyes. A related genre of screen arguments hardly speaks and mostly sings, acts and gestures dance. Forman, Ragni, Rado and Weller (1979) *Hair* with choreography by Twyla Tharp is an example. *Hair* and *Heaven And Earth* explore the same invasion among those that fought against hatred and aggression. Unlike the widening contradiction between Ly Le's partner Steve's words and actions in *Heaven And Earth – Hair's* lyric song utterances and the dancers' actions continue to affirm their honesty. The dancers do what they promise in song. Steve has taken thousands of steps into entrapment and dishonesty.

A movie character usually aims to use speech to influence other characters' actions in a scene. Such influential negotiation among speakers is called "perlocution." Lindy uses a lot of perlocution in *A Cry In The Dark* because her husband Michael tends to be a procrastinator and preacher, and without Lindy's speech, the actions that need doing around the family tend to drift. She often speaks in a way that prompts Michael to act when Michael would rather hesitate. Occasionally, movie dialogue is the main thing being done in a scene – the scene's main "action" in the philosophical sense. Such privileged speech is called illocution, such as when an order, promise or warning is spoken at length in a scene. Marriage vows are illocution. A surreal aerial wedding inside a Hindu-Christian cathedral is spoken and sung in *Hair*. In most movie dialogue, though, characters persuade or convince each other over a long negotiation or conversation among others. The conversation extends, scene by scene, over much of the movie argument. This is locution. In Section-20's *Evelyn*, Evelyn, Bobby and Charlie's speech is constantly renegotiating the status of their friendships, and it is only in the last scene that their relationship strands reach a deep bond of friendship.

Much of the time, words in movies are like foam blowing off the crest of the surf while the wave falls elsewhere. For example in Curtiz et al. (1942) *Casablanca*, Elsa aims for and achieves sexual satisfaction in the first half of the argument. Her

actions lead her to spend the night with Rick, while her speech mostly talks about protecting her liberator husband whose life remains threatened. In the second half of *Casablanca*, Elsa's actions aim for and achieve the protection of her liberator husband while her speech unsuccessfully negotiates the new arrangement with Rick to revive her reclaimed sexual satisfaction. Elsa is an admired, ethical screen character and yet her actions gradually unlink from her speech – that is part of the power of this movie. In movie arguments, speech is critical but how it is critical depends on what is being negotiated in the layers of action and gesture.

Speech and action are extremely different elements in life. In life, we frequently distinguish between what is done – and what is said or inscribed in a devised text argument. But recorded movie speech and recorded action are also arguments inscribed on devices by makers. A healthy measure of doubt accompanies what people say and write, whereas what they do is more trusted, especially over a long period of time. In life we tend to trust action over gesture and gesture over speech. We also watch others in life apportion trust in this way. But when we watch people on film trusting or not trusting other characters – the film we interpret is not life – it is an inscribed device. Although screen action is given more credence than screen speech, the fact is, any screen element is not the real thing. Action on screen is an expression, and if formulated well, it is an argument. But it is never an action: our action at the time is "sitting watching the screen;" and any speech is "what we say in the screening room" to other people. In real life, one should approach the truth conditions of unfamiliar screen actions with the same skepticism as one would approach the speech of an unfamiliar person. As Alma Reville says about her movie *Psycho* in Section-49, "Don't upset yourself darling, it's only a bloody movie."

In subcultures where people have not taken unto themselves to make movies – and choosing to bow to the screens of a lofty media hierarchy – tabloid political and commercial campaigns leverage people's confusion over our tendency to

believe what we see and hear on television and online screens (Gleeson 2011:26). People confuse actions in real life with the screen actions expensively performed and deceptively edited by dishonest filmmakers (Kull et al. 2003; Pilger 2010). For people who desire to make honest arguments that justify what is spoken or performed on film with what is actually valued and acted in the world – another barrier that prevents makers researching and developing facts and biography is not political censorship and suppression of knowledge. Another barrier is a cultural and embodied quality of thought and speech itself.

Much of our spoken and written vocabulary expresses notions like "trust, deception, tendency, justified and honest." These notions are difficult to argue as recordable, concrete actions and gestures in movie thought. How do you record "trust" with a microphone without that recorded audio of a trusted place, action or gesture being mistaken for some other notion? How does a cinematographer record a "tendency" without the motion pictures of that tending place, action or gesture being mistaken for another notion? "Notions" are the eighth and final element in every screen "interaction."

Notions are difficult to record and they are investigated next.

Pages 172-188 removed
for copyright or
proprietary reasons.

It is chapter 1, part 18. Notions: the challenge to detail actions.

19.

Interactions.

Section-50 lists hundreds of writers and directors who have researched and recorded our world as "interactions" – that is, our world as "thinking people acting among each other in time-place." Interactions are what we think and do amongst self and other people. When a shopper purchases food from a storekeeper, or the shopper sits down for a meal with friends or family, or the storekeeper pays a farmer or a banker, these are common interactions. But they are rarely "dramatic" interactions, which concern movie filmmakers. It is only when these interactions surprise us in ways that reverse our expectations that the interaction can be considered dramatic enough for exploration and development by moviemakers.

Some of the most striking interactions in Ingmar Bergman (1972) *Cries And Whispers* are when Agnes' dead body weeps for her sisters. Part of the surprise is that a dead body intends and acts – yet movie thought explains this in terms of the film's modal shift in Section-30. Agnes' sister Karen fears the touch of other people. In an earlier striking interaction Karen cuts her vagina and smears blood on her face as a desperate cry against her husband who desires to touch and sleep with her. When, years later, Karen is called by her dead sister Agnes to comfort Agnes, she cannot bear the touch of lost Agnes either. Agnes cries out for her other sister Maria. In an earlier striking interaction, Maria, who delights in sex and loving touches, sleeps with the family doctor but her husband guesses that he has been cuckolded and he attempts an unsuccessful suicide. Years later, when Maria is called to her dead sister's bedside, Maria loves to touch others. She openly offers loving touches to Agnes. But when dead Agnes holds Maria tightly and refuses to ever let her go, Maria is horrified and abandons her lost sister. Only the maid Anna is willing to comfort the sorrowful, dead Agnes. She holds her mistress

like a nursing mother holding a babe in arms in her bed. In an earlier interaction, maid Anna lost her own child to childhood illness. All of these interactions are extraordinary thought and actions among people in time-place. All of them are worthy of movie investigation as recorded three-dimensionally located, acting, gesturing, speaking, thinking people among others – audio motion-pictures in time, cascading as "interactions" – one interaction of "elements" rolling on the next interaction of elements.

A Cry in the Dark's book author John Bryson is not a specialist in this layered audio motion architecture of movie "interactions" and their elements. In the 1980s, he specialized in researching and writing the crafted "sentences" of his book *Evil Angels* (1985) about Lindy Chamberlain's witch-hunt. (Author's books are in Section-53). After Bryson's book of sentences was released in 1985, director Fred Schepisi and screenwriter Robert Caswell contributed further research and co-operated with Bryson. They redescribed parts of Bryson's book as the layered audio motion architecture of movie "interactions" – such as when the very pregnant Lindy is jailed for life, and guards guard and watch her naked body in the jail shower. Schepisi and Caswell's final list of list of interactions would look much like the list covered in Section-47. Section-47 reverse-engineers *A Cry in the Dark* by listening to and watching the movie's interactions on screen.

Similar to Bryson, Le Ly Hayslip co-wrote two autobiographies about her experiences: as a defender of her Vietnamese homeland, as a mother, and as a successful American businesswoman. Director Oliver Stone worked with writers Jay Wurts, James Hayslip and Le Ly Hayslip to develop some of Le Ly's book sentences and additional research into the screenwriting and recording of "interactions". Screen thought is "thinking in interactions" and this investigation first interpreted *Heaven And Earth* as a cascade of performed interactions, then transcribed them into the written interactions of Section-48.

The nineteen Sections of Chapter 1 analyse the world – and analyse films – in terms of entirely distinct parallel, layered audio strata and motion picture strata. This distinct way of separate thought is bracketed on the page in Section-08's *The War You Don't See* documentary audiovisual AV script. The AV script is formatted in three columns that demonstrate that filmmakers conceive the world of interactions in terms of (a plot's running) "time," woven with cascading yet separate layers of "audio" and "motion-pictures." (As documentaries include many still pictures such as photos and graphics, the convention "Visual" in AV rather than "Motion-picture" is used). In a screen interaction, the audio and motion-picture layers are eternally separate. The layers are eternally separated by our eyes and ears too – yet most people naturally behold "a sound and an image" together. We usually interpret these synchronous live or screen layers of a "interaction" in a meaningful way.

When a screen thinker interprets *Heaven And Earth's* interactions in Section-48, each interaction – such as "A mobile armored heavy machine gun invades" – is imaginatively "listened to and watched." Because interactions are listened to, some are extremely noisy like the gun, whereas other screen interactions in an audio argument will be pleasantly quiet such as "verdant paddy fields" or horrifically quite such as dead Agnes' tears. Reading coverage, at the same time as translucent audio layers are imaginatively heard, the film thinker watches the translucent motion-picture layers. The gun is "mobile" and it is "invading" – so, amid its noisy diesel engine noise, the noise of its heavy machine gun fire, and the desperate cries of the farming families being cut down in this village, the interaction is simultaneously watched.

Not only is a movie argument "layered" and appreciated in this way, Chapter 1 identifies eight elements in an interaction's audio and motion-picture layers. Evidence is drawn from Section-50's movies to claim that any interaction potentially has eight elements of "*thinking people acting, gesturing, speaking* among other people and *devices* in *time-place*" – although some minor elements like utterance are silent across many interactions. Major elements like time-place, people, action and gesture always run in movie interactions. If a montage of

clouds fills the frame for, say, three minutes, this would not be considered an interaction. Clouds are not people acting in time-place. An analyst continues to listen and watch until the sequence connects with people acting in some capacity. People appear out of the clouds and mist in Coen 2008 and Whale 1935. Similarly, if a remote-control device like a mobile machine gun moves in some scenes without its operators or victims coming to light, then these ghostly, unpopulated scenes do not yet constitute an interaction that records "*thinking people acting, gesturing, speaking* among others in *time-place*". Again, the analyst keeps listening and watching until they acquire an interaction. The researcher may ask questions like "Who operates the device or sets it in motion? What are the operators thinking? Who are they targeting and bullying? If farming families in a village appear, how do they deal with the device? What are they thinking? How do people react? By their gestures, who recognises friends and who does not? What do people say? What is this time-place? What dominate notions are argued? These are the holist (feeling, valuing, believing, intending) questions that unpack or develop interactions.

As Agnes' surreal return from the dead happens late in *Cries and Whispers*, it is striking but understandable because audiences know so much about the earlier interactions between Agnes, Karen, Maria and Anna. Because the mobile gun interaction is put early in *Heaven And Earth*, there are too few passing interactions to help audiences understand the "time" of this violence. For this reason, filmmakers add a speech element. Adult Le Ly's opening narrative voiceover introduces: "the summer of 1953". So we have a time, a place – infant Le Ly's village – along with people and their actions. But some of the scene's people raise more questions than they answer. For example, some of the ground troops that escort the mobile gun are of recent African descent. ("Recent," as we all descend from Africa; says Roberts 2010). Did an African country invade Le Ly's homeland in 1953? Or were these African-American soldiers? The movie neither explained their appearance nor many other "inexplicable details" as Aristotle puts it. A few minutes later in the plot, some "local" Asian-looking soldiers march in, and then another group of marching locals and overseas fly-ins fight the first local group, without clearly identifying who is fighting who and for

what reasons. Again, when Le Ly is tortured in a secret prison, the chief torturer appears to have flown in from thousands of kilometres away. What place is his home and business? What is he thinking? Why is he here and why is he directing the secret torture of teenage girls? The movie is full of these inexplicable interactions that give rise to inquiries.

As a film thinker, critical screen thought aims to understand inexplicable notions by redescribing notions as coherent interactions: "thinking people acting in time-place." These elements make explicit "what people think and do" before the questionable interaction and "what they think and do" after. As such, screen thought is much like law or science that rely on justifiable evidence and intention. In order to understand the 1953 mobile device, one might research where and by whom it was made, who financed it, who shipped it to Le Ly's homeland, who profited from its financing, who parented such investors, and so on. In order to understand Le Ly's early 1960s torturer, one might research and develop earlier scenes in this man's life that show interactions, that is, "the man acting among others in time-place." He appears to have come from another village or town in another country where he was financed to learn how to torture young girls like Le Ly and her fellow prisoners. But in *Heaven And Earth*, he is yet another "inexplicable detail" in yet another puzzling interaction.

Because filmmakers consider screen thought to be a discourse about people acting in time-place, the film thinker's response to inexplicable notions in a serious autobiographical movie is to roll into the first cycle of screen thought and do more research into detailed people and actions. Stone and Hayslip did not provide answers to hundreds of questions they had raised. This inquiry saw a yawning gap in screen knowledge and so moved to answer some of these questions. But in criticising Stone and Hayslip in this way, this inquiry first praises *Heaven And Earth* as one of the few factual Anglophone movies about a young woman's leading role, defending her home and culture from recent genocide. In the pantheon of film philosophy movies, it has a seminal if not unique place to date.

Part of the problem with such rarity is that some of a film's interactions may appear strange to audiences who do not know much about their world of people (United Nations Population Fund 2011). Because of the holism of the mental, screen thinkers watch a film like *Heaven And Earth* with thousands of past interactions in their thoughts and millions of past screen elements that make sense of what is listened to and watched on screen. Less familiar interactions strike audiences and then a strong argument will explicate the less familiar. But if we have grown up with millions of heroic gestures by screen and press people who look like Steve and we have grown up with hundreds of despicable gestures by screen and press people who look like Le Ly, such a prejudiced upbringing will undermine our desire or ability to interpret facts or actions in *Heaven and Earth* – or any other film for that matter.

If we watch Charlie Chaplin's antics in *The Bewildered Stage Hand*, people familiar with white performers in Hollywood, Los Angeles will enjoy the romp because we are not stopped in our tracks every second to ask, why is that white boy defending his liberty? What's that tripod under the camera? What precarious objects in this scene are fragile and expensive? Why are the youths attracted to each other? We already know the answers to these, and thousands of other questions, because we have listened to and watched hundreds of other similar movies, or participated in similar (usually less dramatic) real life interactions at home or work. If the beliefs and actions of "young leading women in movies who resist recent genocides" were common in Anglophone film philosophy, then the constant puzzles in *Heaven And Earth's* interactions would not have puzzled this inquiry so much.

In a film philosophy discourse familiar with real people like Le Ly interacting in *Heaven And Earth's* "1953" world, we would already know the American-French re-invasion of Vietnam began a few weeks after the same air force alliance dropped a nuclear weapon on Hiroshima civilians in late 1945. A discourse familiar with 1950s Asia, would already know that the African escorts with the mobile armour are French Foreign Legion troops, and that the white "French"-looking troops are probably German, not French soldiers who enlisted in the

Legion after the fall of Nazi Germany in 1945. But this investigation did not emerge from a film discourse that knew much about world war after 1945 in the region and therefore *Heaven And Earth* was a highly puzzling screen argument.

The investigation's original motivation to add this movie's interactions into the inquiry was that, having investigated a logical, steadfast and loving female lead caught in an existential crisis with anxious irrational nationalist incarcerators, it seemed a useful step to compare her interactions with interactions that widened onto the international stage, while keeping the other notions reasonably constant. This inquiry emerged from living and working in Australia and East Asia for many years, so the investigation's expansion into Le Ly's biography was expected to be reasonably smooth. But the investigation came to agree with U.S. and U.K. academics: that our ability to think publicly about the American invasion of South East Asia had been "collectively suppressed" (Nguyen 2012:14) and those responsible for leading public thinking "prevented any significant, long-term lessons from being drawn from the defeat in Vietnam" (Geuss 2008:5). There is a great resistance to thinking rationally about dramatic interactions in this region of the world.

Heaven And Earth is a rare film argument that attempts to roll back ignorance about world drama. But this contribution to knowledge is resisted and so this investigation had to rethink its philosophical approach. This study assumes *Heaven And Earth's* people, their thoughts and history are much like any group of people – and the region's interactions should be researched and developed from that friendly starting point. By overlaying *Evelyn's* story of friendships on a film shoot with a historical film-within-a-film, two tones of real world interactions could be investigated. A new movie scenario was written that stepped into the breach only partly filled by Stone and Hayslip and other rare Anglophone movies of this region. The resulting new movie scenario is *Evelyn. Evelyn* was researched mainly from "compilation," a method Chapter 2 explains.

Evelyn emerged in response to *Heaven And Earth. Heaven And Earth* emerged from *A Cry In The Dark. A Cry In The Dark* emerged from the dearth of dramatic female leads and the Australasian region in film philosophy. But the leading character in *Evelyn* is not specifically a man or a woman because screen thought, as a philosophical approach, is gender-neutral. Screen thought is an equitable theoretical template over which a filmmaker can assign or cast either male or female values to the character Evelyn, and to the scenario's other theoretical characters Andy, Bobby et al.

Chapter 2 discusses the kind of notions used to develop *Evelyn's* interactions. In doing further research into real-world interactions, what elemental shifts were made in advancing from *Heaven and Earth* to *Evelyn*? In terms of the time element, time was extended back to the 1700s and forward to the present. This deeper search of the time element allowed for a much clearer understanding of people's being – thought and action – at the center of this drama. The "place" element was also extended to the high seas, to power centers in the U.S., Europe and Eurasia, as well as places already in *Heaven And Earth* and *A Cry In The Dark*. The inquiry collected the interactions of more powerful "people" who led the overthrow of colonization in the *Heaven And Earth* region. There was also a shift in the element of "gestures." As a war film, *Heaven And Earth* has many violent invasive gestures directed towards the region's people. As Section-51 and Section-52 researched cross-referenced world and regional history, the horrific acts and gestures of those times only mounted and mounted. So the decision was taken to put the *Evelyn* argument as a film within a film. By developing a strata of loving interactions in this film – among the young movie performers at the hotel – *Evelyn* could explore actions and gestures of friendship more than grief.

An interaction that sometimes bodes for friendship and sometimes bodes for grief opens and closes the *Evelyn* scenario in Section-20:

> "Cloaked in strange medieval garments, Fred, a high overseas official, descends from a square-rigged sailing warship moored in the bay. Fred is rowed ashore to a tropical beach."

There is immediate drama in the time elements of this "interaction" because Fred is dressed in medieval garb (circa 1200s) and yet he or she is rowed ashore by late 1700s square-rigger sailors dressed in 1700s uniforms. Various "places" structure this interaction or series of interactions: the scene of "the bay" is shown on film but an "overseas" place is mentioned as a notion. There are places within places: within the scene of the bay, Fred descends from "a deck" to "a rowboat" and he goes "ashore." The "person" Evelyn is nowhere to be seen in this opening scene. The writer's research has populated it with characters Fred, Sailors and, as a marginal notion, "an Overseas bureaucracy" is spoken about whose medieval and 1700s uniform devices dress the scene. As to the element of action, what action does Fred initiate in this interaction? Fred descends through the frame of the film. What action do the sailors deal with? They row Fred ashore. The gestures are perhaps "pompous" for Fred and "liberating" for the sailors who are happy to exercise their bodies away from the limited space of the warship. What notions attach to these interactions? There is probably a notion of "authority" or "power" enacted as Fred desires and initiates travel about the bay to places Fred chooses, riding the manual work of the rowing sailors. Whether this notion of authority is true or not, strong or not – an analyst would interpret the long-term pattern of Fred's interactions across the whole movie argument.

In the next Chapter 2, beginning with Section-20, *Evelyn's* historical research is developed into a rather prose, notional style of coverage. Certainly, the synopsis is not *Evelyn's* screenplay because it does not list every action (and hence every interaction) in every scene. It only gives a summary of key scenes, and character turning points. It hardly includes the element of speech. Its historical time is already compacted by cutting from the age of sail to the age of marine engines, but this telescoping of time is further accentuated in a synopsis. In *Evelyn*, factual characters from the research into world have been aggregated as character "types." Types and typology are explained in Chapter 2. At every instance of

researching and developing *Evelyn*'s "interactions," the study developed the elements of time, place, person types, actions, gestures, speech, devices and their oblique overarching notions. *Evelyn's* interactions have been developed from participatory research and the resources listed in Section-51 and Section-52 and other sources between 50 and 55.

In Chapter 1, screen elements have been isolated from a few "interactions." The interactions themselves have been extracted from whole screen arguments. Such an analysis gets an investigation of screen thought only so far. Knowing that Lindy chased a dingo doesn't explain why she was jailed for life. Knowing that Le Ly befriended Steve doesn't explain why he threatened to murder her. A logical sequence of interactions has to be developed between early interactions and later interactions, weaving back and forth, in order to know more about people and the world. Moreover this weaving takes place four times in a movie project in Chapter 3. But in Chapter 2 below, the eight elements of a screen interaction are accepted as the investigation now asks how hundreds of layered interactions are arranged in feature-length screen arguments. With such long-term patterns, and the movie discipline's wide inquiry scope, come opportunities to better know our world of people.

Chapter 2

DEVELOPING INTERACTIONS as ARGUMENTS

Pages 200-210 removed
for copyright or
proprietary reasons.

It is chapter 2, part 20. Evelyn's synopsis.

21.
Developing the Writing Develops the Argument.

Chapter (2) explores "development notions" that shape a complex, layered, double-plot movie argument like *Evelyn*. Rather than use a distributed movie that does not contain the region and does not contain all the development notions explored in this Chapter, this inquiry uses Section-20's *Evelyn* "thought experiment" (above) as its example argument. A thousand movie and documentary features were screened for this inquiry, but not one distributed movie was found that:

1) overlaps the time-place in Schepisi, Caswell and Bryson (1988) *A Cry In The Dark* – and Stone and Hayslip (1993) *Heaven And Earth*;
2) investigates "screen thought" in its content, and moreover
3) explores the full agenda of characters' private sphere and things public.

The screen thinking in this Chapter has been collected into the research and development of the *Evelyn* movie synopsis – in the way another investigator might introduce a thought experiment to an inquiry and then unpack it. By working with a synopsis rather than a distributed movie, readers are involved with the foundation cycle of movie thought. In exploring an argument in its writing cycle, this study shifts away from the very high risk of treating all movies as "givens" that can ignore their cycles of writing, performing and recording. A released movie is the version of the screen argument decided at a political level by the distributor and other powerbrokers investigated in Chapter 3. By focusing on a heavily researched and developed synopsis, this inquiry demonstrates that there is much more to movie thought than the distributed movie in an Internet store or at the cinema. The idea that movie arguments go through four cycles of writing, performing, recording and distribution of a project is itself one of the "development notions" explored in Chapters 2 and 3. Filmmakers use

"development notions" to orientate their control over the making of a movie argument. Many development notions like "real-time-base" arguments and "emotional arc" are investigated in this chapter – often using *Evelyn* to demonstrate a point.

What is *Evelyn's* story in Section-20? Briefly, the *Evelyn* is set in the present day. Seven movie performers – including stars – come together to film a historical re-enactment feature movie. *Evelyn* is a film within a film: the present day story of the performers' friendships, and the historical story of conflict and liberation. A performer named Evelyn is new to movie work. (Screen thought theory is open to any gender, so Evelyn is given a gender-neutral name in this study.) Performer Evelyn befriends other performers at the hotel. At work on the set, Evelyn gives performances that rocket Evelyn to stardom. Despite the horrors of the past, it is an optimistic movie about the present and future.

By researching and developing *Evelyn* as a synopsis, the inquiry hopes to demonstrate that screen thought is not so interested in completed movies but in the future of investigating the world via movie thinking. But convention asks for references to released movies and 170 are referred to here. Movie thought is more than film history, though. It allows a thinker to make a movie from their worldly experience, rather than referring back to someone else's argument. In order to build screen thought, Chapter 1 suggested filmmakers think of our world in terms of "interactions" and "elements." Now Chapter 2 discusses notions of strategic shape and ways of characterizing people in arguments by combining layered interactions in an audio motion-picture cascade.

The inquiry suggests that movie thought emerges among people interacting among others in the world, rather than stamped in the first instance from other people's movies. The field of reviewing "past films" is extremely well provided for in academia, and this inquiry adds some female leads to that discourse but its

primary goal is to explore screen thought as an equitable research and development discipline that embraces drama in the world. Later Chapter 3 explores the successful four cycles of making Hitchcock, Stefano and Bloch (1960) *Psycho*. It emphasizes *Psycho's* real-world context, in order to consider avenues into new movie arguments that might emerge from culture, time and place. This study contends that what primarily interests screen thinkers about *A Cry In The Dark, Heaven And Earth* or *Evelyn* is "our world" that these screen arguments emerge from. Movie thinkers developed arguments from our world. Is there the risk that too much focus on distributed arguments may obscure the way forward to putting fresh inquiries?

That movie thinkers prefer "the world" rather than other writers' movies should not be mistaken as a lack of respect for makers. Concurring with Mulhall, Falzon and Plantinga, I agree that movies and documentaries are makers' arguments and this inquiry attempts to expand on that notion. To meet serious filmmakers on the same level as philosophers and accept that makers sincerely put an argument, suggests that this study should respond in kind by putting the *Evelyn* argument as an extension of *Heaven And Earth*, itself an international extension of the desires and beliefs explored in *A Cry In The Dark*.

From a maker's perspective (such as my own as an ex-studio executive) it is movie writing – from Shakespearean to garbage quality – that underpins the global industry. Behind the scenes at international film festivals, filmmakers trade "movie screenplays and their projects attachments" (such as performers and directors) – but they rarely trade finished movies on screen. Most finished movies that screen to the industry or public at festivals are already traded. Festivals publicise a movie to the world press; but distributors previously invested millions in the argument's screenplay and business plan at an earlier festival market behind the scenes. Inside the industry, it is green-lit screenplays and their project "attachments" (performers and recordists) that have value, not most finished

films. During the writing cycle of a movie, the performance and recording cycles do not exist. Furthermore, when the film is finally made, it exists as a massive debt and investment liability. Finished films are a massive cost liability that makers hope to recoup in millions from busy and mostly disinterested audiences.

The *Evelyn* synopsis highlights that written arguments and not released films are of most value to filmmakers, if not to consumers. New movie culture depends first on the writing. In exploring movie thought from a new synopsis, the reader is positioned more where filmmakers think and value movie thought, rather than where consumers think – although both production and consumption are essential to movie culture. Rather than take a released movie's argument as a given: developing new writing from worldly research develops a new contributing argument to screen discourse.

22.

Climax: An Emotional Arc and its Music.

Chapter 1 distinguished movies from most feature documentaries by the movie audio layers that do not "lecture" their arguments in speech. By contrast, Section-08's "lecture-style" documentary says of the 1960s:

> "A new military jargon –"collateral damage" – was designed for the media, to cover up the scale of the industrial killing of up to three million people." (Pilger and Lowery 2010:40).

These emotional research facts are spoken in the presenter's lecture style, where any emotional reaction to the killing is toned down and spoken calmly. The calm delivery is part of a measured, rational explanation of why industrial killing overseas is "collectively suppressed" (Nguyen 2012:14). Pilger's emotional tone is calmly delivered throughout the film. But if moviemakers research and develop the same facts as a "movie" about Le Ly or Evelyn, then performers reenact the argument, and not much is spoken – calmly or otherwise.

Moviemakers choose to investigate high drama –emotional real world events – as we untangle the lives of people enmeshed in complex circumstances. People fall in love, raise a family, defeat criminals, overturn environmental destruction, defuse witch-hunts, make scientific discoveries, stop dreadful invasions or praise community progress and courageous loyalty to one's friends. "Invasions" are only one of many emotional climaxes that are investigated in movie thought. In extending this inquiry from "individual female versus mass beliefs in a national witch-hunt," to individual female versus mass beliefs in an "international" drama, *Heaven and Earth* was one of the few Anglophone movies that fit the study. Although this film and

Evelyn contain most of the themes (such as falling in love, environmental destruction, and so on), both Le Ly and Evelyn have invasion as their central argument.

Obviously, the killing of three million recognizable people cannot be performed in the foreground of a movie for 100 minutes, so how is such drama argued in a movie? Recall that movie arguments select a few leading characters into the foreground. Everyone else performs on layers that recede towards the film's background place. Many extras perform in vignette scenes or background crowd scenes to give the impression of "three million killed". *Heaven And Earth* has some vignette scenes that "act" the mass mortality statistic "spoken" in documentaries:

> "An Invader orders Proxies to chase two teen girls into a bunker. The girls kill themselves and the Proxies with a grenade."
>
> (Section-48)

This interaction is argued in both audio and motion-picture layers. Audiences listen to: the girls' cries, the Invader barking orders to Proxies, and the sound of the grenade explosion. These are highly emotional arguments, as are the accompanying violent motion-picture acts. As soon as the decision is made to film dramatic history and biography as a movie, rather than lecture about it in a documentary, then both the maker and the audience is faced with hundreds of emotional facts.

The question for an honest filmmaker is not, how do I deny the emotional content of dramatic history and biography? The question becomes one of plot time: What is the "best order" to screen these interactions? What is the plot order of the emotional facts? This is such a vital question for moviemakers that a primary goal of the writer's research and development is to identify the strongest emotional sequence in the data and position that sequence towards the end of the movie where it performs the "climax"

function.

There is a very cogent reason for selecting the most emotional sequences and shaping the emotional arc of a movie around that climax: to attract and retain the movie's audience. After researching all the interactions relevant to "falling in love" or "defeating criminals" or whatever the theme, it would be foolish to plot the most emotional and riveting interaction first, then the second-most interesting interaction, then the third, and so on towards slumber. The audience would lose interest in following the real-time-base argument. And after a few minutes they would leave. Strong movie arguments attract rather than repel or dismiss the audience.

Writers develop movie research by identifying what is the most emotional, powerful and complicating sequence. It is this emotional sequence around which the argument revolves. Usually after considering the material, the writer will "feel" that a certain sequence is the strongest. In order to entertain an audience rather than bore them, these scenes are positioned towards the end of the plot and story, along a "three act/climax" structure that is explored in Section-36.

One of the most difficult decisions during the research and development of *Evelyn* was deciding its climax. The decision was both a rational and emotional decision because *Evelyn's* historical material is collected and ordered scientifically; yet concurrently interactions have emotional impact on people's feelings. People have interconnected feelings, desires, evaluations, beliefs and actions in life – the holism of the mental.

The private sphere of the *Evelyn* story is also emotional, collected by participatory research among writer, performer, recordist and distributor friends. Then this combined history and private data was shifted from the

mode of biography to typology. For example, facts about President Wilson were aggregated in the character type A or "Andy." In shifting historical and personal interactions to typology, there is the constant opportunity to combine real actions, gestures or utterances into the appropriate character type, A to G (Gerry).

In arguing Andy's unexpected and shocking death in the airport climax, the film turns to how Evelyn, Dale and the others react in this, their emotional climax and resolution. So a moviemaker not only gauges how each interaction affects an audience, but also measures how each interaction affects the characters in ongoing interactions. If the airport fall had been positioned at the start of *Evelyn*, Andy's accidental death would have had less impact on the audience. At the start of the film, audiences have little idea who Andy is as a person. Andy's death has no more impact than watching overseas strangers on television. Similarly, in a more horrifying film, Radford and Orwell (1984) *1984,* whole regions of the Earth are under invasion in 1948. These people's deaths are televised in the background of *1984* as extras and strangers whose speech and feelings are collectively suppressed. *1984* encourages one to do as its television audience does: to care about the foreground characters and not care about the televised victims who speak an untranslated language in an unfamiliar place.

As the audience to *Evelyn's* first scenes, we have no experience of the highs and lows of Andy's life. But, as the film progresses, we follow Andy, copping with star publicity, fan adoration, gossiping, drinking with friends Bobby and Charlie, night-clubbing with Evelyn, seducing Dale's affections; personal and private failure, laughter and tears; controlling one's body and emotions as a trained professional on the film set each day – and so on. If Andy dies unnamed, unknown and immediately at the airport in the first scene, would we care so much? Later in Chapter 3, Hitchcock and Reville

cast Vivian Leigh to the role of Marian. Marian dies relatively early in *Psycho*. But Leigh is a well-known star in 1960, and her early "death" was written to strongly affect her fans. If we follow Andy's plot in Section-20, gradually increasing its emotional impact and what we know of Andy – by the time of the militarised airport state visit, the audience is primed to feel emotion when Andy falls on the steps. Certainly, Andy's friends and colleagues in the lunch marquee are horrified.

Interactions – that is, people's thoughts and actions – always include emotional changes in body and mind. Emotions are part of the holism of the mental that is screen thought. Whether Evelyn shares a laugh with Dale in the lunch marquee, or turns horrified to see Andy tumble down the aircraft stairs and die – these interactions among people are emotional facts. Exactly how people will react emotionally to an interaction varies from individual to individual. In Kazdan and Benedek (1983) *The Big Chill*, friend A confides to B that she in annoyed by C's apparent joviality after C's boyfriend D dies. But B identifies with C rather than A, so A's annoyance is felt by B as "annoyance directed at B." Emotions in an interaction are complex and fascinating, and movie arguments are shaped to explore the way people react to each other, in interaction after interaction. Emotions are necessarily interwoven as a layer of the logical story in a movie argument. We understand Evelyn and Dale's reaction to Andy's fall – they run to the accident – as a logical reaction to their friend's demise. If their emotional reaction to the fall had been callous indifference, we would question the logical progress of the argument, and question the mental attitudes of the characters. Desires, evaluations, beliefs and intentions interconnect with emotions and feelings in movie thought.

While developing *Evelyn's* emotional arc, this study was aware of the weak climax sequences in both *A Cry In The Dark* and *Heaven And Earth*. A goal

of *Evelyn's* research and development was to "not" repeat that weakness. Chapter 1's key films were first chosen for their philosophical inquiry into people's "individual and mass beliefs and actions," rather than for their aesthetic power (or lack of power) over audiences. So the emotional arc in *Heaven And Earth* is problematic. Early in Le Ly's teens, her emotional scenes are highly dramatic, but then her personal drama eases off as she takes control of her life. As a teen, she is attack by America's invasion of the South East Asia region that killed five million women, men and children in their homes and businesses. The conservative subtotals for this genocide are reported in Hitchens 2002:49, Pinto 1995:143, Vickers 3013:L3253, Weiner 2007:147 and Oppenheimer's Indonesian documentary (2012). Of the more than five million victims, over three million (perhaps as high as six million) died in Vietnamese homes, businesses and public places (Nguyen 2012: 14, 316). Unlike her neighbours, Le Ly survives this holocaust, partly through chance, and partly though her own initiatives: she fights back, defends her farm and family, survives torture, leaves home with her mother, seeks work in the occupied colonial capital, and finds genuine love in a dynastic family. But the dynastic family's matriarch sends pregnant Le Ly into exile in another city. Waves of invaders have destroyed whole generations of family and community networks that would support a pregnant young mother in her homeland. So destitute Le Ly is forced onto the streets where she "services" off-duty invaders with drugs and prostitution – as does her sister. Both sisters have left their once-prosperous farm to find food and shelter in this military-occupied town.

Here Le Ly befriends a soldier of the invasion, and they return to his homeland as a loving couple, with children. Probably in order to afford Le Ly's real partners anonymity, "Steve" is a character "type" combined from two men in Le Ly's real life. The first "Steve" was much older than Le Ly. He died and Le Ly partnered another returned soldier. Combined type "Steve" engages in domestic violence and commits suicide. The film has a

bittersweet ending. Le Ly co-operates with other immigrant army wives. She initiates U.S. businesses that support her growing family of young, fatherless boys. Le Ly becomes a prosperous businesswoman. She takes her sons back to visit the invaded homeland to meet survivors from her old community.

The problem with this emotional arc is that Le Ly's most emotional interactions (being raped and tortured) occur early in Le Ly's film when she defended her home as a child soldier. All the events are emotional, but rape and torture are this drama's emotional climax but they are plotted early in Stone and Hayslip's film of the argument. In order to reshape and improve this declining emotional arc, the project includes Grammy Award winning writer-performer Kitaro's symphonic World Music score. The beautiful *Heaven And Earth* music soundtrack won the 1993 Golden Globe for Best Original Score. The music helps to raise the dip in the emotional journey. But a much stronger argument would write the interactions to build on each other, until the most powerful climax sequence is reached on the page. Then, when the music score is added, the whole rising curve is bumped up again. Another plot woven together by its composer is Hawks and Chandler (1946) *The Big Sleep* with music by Austrian Max Steiner.

Musicians shape much of the emotional arc for audiences: the Skubiszewskis are responsible for much of the emotional affect of Byrne and Ledger's Sydney street scene (Section-11). If the reader checks that script page, it has an asterisk. The Skubiszewskis' swelling strings, soft synth repeat-beats, soft romantic electric piano or guitar, easy strum guitar, and a soft pristine picked guitar arpeggio enters the screenplay's love scene at the timing point of the asterisk. In *A Cry In The Dark*, Bruce Smeaton combines Aboriginal and easy-listening music to build its emotional arc.

Musicians such as Kitaro take a draft edit of a movie's often awkward, lumpy, scattered emotional arc, and reshape the emotions to communicate with audiences. Bernard Herrmann rescues *Psycho*, in Chapter 3, too. Normally, movie scenes without their music and effects are emotionally dull. The score is the way audiences feel musically for the film's leading characters. So many emotional layers argued in a movie are argued in the score. This shaping of a movie's emotional arc begins with writing (putting the climax towards the end, understanding how individuals react), and emotion is rebuilt with casting and performances (including the musical performances) and rebuilt again with the recording, filtering, editing and mixing. Distributors then reshape and publicise a particular emotional tone in their publicity campaign.

Later in Section-31, this study explores emotional fallacies in some filmmakers' work. But for now, the emotional layers of a movie are considered an essential and interwoven fact when people interact rationally together in cascading interactions, as a movie argument is put. For scientists like J Bronowski in *The Ascent Of Man* (1973), the emotional layers of history are essential for our survival. When "collective repression" of the emotional dramas of history takes place, censorious leaders sabotage billions of lives. Wading in the marshy graves of millions of murder victims of 1930s European public relations campaigns – people who were detained by obedient bureaucrats in Auschwitz – Bronowski underlines the difference between "Knowledge And Certainty" (Episode 11). Bronowski compares what we know (which is trusted because it remains open to inquiry) with war investment and detention campaign fallacies that are emotionally believed with absolute certainty by a public:

> "There are two parts to the human dilemma. One is the belief that the end justifies the means. That pushed-button philosophy, that

> deliberate deafness to suffering, has become the monster in the war machine. The other is the betrayal of the human spirit: the assertion of dogma that closes the mind, and turns a nation, a civilization, into a regiment of ghosts – obedient ghosts, or tortured ghosts." (1973 and 1973b: 370)

The emotional arcs of public relations campaigns – which include many movies, discussed later – allow weak-minded bullies to hide their poorly researched beliefs behind forceful rhetoric. Virginia Woolf identifies such angry emotional arcs in 1920s academic writing. She refers to a polemicist, "Professor X." X was deliberately deaf to suffering and dogmatically rejected women from academia, finance, science and the arts. Writes Woolf:

> "I knew that he was angry by this token. When I read what he wrote about women I thought, not of what he was saying, but of himself. [But when] an arguer argues dispassionately he thinks only of the argument; and the reader cannot help thinking of the argument too." (1929:57)

Woolf has a point when she compares polemic and academic literature. Like documentary presenters, academics are expected to tone down their emotional content and clarify reasons and external evidence. As a novelist herself, Woolf understood there was a distinction between academic arguments and novelists' arguments. Novelists and moviemakers explore people's emotions attached to desires, evaluations, beliefs and actions. Movie thought includes an emotional arc in its account of the human condition. Sincere makers collect and test research, identify the most telling emotional sequence for their climax and build the other interactions towards the strong climax. The emotional arc is built from what it is fair to argue from life.

But fallacious news or screen teams continue the victimization of their victims by poisoning their emotional arcs, and this is taken up in Section-31. Listen carefully to television news reports and usually emotional music (entirely unconnected to the person filmed) is layered in under the reporter's narrative and the motion-pictures. So soldiers supported by the partisan news broadcaster will have stirring rock music added to what was once factual audio of their action. Soldiers hated by the partisan broadcaster will have creepy science fiction music or anxious thriller music added to what was once factual audio of their action. Screen thinkers who listening to these additions are able to identify duplicitous makers.

Rarely do biased filmmakers admit emotional manipulation in their movies. A rare exception is James Cameron and Arnold Schwarzenegger's *True Lies* (Cameron, Zidi, Michael and Kaminka, 1994, Fox/News Limited). In *True Lies'* end credits, distributors include an apology for its racism. Compare this with movies that take the emotional complexities of prejudice as their argument, such as Allen and Brickman (1977) *Annie Hall*; Lean, Rau and Forster (1984) *A Passage To India*; and Daldry, Hare and Schlink (2008) *The Reader*.

The composers of emotional music are writers too. They may strongly interface with performers and recordists. For example, David Arnold wrote the score to Campbell, Fleming et al. (2006) *Casino Royale* starring Daniel Craig:

> "Arnold visited the Prague locations in March 2006 and talked with Craig about his approach to the character. Craig expressed interest in the music, Arnold said, 'because he knew it was a big part of [the entire Bond experience]. I think he appreciated the curiosity that I had about him and what he was going to do; the whole point of this

> is to make him look as good as we possibly could.'" (Burlingame 2012: L4326.).

What Arnold means by making the performer look good is making the leading character and the character's interactions "sound" good as the score helps build the argument's emotional arc. Stars are strengthened by strong writing. In return, stars like Daniel Craig are the distributors' interface with the emotional public. Emotional, evaluative and coolly rational performances are ways that distributors connect the movie product with the desires of paying consumers. Consumers will either refund the costs of investing in a movie argument – or they will stay away from the cinema and home usage. Stars in a project's distribution publicity attract the public to new arguments. For example, star performers Bono and the Edge (U2) wrote the opening single, and star Tina Turner performed it for Campbell, Fleming, France et al. (1995) *GoldenEye* (Burlingame 2012: L3674).

Star may use their emotional pull over audience segments for good or ill. In István Szabó, Péter Dobai and Klaus Mann (1981) *Mephisto*, a highly talented and hard-working theatre performer, Höfgen (Klaus Maria Brandauer) captivates the political elite (that is, the distributors) during 1930s Nazi Germany. Höfgen's cosmopolitan distribution friends, who have prospered in the democratic 1920s, give Höfgen the opportunity to escape Germany and make movies outside, but Höfgen fears he cannot perform a career outside the German audience segment, as he has not mastered another sublanguage like English or French. Besides, the Nazi Party's performers and distributors welcome Höfgen home. The head of military and national security propaganda (that is, the imperial minister for culture, based on Paul Joseph Göbbels) is struck by Höfgen's performance "chemistry." General "Göbbels" grooms Höfgen to be Nazi's Germany's star on stage and also appoints him to a distribution post as C.E.O. of the Prussian State Theatre. The General in charge of military-industrial culture arranges for Höfgen's divorce from

his pro-cosmopolitan fugitive wife. The General deports Höfgen's lover, an African-German jazz ballet tutor, on fallacious "racial purity" grounds – but he does not execute her, out of deference to the obsequious Höfgen. Höfgen desires power in the performance and distribution cycles. As an instrument of the General, Höfgen destroys German culture by pushing all the modern complex and entertaining writers to suicide, execution, concentration camps, or asylum-seeking refugee paths outside Germany – as continues to happen elsewhere around the globe.

Höfgen agrees to only stage politically-censored, pan-European theatre writing. As the national security General says to the craven performer: "it seems the secret of acting is to portray strength, yet one is weak." By submitting to the General, star Höfgen gains deputy control of all theatre writing and performance in Europe. His pact with the military-industrial Nazi government silences European theatre. The politicized military remind the performer, to the end, that national security politicians set the limits to thought in the sterile stone and arc-lit amphitheater they stamp on the world (Szabó, Dobai and Mann 1981; Paxton 2004: L2508).

Unlike academic arguments and documentaries (where we expect toned-down emotions in the spoken narrative), movie thought interprets an emotional journey developed from feelings researched in real-world drama – even if the mode shifts from biography to fantasy. In real world drama, a whole range of layered emotions exist among people's thoughts and actions – and these emotions will vary from person to person over the changing dynamics of time-place. Whatever interactions are researched and developed, they are networked with emotions. Interactions naturally have emotional layers. If the interactions are to be argued as a movie, makers might trust their feelings to identify the climax sequence; and develop a story that is wise about the humanity of all its characters – and find distributors who share this wisdom. To "know" the emotional arc in an argument, an audience

experiences its real-time-base, discussed next.

23.

A Real-Time-Base Argument and its Emotional Arc is Formulated at Once.

The *Evelyn* synopsis offered in Section-20 is an opportunity to "experience" (not simply know analytically) *Evelyn's* "real-time-base" array. Movies argue in terms of beliefs, including knowledge, at the same time as they argue experiential desires and feelings. Feelings and emotions build over the plot time of a synopsis, in a way that a brief summary of *Evelyn* never does. *Evelyn's* real-time-base includes its emotional arc, its symmetry, and any surprises in the order of character introductions and their decision paths. Only by reading any plot fresh and cold is an analyst in a position to both "experience" and "know" an argument as movie thought.

Unlike traditional logical arguments, movie arguments such as *Evelyn's* are real-time-based. They rely for their logic and affective knowledge on the real-time order of each interaction 1, 2, 3 over an extended duration that affects an audience. A screen "analyst" who shuffles the real-time order, or omits parts of the real-time order by glancing at a few lines here or there (as if seeking key moves in a traditional logical argument) is no longer in a position to "experience" *Evelyn's* affects as a movie synopsis.

This is a massive difference in thought: the way thinking works in non-time-based arguments in traditional critical thinking – compared with real-time-based movie thought. It makes no difference to one's understanding of a *modus tollens* three-line written argument if the reader first glances at the conclusion then goes back to run through all three lines. But screen arguments have affects on the emotional arc that only have that affect when experienced in real-time order and duration. The recordist Stephen Spielberg knew that film's correct emotional arc is only created

on the first complete experience of a movie argument. Spielberg took the very unusual production step of recording all the scenes of Spielberg and Matheson (1982) *E.T.* in running order so that his large cast of less-experienced child performers "experienced" the affective build-up of the film's emotional arc (in the same way a professional reads *Evelyn* from plot start to finish) until the children eventually performed the authentic emotions of *E.T.'s* climax. By scheduling the production in plot order (which, for budget reasons, is rarely done), the children came to perform the emotional climax scenes, after they had been primed by their experiences of performing the first and second acts written by Mathison. But on most movies, experienced professional performers work "out of order" of the written plot and emotional arc. So performers prepare their characters' emotions for each day's recording by referring to the scene's position in the screenplay and then rebuilding their emotions across that arc. Audiences are storytellers of the plot arc (as discussed later in Section-34) but they will begin formulating an *Evelyn* "story" (the wrong *Evelyn* story) if they first cherry-pick "interactions" here and there from its whole argument.

Evelyn's prose synopsis is one way that people converse about a movie, video game or documentary. A prose synopsis is usually much easier for the public to read than – say – the extended industry-standard Coverage in the appendix. Why is *Evelyn* easier to read than coverage? The synopsis is written in prose that is familiar to literate readers, whereas "coverage" translates and orders whole movies into all their scenes and actions, without many explanatory notions that prose readers rely upon. Movie thinkers do not "read" the scenes and action of coverage as if they read prose. They imaginatively listen in motion surround sound, and watch the actions as full color, textured motion architecture invoked "inside each scene" of *A Cry In The Dark,* or *Heaven And Earth's* coverage. But the *Evelyn* synopsis is read like a short story, report, or philosophical thought experiment, in the familiar way. Chapter (2) investigates "whole" screen arguments, and *Evelyn*

demonstrates this completion.

Being a prose summary of the movie, *Evelyn's* synopsis should not be mistaken for a movie screenplay that formats movie thought's screen elements. Rather, the synopsis summarizes the *Evelyn* story, with a few of its scene outlines slightly expanded with detailed interactions. Without its detailed elements, the *Evelyn* synopsis can be developed as a comedy or tragedy. Only when the screenplay is written up in detail do certain elements of movie thought such as emerging tonal gestures or eye-line gestures specify comedy or tragedy. Even then, the fine-tuning of its emotions (and hence genre) is a matter for the director and distributor. It is at the level of "gesture" and "timing" subtlety (more obvious in a screenplay, hardly in a synopsis) that the strongest comedies and tragedies develop.

In exploring the elements of *Evelyn* or any movie in terms of its overall argument, makers shape the argument as an emotional arc told over the real-time-base duration of its explicitly detailed and interconnected interactions. Makers put the drama while controlling the real-time-based argument as both a cyclic and fixed emotional drama, as is explored next.

24.

Makers' Fixed And Cyclic Ziggurat Argument.

Later, Chapter 3 explores a few of the thousands of movie arguments that are built and rebuilt four times as writing, performance, recording and distribution. During the distribution cycle, an audience are told of the film argument's "fixed" screen version that is available for their screens. After these four cycles of rebuilding, audiences may choose to listen to and watch a movie. Like a medley relay, writers hand on their argument to performers, who hand it on to recordists who deliver it to distributors who hand it on, under license, to paying audiences.

Initially screenwriters do what report-writers and novelists do during the first part of the film writer's role. Original writers "research" our world using methods discussed in Section-27. The research collects thousands of movie thought elements as interactions and then, in the second part of the writer's role, the interactions are "developed" from the research notes into a feature-length movie argument. Although filmmakers call screenwriters "writers," the discipline's writers do not think or practice development like novelists or report-writers who write prose. Screenwriters use words and syntax in the discipline's technical language, such as: "exterior, day, action, dialogue, page 12"– which are an engineer's array of audio motion-picture cues for performing, recording and distributing. The page number is actually a time cue, the dialogue paragraphs are instructions to the sound recordist, action paragraphs are instructions to the lighting cameraperson, and "exterior, day" carries various scheduling, casting, contract and recording implications.

A pile of interactions, such as "Lindy calls out about the dingo" or "Charlie has the motor vehicle dismantled to demonstrate to Bobby that the device is entirely reliant on its rubber tires," is not a screen or movie argument – in the same way that a jumble of sentences copied from archives, letters or phone call transcripts is

not a report or a novel. It may take years for a writer of literature to put the right sentences together. It may take writers of screen arguments years to put the right interactions together. Screenwriters collects interactions, take notes, sort and modify interactions – trying them in draft arguments, editing and finally putting a movie argument in a fixed form like a film. But makers of films are aware that physical film materials change over time. They are degraded by cosmic, natural changes and by people's intentional impacts. All these degradations continue to impact the world's first movie – (1906) *The Story Of The Kelly Gang* – today. Most of *Kelly* no longer exists but historian-filmmakers have reconstructed much of its argument from its many theatre programs, posters, publicity stills, newspaper reviews and production documents from the early 1900s. These film's ancillary documents degrade less quickly than the chemically unstable (in fact, explosive) cellulose nitrates used to make early films.

Screen arguments on more or less durable materials can be degraded by people's intentional impact too. A very strange example of intentional change by distributors is the censorship of Polanski and Harris (2010) *The Ghost Writer*. In the cinema version, a British army officer swears strongly at a contract writer, as a violent threat in passing. But in the DVD version, the distributors have digitally removed that level of threat and now the officer swears in American vocabulary with a different political slant. The change is made very carefully, using the British officer's natural British accent and intonation, so that the distributor's political rewriting of the argument is impossible to hear. Only a filmgoer who remembered the cinema version would notice that someone inside the distributor had rewritten Polanski and Harris without indicating this on the DVD product. This degradation of the supposedly "fixed" argument means audiences who did not see the movie in the uncensored cinema version – but who rely the DVD version (with its perfect deception) – will believe the British army officer says "asshole" and wrongly attribute this Anglo-American admixture to Polanski and Harris. The distributor has changed the argument between screening it in the cinema and releasing the

"same" argument on DVD. This is not disclosed on the "completed" E.U. movie's Australian DVD packaging.

Again, for most consumers in 1906 and 1907, they probably thought the *Ned Kelly* movie was timeless and fixed, if they went to one screening of the feature. But avid fans of the world's first blockbuster would have noticed that it was exhibited in many versions with extra scenes, and the audio was performed live and hence subject to artistic variation by the performers (Bertrand and Routt 2007 passim.) More casual consumers would have believed the *Ned Kelly* argument as a fixed, artistic whole. Casual consumers probably think (2010) *The Ghost Writer* is its fixed argument too. Certainly, copyright registrars in national libraries talk about documents being "fixed", although tragically, invasions often destroy national libraries that have been built over thousands of years – and destroy what was "fixed" as baked ceramics, scrolls and generations of scholarship in a matter of a few days of looting (Galbraith 2006: Ch. 8).

Filmmakers understand that screen arguments go through fixing and un-fixing during a medley relay of cycles. Arguments are developed though various drafts to a ("fixed") final, approved, green-lit screenplay. The same writing may be developed as two projects, such as the two versions of Shakespeare's *Romeo And Juliet* in Section-50. For each project version of that screenplay property, the argument is "rebuilt" as formers form the set and performers explore the characters and music. At the same time, recordists fix these audio and motion-picture performances in the dailies (or rushes). Then the recorded takes are recorded for backup, shaped, edited and mixed as the "fixed" master recording. The argument's vault master and matrix copies (along with versions of the writers and recordists' marked up screenplays) are delivered, under contract to, or within the distributor. Distributors rebuild the argument again as they negotiate with political censors or prepare various "release" versions for market segments such as airlines or additional sublanguages, along with copyright protection for the makers

and investors; and maintenance, conservation and preservation work to slow down the argument's physical degradation.

For filmmakers, there is a stereoscopic view of what a screen argument is. On the one hand, the team of makers (and the audience) have a "fixed argument" in mind when making or appreciating it; plus, those makers with creative power over the argument also have a Daoist, material science, practical or cyclic view of the argument where arguments may be built and are collapsing, yet are usefully believed in conversation to be "stable" at various milestones: the green-lit (approved and funded) screenplay and the recorded version's archive master are both agreed as "fixed" for a range of day-to-day purposes. There would be no point Evelyn learning lines for the next day's shoot with the contracted screenplay, Bobby learning the "same" scene from the revised pages, and Charlie taking the night off because the director has moved the scene in the schedule and forgotten to communicate the schedule update to Evelyn and Bobby. Successful screenplay arguments swing through many ongoing negotiations where the team agree to a fixed version and then the project's "above-the-lines" (writer, director, star or producer) make new agreed changes to the argument, and everyone is informed of the change. Different coloured revised pages and header notes ensure everyone is writing, preforming, recording and distributing from the same page.

Movie thought's team competency demands that various experts converse with each other so that participants both know the argument in all its cycles as a dynamic rebuilding process; and, at the same time, the team pretends to "fix" the argument's structure at any phase for purposes of analysis, co-operative conversations among makers, contracted delivery, or artistic appreciation. As discussed later, people naturally develop and tell a whole story from scattered plot elements as they interpret a screen argument. This competence – putting a plot together as a story – is what audiences do too.

At first glance, Paisley Livingston and Carol Archer (2010) "Artistic Collaboration and the Completion of Works of Art" throws some light on the team process of movie thought. They analyse some artistic teams who fix – or as Livingston and Archer say – "complete" the artwork. Where this article falls down, in relation to movies (they mention filmmaker Jørgen Leth), is its emphasis on teams that submit to a leader:

> "Although a comprehensive history of artistic collaboration remains to be written, it is well known that many of the great masterpieces attributed to an individual artist were in fact the products of collaborative effort. Yet the overarching tendency has been to assume that the dominant policy of individual attribution remains justified by the master's superior talent, experience, and hierarchical control of the workshop and of the artistic projects undertaken therein. And if that is correct, then the application of a completion condition based on an individual model would be straightforward: it is the maestro alone who determines when the work is finished." (2010: 447)

In movies, there is not one "master's superior talent" although this myth is common. Later, Chapter 3 explores a masterpiece *Psycho*, that is commonly attributed to Alfred Hitchcock although the film is the product of collaborative effort. This investigation rejects the tendency (nay, dominant fallacy) to assume "hierarchical control of the workshop [or movie studio...] and of the artistic projects undertaken therein." Chapter 3 argues that the successful studio or project team is not a "hierarchy" illustrated by a pointed pyramid with "the maestro alone" at the top. Successful movie thought and practice is better illustrated by a square, flat-topped ziggurat as found in Mesopotamia, Guatemala and the U.S. Great Seal of government. In successful movie arguments, four groups of experts co-operate from four corners of the flat top: the chief writers, the stars, the director and composer, and distributor/producers. We will return to this flat-topped shared hierarchic "medley relay" in Chapter 3.

Not only is a movie argument negotiated through agreed fixed (or completed) states and periods of creative flexibility and inquiry; but this iterative cycle is built and rebuilt four times before audiences consider the "complete" argument. Moreover, although assistants and team groups are arranged in a hierarchy, the argument is not ascending to a single leader's control at the top of the team. Rather, the four top corners of a ziggurat-style team have experts that together put a strong argument.

25.

Research: A Pile Of Interactions And A Guiding Argument.

Developing a movie argument to a finished prose synopsis like Evelyn's in Section-20 requires a great deal of participatory, compilation and statistical research of the kinds explored in Section-27. The impetus for researching Evelyn came from the limited choice of available movies, and the desire to demonstrate that screen thought begins with its writing cycle. There was a very limited choice of Anglophone movie arguments about an individual's beliefs and actions in the face of an overwhelming "international witch-hunt's beliefs and actions" in the Asia-Pacific. *Heaven And Earth* was a rare example but was full of "inexplicable details." What both *A Cry In The Dark* and *Heaven And Earth* did provide were factual stories that gave a rich framework for further research into people coping with high drama that was forced upon them.

The object of screen thought, and particularly movie thought, is the world of people acting in time-place – interactions like:

> "Young people D, trapped without work in a passport-controlled military colony, are forced to sign contracts on colonist B's rubber plantation far from home" (from *Evelyn*).

Such a fact from the real world is highly emotional and dramatic. It may be a useful interaction to collect during the movie's research. Potentially, the interaction will form part of the argument's emotional arc and its music. The interaction between D and B is not a timeless photo or a place where people don't act. As an interaction, it has time duration and time order. First, the youths D are trapped by colonial invasion; then they are forced to sign contracts in the colonist

B's plantation. People travel from their homes to the plantation, so potentially this is an interaction in a real-time-base argument that has duration, people acting through a plotted order of actions, with an audience that watches this time unfold. Moreover, this inquiry suggests that a researcher who would set out to collect such an interaction in their *Evelyn* research is somewhat aware that they occupy a top corner in the movie ziggurat, on the same level as performers, recordists (headed by a director) and, in the forth corner, the chief producers of the movie.

From this position as the writer (of an argument that is not yet formed) – what guides the researcher's work? I have suggested that gaps in the *Heaven And Earth* argument prompted this study to look closer at interactions in South East Asia. Stone and Hayslip's argument contains many little puzzles, like: "What are African-looking soldiers doing attacking Le Ly's farm?", "Who sent the mobile armor in?" Why?" By crosschecking reliable historians and compiling "interactions" from their work (in Section-51 and 64), the study could set about solving these "little puzzles" – as Edward Craig puts it (2002:1). But a screenwriter then shifts the research and development up a level. Rather than little puzzles, moviemakers develop vast fixed arguments consisting of hundreds if not thousands of interactions. Yet day-to-day, the writer deals with particular, small interactions that may puzzle the ear and eye.

One way a movie thinker deals with audio motion-picture puzzles to have an overall notion of a future argument, a hopeful "guiding argument" that initiates, elaborates and modifies the research framework but also energizes a belief that a strong, interconnected, layered film argument will eventually cascade through a circa-100-page screenplay, and then cascade through the performances and recording of the distributor's 100-minute movie versions. Director Rolf de Heer describes the guiding argument in this way:

> "The initial idea for the film really came in two ways – one sort of general and one quite specific." (de Heer interview in Djigirr, de Heer et al. 2006)

A writer, performer or recordist only builds one specific interaction at a time by weaving it amongst a few related interactions, held together in an evolving, general idea. No maker ever puts the whole cascading argument of hundreds of interactions at one time. A little puzzle can be introduced and completed in seconds. A movie usually takes years to research and develop the screenplay, months to perform and record, and years to distribute. Although makers only deal with a few layered elements and interactions at any one time, this sharp pinprick of focus is awash in a sea of similar but not identical actions. So it is essential to have a guiding awareness of the whole project: a notion that while one is focused on sailing, one is also focused on the weather, so to speak. I did not know how *Evelyn* would turn out – I had no idea that Europe and America's mechanization relied on rubber plantation colonies in the tropics, for example. But I was impelled to look though the gaps in *Heaven And Earth*, with its meager hints at powerful beliefs and actions behind its scenes of invasion skirmishes. One might call this notion the guiding argument.

Characters in movies sometimes give hints for guiding arguments that the researcher may follow up. For example in *Heaven And Earth*: after his sons leave home for the war front, Ly Le's father is highly concerned to explain to his daughter about the many past invasions of their farm and valley. She is now the farm's front line. He lists some invasions but if he explained them to Ly Ly in off-camera scenes, his explanations are not in the film. Father's lack of information was one of the entry points to *Evelyn's* research: what were the invasions? What were their economic relations? Surely there was more to invasion than a diseconomy of killing, prostitution, agricultural ruin and concentration camp handouts, which *Heaven And Earth* does show? Who gained from invasion? Many modern invasions have had greed for oil as their basis – so I was using the economic area of the inquiry scope to suggest a guiding argument. Yergin's 2008

founders' history of oil, *The Prize*, refers to invasions over 60 times. But oil was not the resource issue in 1960s Vietnam. Yet through crosschecking various sources, the investigation happened on Lay and Thompson (2006) *The Battle of Long Tan* (about an Australian battle in a French-colonized rubber plantation in Vietnam). In the background of this documentary was the implication that rubber might be the coveted commodity. Having a guiding argument that included an "economic" area of inquiry, I did not give up hope when Yergin did not explore Vietnam. Yergin's connection between oil's economic resource and 60 world invasion scenes was enough to guide the inquiry through Lay and Thompson and hit on rubber as the reason for the killings. This guided me to read John A. Tully (2011) *The Devil's Milk.* Tully confirmed the guiding argument's suspicion that France invaded and colonized Vietnam for its rubber and their instigation of forced plantation labour.

The guiding argument is somewhat like an "interaction" template with questions linked to elements like time and action: When did this rubber colony start? What people, what actions? This led the inquiry to France's first highly successful invader, Pierre Pigneaux (Mantienne 2012:78). Pigneaux was two hundred years distant from Le Ly, but the study's guiding argument had led to him. In a literate argument, one can write or speak statements in words that identify notions such as "French invasion" or "American invasion" – as Le Ly's father did when he listed invasion names for his daughter. But what if a screen thinker wants to listen to and watch the differences between these sequences of interactions on film, rather than hear words in father's list? Out of data on the earlier French invasion, an opening scene for Evelyn was developed. But as discussed later in Section-29, the decision was taken to shift the real people in this new argument from biography to "character types" that aggregate the thought and action of people collected in the data. So Pigneaux became character F. For ease of reading screen thought notation, the characters A, B, C et al. in Evelyn have been given names rather than letters. Pigneaux's F became character Fred. With these developing guidelines for the guiding argument, the research had pulled together an interaction. The interaction between Pigneaux and his sailors eventually became the opening sequence in Evelyn:

> "Cloaked in strange medieval garments, Fred, a high overseas official, descends from a square-rigged sailing warship moored in the bay. Fred is rowed ashore to a tropical beach."

This 1777 arrival, as a scene of interactions, can be compared with the 1945 arrival of the American invasion, in audio motion-picture terms. The French "sailing ship" is obviously different from the American C-47 aircraft that flew a British invasion force into Vietnam 12 September 1945 (Child, Morrison, Rowley et al. 1966:20). By collecting interactions of square-riggers and contrasting C-47 aircraft, different time periods are filmed. The *Evelyn* research developed richly detailed scenes of invasions that Le Ly's father only named without further explanation.

From Mantienne's history, a closing scene to the initial French invasion is found: Pigneaux advised the French-Vatican backed Vietnamese ruling faction for many years before dying from dysentery in 1799. For a filmmaker, there is irony here: 1770s Europe believed it brought the Enlightenment to its colonies, yet Pigneaux brought French hygiene habits to the Vietnamese. The Vietnamese court already boiled their drinking water and never ate salad, only cooked vegetables, which are two key habits to avoid dysentery (U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC 2015:1). Dysentery is avoided by following Vietnamese hygiene, not imported habits of the 1700s. CDC also advises travelers to avoid anal sexual activity if they are concerned about dysentery. Warfare also brings dysentery. Health research was guided by a movie's full scope of inquiry (thought, body, intimacy, friends, family, economy, politics, culture, nature, cosmos) and so it was a logical step to find out more about how dysentery works in history. This, and other related research about Pigneaux's friend Emperor Gia Long (Gerry) and the European cultural understanding of hygiene in the 1700s (Nuland 2008: L2844) was developed into this sequence in the *Evelyn* argument:

> "Gerry and Gerry's local people find Fred's culturally weak understanding of people's bodies, medicine and hygiene an object of disgust or amusement. Fred dies of dysentery. Gerry gives Fred a state funeral and a monument is erected."

Like all Section-50 movie arguments cited in this study, Section-20's *Evelyn* synopsis is understood within a "cycle" of writing, performing, recording or distribution. All four cycles are guided by a "guiding argument." Performers usually have an overall modus operandi that they bring as individuals to their work, a background argument that guides their practice of adopting a character role. Amusingly, Donen, Kelly, Comden and Green (1952) *Singin' In The Rain* makes fun of its superstars' publicized guiding argument: "Dignity, always dignity" – when, in fact, the two stars snipe and loath each other behind the scenes. For the sound recordist in Von Donnersmarck et al. (2006) *The Lives Of Others*, "concepts of punctuality, accuracy, absolute loyalty to the bureaucratic state, selfless service and incorruptibility" guide his research. But the recordist's guiding argument changes as he spies on supposed criminals who are incorruptible and give selfless service – whereas his national security boss and department minister unfold as selfish, corrupt egotists. The distributor in Altman and Tolkien (1992) *The Player* does not change his guiding argument as he runs project development in a movie studio – his methods are successful. But he is ruthless in "living his guidelines." Others fall in his wake, as he climbs to the top of the producers' corner of the movie ziggurat.

Evelyn is in its writing cycle. "Writing" mostly consists of research and then, increasingly, writing segues into its development phase that is guided by a "guiding argument". To develop the *Evelyn* argument or any movie argument in this way, the writer or writers have to have many notions that suggest the strategic shape of the project and the completed argument reacted to by future audiences. Chapter (2) explores many strategic shapes of *Evelyn* and other movie arguments, and it can only do this because what drove *Evelyn's* development was

the idea of a whole, completed movie rolling on the audio motion-picture screen in surround sound, gorgeous colour and astonishing performances – even when *Evelyn* was just the elements of its first interaction, without the whole story researched and written down.

The very idea of a guiding argument or conceptual scheme is balanced with the sister notion that arguments are cyclic. While writing Evelyn, it is in a "cycle of building," a cycle of resisting material deterioration and people's worldly impacts. The screenplay is built until it is handed on to the performance cycle. But arguments can go into decline, or cease building, when hope of production and distribution fades from view.

During research and development of a movie argument, the guiding argument may change as more and more interactions are collected. When this study began, it was unclear whether or not to include released movies like *A Cry In The Dark.* Originally, Soderburg , Grant and Brockovich (2000) *Erin Brockovich* was also included in the study. Moreover, the books and author biographies behind these movies were being investigated. But as the guiding argument for the study as a whole was refined, the books were dropped and Soderburg was moved back into Section-50's background list. Similarly, *Evelyn* was originally developed in the biographical mode; then it shifted to fantasy mode; and then the development shifted to its current typology mode. Along the way, decisions were taken about the likely audience for *Evelyn.* The guiding argument assumed that *Evelyn's* audience would prefer biography, then that forecast changed to a fantasy audience, and settled on an audience for a movie argued with character types.

A movie's guiding argument may also change during its ongoing rebuilding during performance, recording and distribution cycles. For example, Stephen Spielberg has returned to his movies during their distribution stage to un-fix and slightly reshaped some arguments. Spielberg and Mathison (1982) *E.T.* was first

distributed in 1982, then, as a recordist with the power of a distributor, Spielberg made many changes to the 1982 version. After years of original distribution, he digitally replaced the F.B.I.'s touted shotguns in a children's neighborhood with walkie-talkies. Ten years on, he went back to the computer and digitally restored the shotguns to the officers' hands. Words drop in and out of currency among political public relations and their avid followers. The utterance "terrorist" in *E.T.* (referring to a Halloween costume) has been overdubbed with the utterance "hippy" in later distributed versions. Whatever cycle filmmakers find themselves in, makers have a goal out in front and then a set of methods that work towards that goal, along with some wisdom to refine that direction, and apply it to the unfamiliar challenges of a new project. Speaking to student performers in New York City, performer Russell Crowe shared this advice about what guides him:

> "Serve the narrative and you are doing your job. ... I am not interested in being the 174th *Hamlet*. What I want to do is – I want to find who Shakespeare is now. That is what I am really looking for – 'who the great writer is now.' And I want to work for them and I want to create something. The whole job is about creating." (2007)

That is: creating under the imprimatur of a guiding argument. The way performers find "who the great writer is now" is to read professionally (or have their agent or assistant read) hundreds of screenplays. Yet one can detect a guiding argument for Crowe that overarches any particular movie project and its writers: to live one's working life via an embodied inquiry into today's dramas of Shakespearean quality. To a great extent, the distributor, the recordist and the performer all acquire their guiding arguments ready to hand from the screenplays they support. But the courageous (or foolhardy) writer does not have a screenplay as a given argument. The writer is without a written guide. Socratically and peripatetically, when the writer living in the world begins a new line of inquiry, it is up to the

writer's own initiatives, friendships, knowledge and experience to be inspired with a guiding argument that drives research and development. As any number of writers will remind their audience, a guiding argument for drama usually comes at personal cost on the Socratic and peripatetic street of experience. One is reminded of song writer Mark Knopfler's sarcastic put-down of a consumer who thinks recorded arguments such as songs come for free: "Money for nothing and your kicks for free." Finding a guiding argument – an argument that drives writers and other makers to co-operate on a project that is successful with the paying public – is usually difficult and costly. Usually, the new research for a movie goes hand-in-hand with the emergence and refinement of the writer (or the writers') guiding argument.

26.

From Research and Backstory – to Documentary or Movie?

A researcher's guiding argument develops an emotional arc during the writing of drama that affects people. The development process is imagined as both fixed (a complete movie is the goal) – and as a cycle of rebuilding/degradation (with experiments and false starts). There are many other notions that help turn research elements like time and gesture into a feature synopsis like *Evelyn.*

An early decision for a filmmaker is the decision to develop a lecture-style documentary or a movie. It is not just the writer's decision, either. People of interest to the writer may be happy to do a documentary interview but have no interest in performing a drama. Or the opposite may be true. During the original development of Oppenheimer, Anonymous and Cynn (2012) *The Act Of Killing*, the directors decided to make a lecture-style documentary with interviews about the 1965 Indonesian genocide. But the people they interviewed were not prepared to speak – out of fear. Oppenheimer then stumbled upon some perpetrators who were enthusiastic – not to give interviews – but to perform their "1965" events for the camera in a popular movie style. Oppenheimer discovered these gangsters were star-struck movie fans who modelled their lives on 1960s American movie stars when they committed their one-million genocide. The film that resulted in 2012 is an astonishing new method of documentary making.

Oppenheimer's film is a documentary and not a movie because it emphasizes verbal narrative. It links passages of interview with movie-style re-enactments where the situation is talked through. Although it develops only a few persons as leading characters, its narrative is constantly referring to the background millions affected by 1965, as a documentary would do. To-camera presentation is common

in documentaries, and some gangsters give to-camera or on-camera confessions and meditations. The eye-line gesture looking to camera is rare in movies and miniseries, but it is used effectively in Seed, Dobbs and Davies (1990) *House Of Cards* both for humour and for a slight documentary feel to the miniseries. Documentaries often use a television studio as a "hub of the narrative" that links place elements together. Oppenheimer casually uses studios as scenes, although not as a centralizing hub in *The Act Of Killing*. Pilger and Lowery *The War You Don't See* uses many studios in its documentary, although no single studio is a hub. Adam Curtis' *The Power Of Nightmares* eerily opens each of its three documentary episodes on an empty news desk and vacant studio. Like most documentaries all these films record much of their research as on-camera interviews, archival documents and actuality scenes that are later edited into the final film.

In the above differences, movies differ from documentaries. But in their initial research, the two genres can be identical. Chapter 3's key movie is Gervasi, McLaughlin and Rebello (2012) *Hitchcock.* Writer Stephen Rebello spent years interviewing the crew and stars that had worked on (1960) *Psycho*. His documentary interviews could have been developed as a documentary or a movie. He originally published his research as a book. Only later was the research developed as the 2012 movie. Any film thinker is going to research the same kind of screen elements such as time-place, persons and actions over a long period – even if such historical time/people research is pared away during development, as the shape of a particular guiding argument becomes clear. Filmmakers call this massive extra research material "backstory." The backstory research may not appear on screen or in the dialogue but this massive research indirectly drives the otherwise hollow characters across the screen. Without backstory, a movie writer does not know the disposition of new characters, nor the decisions the characters prefer, nor the direction characters take as they interact in a movie argument. Without backstory, movie characters are like immobile props on an empty stage.

Without research, an idle screenwriter might jot down four characters Q, B, G and P. What has motivated these four "people" to be together in this space? The space is not even worth calling "place" yet because the space has no backstory of habitation. How are Q and P acting? Actions are linked to intentions, beliefs, desires and feelings; but without research, neither thought nor action by Q or P is known to the writer. Let us assume that P welcomes Q into the space. Here we have a motivated action by P. But now we must assume that the writer knows something of P and Q's backstories to suggest that P would welcome Q. Usually when writers do not know what to write on the page, it is because they have not done enough research. Jonz and Kaufman's *Adaptation* (2002) is a whole movie argument about this very problem that brings screen arguments to a halt. *Adaptation* is discussed in the next Section. If the writer gives Q, B, G and P names, then already some backstory is admitted by the writer. For example, if the characters are named Qutb, Boy, Girl and Pastor, then a scene involving a Pastor and three others is underway. The Pastor has welcomed Qutb, so is there some reason, perhaps connected with P's religious role, for inviting Q into the space? Without more research the reasons and actions are ineffable. The key to freeing up this limbo, this puzzling space, is for the writer to research the backstory of this scene.

One research path among billions would be to follow filmmaker Adam Curtis into his own research, where Curtis discovers that Qutb, an Egyptian trainee school teacher on exchange to America, is invited to a social dance between boys and girls, supervised by their local pastor. With this additional information, the beginnings of a movie scene appear. Some backstory starts to propel the characters. The research – for this movie idea, or for Curtis's documentary – is much the same: living people act in time-place. A documentary will tell a lecture-style film about these people and their (mostly public) actions. A movie will develop the thoughts, gestures, and actions of a few of these people across the

inquiry scope of movies, including: the private and public spheres of these people, with their thoughts revealed as scenes, intimate relationships, the growth or decline of friendships, family, economic relationships, political drama and cultural shifts. A movie confines most of the drama to a few foreground characters.

When *Evelyn's* argument commenced, it too was a blank page. *Evelyn* demanded some research approaches that are considered in the next Section.

27.

Performers' Attitudes From Writers' Six Tiers of Research.

It is a fascinating exercise to attempt to listen to and watch a few dramatic scenes from a favorite movie from the writer's perspective. The motives driving the superbly performed characters are the very motives that the writer has researched for the argument's history and backstory. Motives are layered into the choice of scenes, people, actions, gestures and utterances developed on the page and then rebuilt on screen. Engaged in dramatic performances, it is all too easy to lose oneself in the characters, scene and interactions – and forget, or never realize, that gestures, eye-lines, intonation and performance have emerged from the writer's research.

People who research and create movie arguments are, to a strong or weak extent, historians. If the movie is about people in the present day, then the writer has conducted current affairs research by participating, compiling news reports or other methods. If the movie is about people in the past, then historiographic and other history research will be done to a strong or weak extent. The *Evelyn* movie is half scenes in the present day, such as the arrival hall at the airport, and half historical scenes performed on period costume film sets. Six methods of research were used to collect the interactions for *Evelyn's* scenes:

1. Participation.

A dilemma I faced in developing *Evelyn's* two stories of "history" and "a contemporary movie shoot" was how to bring the two stories together in the emotional and logical climax. This preoccupied me for months during development until I suddenly created Andy (in the role of President) arriving for a colonial state

visit, falling down the stairs to death and Andy's work colleagues reacting. How did this interaction emerge from research? Reflecting on it: Andy's fall came from the writer's participation in poorly designed, troubled, unsafe workplaces and literally taking a damaging fall when my focus on physical dangers under my feet was distracted by unfriendly others. My fall was not on aircraft stairs, nor did it result in death, but unexpected physical injury did sear the scene in my mind and, years later, participation in the troubles of real dramas emerged to tie the two stories of *Evelyn* together at the emotional and logical climax. Participation lies at the very heart of this thesis. This thesis, through its emphasis on participatory research by movie writers, refutes a kind of scholasticism: "the impression we get as screen audiences is that films successfully arrive in cinemas or on the home screen as a given, and not as a strenuous emergence from an area awash with arguments" (Section-04).

2. Interview.

The last key movie in this investigation is Gervasi, McLaughlin and Rebello (2012) *Hitchcock.* Gervasi is a recordist; McLaughlin and Rebello are writers. Stephen Rebello did most of the research for *Hitchcock.* He interviewed most of Hitchcock and Alma Reville's surviving film team who worked together in 1959-1960. From their interviews, he wrote the book on which the biopic *Hitchcock* is based. Again the study's documentaries are interview research. *Evelyn* does not incorporate the interview method directly, rather it "compiles" research. *Evelyn* compiles interviewee data from the documentaries in Section-51, for example ex-intelligence agents describing how they set up and performed authentic-looking "invasion" scenes for the world's press to film and report.

3. Statistical Calculation.

When *Heaven And Earth* raised more questions than it answered, its knowledge gap triggered *Evelyn's* research, including many statistical calculations. The population of South East Asia was discovered to be larger than the population of Europe and America combined (United Nations Population Fund (2011: 116-121). This much large place is almost unrepresented, in either film philosophy movies or Anglophone movies as a whole. The number of people killed in their homes and businesses during the 1960s-onwards genocide totaled over five million victims (from statistical sources quoted in Section-22). Statistics help researchers identify where the non-trivial dramas of life take place – statistics that Geuss and Nguyen suggest is collectively suppressed. The collective suppression of knowledge has been investigated by statisticians Kull, Ramsay, Subias et al. (2003:1-1). The statisticians refer to audiences' false screen beliefs as "misperceptions":

> "The extent of Americans' misperceptions vary significantly depending on their source of news. Those who receive most of their news from Fox News are more likely than average to have misperceptions. Those who receive most of their news from NPR or PBS are less likely to have misperceptions." (2003:12).

These conclusions are stated from Kull et al.'s statistical investigation. Only 23% of audiences who preferred National Public Radio (NPR) or Public Broadcast Service (PBS) not-for-profit channels had false screen beliefs about a 2003 invasion, whereas 80% of the Fox-preferring commercial news audience had false screen beliefs (2003:13). Kull's statistics were developed into Andy, Bobby and Charlie's false screen beliefs and desires. *Evelyn* contrasts their fallacious thinking with Fred and Gerry's public channel beliefs in the *Evelyn* movie (Section-20). Although a movie, *Evelyn* is based on current real-world statistical research. When researchers combine a person's desire with their belief (such as channel preference and belief about the world) – then filmmakers are dealing with "belief-desire pairs" or "belief-desire-feelings" triplets, which are part of the holism of the mental. Screen thought also attends to feelings and actions linked to

beliefs, desires and preferences. And filmmakers use box office statistics to track audience preferences and actions in emotional cultural markets (in Chapter 3).

4. Trace Inspection.

Besides participation, interview and statistical calculation, a fourth tier of film research is inspection of traces. This study refers to another film-within-a-film, *Contempt* (1963), which like *Evelyn*, explores an invasion. *Contempt* explores traces of the ancient northern Turkish city of Troy-Seven, which disappeared into Greek mythology and poetry about 3,000 years ago. It was only in the 1800s, that anthropologists began to dig up and "inspect traces" of this devastated city. Again, Alice Roberts's 2010 documentary series *The Incredible Journey* Chapter (Section-08) is built from the scientific inspection of ancient human traces found in habitation sites around the globe as people migrated from Africa to South Asia c.70,000 years ago, to Australia and Siberia, into Europe and to Chile – our final extent of habitation c.13,500 years ago. Roberts' screen argument relies on trace inspection. Homicide forensics is a form of trace inspection – its methods are popular in crime movies and documentaries. A writer, performer or recordist's beliefs about "people consisting of anatomical parts that are separately subject to health or disease", is only a historically recent Anglophone belief, discovered by pioneering research anatomists whose trace inspections of diseased parts was only believed by other scientists (and educated audiences) from about 200 years ago (Nuland 2008: L361). When Andy's neck breaks, or Gerry dies of dysentery, the modern researcher can identify particular parts of the body and other life forms like amoeba (discovered by trace inspection) that help explain dramatic interactions in *Evelyn*.

5. Compilation.

A fifth tier of research is "compilation" research where other writers' inscribed messages are taken into the development process. Much of *Evelyn's* story was

compiled from historiographic (history scholarship) sources in Section-51 and Section-52. Fifth tier research, historical or otherwise, is done by reading and investigating other writers, journalists, artists and filmmakers' books, news reports, illustrations, songs, films and so on, in order to crosscheck data from many inscribed sources; and develop the *Evelyn* argument. Filmmakers, especially distributors, are very careful around compilation because their movie may be liable to credit citations, licenses and payments to original writers in the "participatory, interview, statistical and inspection" tiers of research for their data which a fifth-tier compilation writer exploits. Lindy's *A Cry In The Dark* was much compiled from public inscriptions, such as police and court transcripts, newspaper reports, television and radio news. John Bryson mostly compiled research in his non-fiction book *Evil Angels* (1985) – from which screenwriter Robert Caswell later developed the *A Cry In The Dark* screenplay. *Evelyn* is no different in using compilation research.

6. Tourism.

A sixth tier of research is tourism research. At first glance, tourism looks a lot like first-tier participatory research: a writer or reporter goes to a place, watches the local people and views the sights as an outsider but cannot listen to what is happening. They lack fluency in the local language, or they do not work in the place and get to know the locals through "participation." The visitor writes up their tourism as "research." Much lightweight news gathering, in places where both the journalists and audience neither speak the language nor have substantial participatory experience, count as tourism research. When a military "embeds" journalists or restricts voters' knowledge to press releases, this is form of tourism "research" – which serious investigators deplore (Curtis 2004; Pilger 2010; Brewer 2009). Graham Greene describes almost all the foreign journalists in 1950s Asia as tourists and the occupying military as their tour guides (Greene 1955).

An interesting example of research that mixes its methods is Greene's early novel (1932) *Stamboul Train.* Young Greene turned "tour" research (an journey on a sleeper train from Britain to Turkey) into "participatory" research by setting *Stamboul's* argument inside a international train with its assorted people. In his early career, Greene was short of money so he only took the real train partway to Turkey, and then returned home. There is no indication of this shorter journey in the novel and movie because he finished the mental journey with "compilation" text research about Eastern Europe and Turkey. Later in life, he could afford to live and participate in countries from Vietnam to South America, from the Caribbean to Africa, out of which his participatory oeuvre expanded.

Jonz and Kaufman (2002) *Adaptation* explores a weak kind of writer who refuses to do participatory or interview research into the lives of his characters. Instead, he frets and theorizes about what he believes is screen writing and consequently experiences writer's block. Eventually the weak writer accepts the advice of Robert McKee (McKee 1996; 1997). The writer does what this inquiry calls "tourism research" and then flips to "participatory research" – that is, he leaves his hermetic existence, fretting at his keyboard, goes out to observe his two leading characters as a spying tourist, but becomes embroiled in their lives and ends up doing participatory research. He becomes a strong writer (he is the author of the movie about this process). He researches his two leading characters' day-to-day history or "backstory" –their interactions in their real lives – rather than trying to develop an argument at his desk from the shallows of his inexperience and anxiety.

It is not only writers who attend to the best methods for doing their research. A performer who is cast to the role of, say, a detective, may ask to attach to a detective bureau and do some participatory research. Harrison Ford did this before performing in Weir, Wallace and Kelly (1985) *Witness* (Weir 1985). Some

performers do compilation research on their character by reading novels or history about them; or they inspect traces of real costumes or devices used by their character.

As the research data from any of these tiers is collected together, the writer segues into the development phase of writing the argument, where hundreds of collected interactions are sorted and ordered into a rough web that is mindful of the writer's guiding argument. As we have seen, the guiding argument may also change and develop as the interactions and elements are collected in the research. Sometimes development has already occurred before filmmakers become involved. When screenwriters adapt a complete argument such as a stage play, novel or autobiography, they re-developed that argument's development. Adaptation is a common form of development. The U.S., French, Australian and U.K. film academies' annual awards all distinguish "original screenplay" awards from adaptation awards. A movie adaptation is rebuilt from what has already passed through literature's cycles of research, development and distribution or publication.

Collecting research data together for *Evelyn*, six tiers of research were used: the airport fall was participation, many documentary sources contain interviews, the statistics from *Evelyn's* real world drama were calculated, the factual history film-within-film was compiled from reliable crosschecked histories and the research was wary of shallow tourism passed off as participation. From research the project segued into development.

28.

The Segue to Development.

Having done some or most of the research, feature filmmakers then "develop" some of this pile of interactions and sundry data into the development of a screenplay. This development also involves developing ancillary business documents touched on in Chapter 3. The ordering and modification of hundreds of interactions and thousands of elements is guided by the writer's flexible "guiding argument."

Without such notions of "backstory", "emotional arc", "fix and cyclic argument" and so on, it is hard to imagine how a person could logically interconnect and build a pile of worldly interactions. Developing *Evelyn*, a guiding question was: how do I string these hundreds of interactions between: "Fred is rowed ashore" and "Andy slips on the stairs"? How are such disparate interactions discarded – or joined together and put into a movie argument? During the years of research, there may not be any obvious connection between "Fred's arrival" and "Andy's death," even though both interactions sit in the expansive research pile. It is only as the "development" phase takes over the writer's screen thought that notions about the movie's shape and characterization are brought to bear on the data.

This study claims that moviemakers research and develop the argument four times in its "writing, performance, recording and distribution." Stanley Kubrick's biographer Vincent LoBrutto also uses this project "shape" to craft the chapters of Kubrick's working thought and life (LoBrutto 1997). Each chapter in LoBrutto is a Kubrick movie project from his youthful work to his last postmortem project completed by his friends. Within each chapter LoBrutto follows the four cycles of putting a movie argument. He explores Stanley Kubrick et al.'s writing cycle; then the casting and direction of performers; then the recording of both audio and motion-pictures; and

finally each movie's distribution. Distribution usually begins in the writing of each project, and this inquiry also follows that overarching project shape.

It is particularly in a movie's writing cycle, that filmmakers distinguish the overall strategic characteristics of the movie argument, including what Murray Smith (2006:34) calls its "basic constituents of argument – premises, a pattern of inference, and a conclusion". Smith poses this shape as a question, doubting whether movies have this shape, but it is the shape that is explored soon in Section-34. This pattern, of introducing familiar scenes of how the world is, then thinking of more existential dramatic interactions that might follow from those familiar scenes, building to a climax and conclusion or resolution – this overall strategic shape of a strong movie argument is called a "three-act" or "three-act/climax" notion in this inquiry. The notion was identified by Aristotle in the dramas of his era:

> "A whole is what has a beginning and middle and end. A beginning is that which is not a necessary consequent of anything else but after which something else exists or happens as a natural result. An end, on the contrary, is that which is inevitably or, as a rule, the natural result of something else [the middle] but from which nothing else follows; a middle follows something else and something follows from it." (*Poetics* 1450b):

Researching today's movie arguments, many analysts (Vogler, McKee, Robertson) agree. They build on *Poetics'* analysis. In moving from a pile of data to a movie argument, a writer's guiding argument is aware that what will unfold has a beginning, middle and end. From Vogler, McKee and Robertson come refinements to this – the notions that the first act familiarizes audiences with the characters, the second "shadowlands" act throws up an existential crisis in its "pattern of inference" (Smith) leading to an emotional climax sequence (drawn from the research) and a resolution of some sort

which is a "natural result of" this shadowlands crisis. This development shape is further discussed in Section-34 and Section-36. In Section-32, this study moves beyond Aristotle. It identifies a different politics in the three-act shape which this inquiry calls the "Inclusive Milieu."

Another way that a writer moves from research to development is by gathering a few characters to lead the movie argument. The *Evelyn* movie is named after its leading character. In English, the name Evelyn is gender-neutral: novelist Evelyn Waugh is male, Olympian sprinter Evelyn Ashford is female. As *Evelyn* is a theoretical argument, all seven character-names, A, B, C, D, E, F and G are gender neutral as befits screen and movie thought, which is a theoretical tool for everyone, if they wish. As commonly used by novelists, each character is simply an initial. The alphabet has been translated to whole English names in this study, for ease of use by readers. But screen development in studios done at the real-time speed of movies. High-speed analysis and movie development is done efficiently with an accurate notation system using A, B, C or similar; but names are helpful when sharing work with others. A movie production version of the *Evelyn* theory would assign gender to each character before casting real people. The simple prose version of the *Evelyn* scenario is flexible. It is readily adaptable as, say, a scene-by-scene game "walk-through" and character/device list for a computer game project – out of which would come a video game bible and project document. Screenplay development does not close off related project cycles – it provides a platform for them.

Much of the data in a writer's research pile may be expressed in notions, so these notions have to be stripped down and redescribed as the seven recordable elements of screen thought if the notions are to be developed. Lindy's *A Cry In The Dark* movie was first written by John Bryson as a book: *Evil Angels* (1985, 2000, 2012). Bryson uses many literary notions

such as this passage in *Evil Angels*. Speaking of Lindy's wife Michael, Bryson writes:

> "although some of God's works are mysterious, many are plainer than pikestaves. It was his wife's duty, and that of his children, to treat their bodies as proper agencies of the Lord".

These notions are not readily listened to or watched as the elements of time, place, persons, actions, gestures, utterances and devices. In *Evelyn* the notion of Fred and Gerry "not" speaking the same language (Section-18) is equally vague. Notions are either cut or redescribed as recordable elements in movie development. How does one film the notion of "God's works"? Is everyone going to know who to cast, what location to use, what to perform and what to record by this notion, and not another notion? How does one listen to, watch and record "mysterious" and not another notion? There are millions of ways of putting interactions in a screen argument to claim "mysterious" or "proper." What were Schepisi, Caswell and Bryson to film in this case of Bryson's writing? In developing *A Cry In The Dark* – from what was already developed as an acclaimed book and its research – would its adaptation include a "pikestave" in the movie? Surely this "device" was not for recording. It was a metaphoric "notion" in the book. The writers looked past the metaphoric embellishments in *Evil Angels* to bring real world, relevant, readily recordable elements into the argument's development.

Evelyn did not have to strip notions and research concrete elements in the way that Lindy's development did. Evelyn began by researching historical facts that could easily be put in concrete, recordable scenes. There are thousands of concrete, factual interactions that are in this study's appended documentaries and histories. Tully describes "control of the plantations" in factual detail. Pilger and

Munro (1994) *Death of a Nation: The Timor Conspiracy* films a Presidential state visit. Ehrlich and Goldsmith (2009) *The Most Dangerous Man In America* describes Le Ly's war zone. Thousands of interactions piled up. At first they were assembled in a more biographical mode of movie argument, but then the development was redone as in fantasy mode and then typological mode. Section-20's synopsis is in typological mode, where various presidents are combined in Andy's "type," for example. Written in prose style, this synopsis is more readable for text readers but it does retard the development of screen thinking. Instead of listing plantation scenes, state visit scenes and war zone scenes, the synopsis turns from *Evelyn's* movie thought argument to generalize in prose:

> "Gerry2 regains control of the plantations and "invites" President Andy to make a return state visit to what is now a war zone" (Section-20).

The point of screenplay development is to shift all kinds of research to concrete interactions in a movie argument. "State visit" is redescribed as an aircraft on an airport apron, or drinking toasts at a televised banquet. There is another shift – the modal shift – which is a part of developing a movie argument, too. Modal shifts are explored in Section-29 and Section-30, ahead. It is a guiding argument of this whole inquiry that, philosophically, all living people are living now at the same time, and we all live in the Earth's global air envelope (Winston 2001). That is everyone's starting point in time-place for developing anything, including a movie argument. That is the current position of every each living person's biography. From that life position, a writer may recall, imagine or have a conversation about any other time scale, place, character or action. But the fact remains that such recollection, imagination or conversation is going to start in the here and now of biography – what the writer and all other living people around the global envelope are thinking and doing now.

From that position, a writer may research the self or other people's

biographies now or from the past, in which case a movie is developed in the biographical mode. If there is a desire to combine some people in a character "type," the argument's mode shifts to typology. These and further modal shifts are explored later in this Chapter. A related factor when making shifts in the mode of development, is to ask, is the mode of this argument being shifted by fear and bullying? Ever since Plato stood up and defended his teacher Socrates, academic thinking has, at its best, been courageous. Socrates was accused of what Orwell later called "thought crime" and executed by a democratic mob. The word "academic" comes from "*Akadēmos*" – an Athenian champion memorialized for his courage. After Socrates was executed, Plato stood up to fear and bullying. He continued to teach reason over mob calumny. Other subcultures also celebrate thinkers who stand up to bureaucratic calumny, for example East Asia's dragon boat festival. But filmmakers are not all courageous. Some are bullies who live in fear, encouraging mob calumny for their own desperate enrichment. Rather than do research, or develop research along the modes of biography, typology, conjecture, fantasy or surrealism, weak filmmakers distort their arguments to malign and defame others. This distortion of movie development is explored in Section-31.

Development of a movie argument positions its inquiry all along the scope of people's worldly agenda (their private and public spheres) as well as in background nature and cosmos. A movie's inquiry scope is further explored in Section-33. Section-34 then raises another question of how arguments are developed by filmmakers and used by audiences: the question of mistaking a device (like a movie or news program) for a person and their actions among others. Later in Chapter 3, Alma Reville has to make a decision – whether to sell up her home and pour its capital into making her movie *Psycho*, or whether to drop Psycho's development and develop a safer, conventional movie with studio finance. Alma had a luxurious home and income for enjoying her work and leisure with other people – but what if she swapped those wonderful interactions for a device (the *Psycho* movie) that didn't

return her capital? She risked her hard-won life with people for a device. Alma accepts this risk after husband Hitch puts an argument that restored her faith in their personal future no matter what the outcome of their investment decision.

Decision-making is a whole layered shape that enmeshes any movie argument. Hitch decides to risk their capital because he believes his future is too bleak if he doesn't make *Psycho*. Alma believes their futures are worse if she doesn't direct the performers and recordists of *Psycho*. An unseen decision-making tree spreads out across the whole development of a movie argument: from Fred's decision to go ashore in *Evelyn's* South East Asia, to Evelyn deciding to step up, hold Bobby and Charlie's hands and finish Andy's eulogy.

In shifting from research to development, there are many notions that help makers argue a movie from a pile of interactions. The next sections explore these development notions.

29.

Movie Modes: People Argued as Biography or Typology.

Having collected *Evelyn's* research data, the study considered how important it was to develop the research's privileged actions, acts or (f)acts as a movie argument. Isn't "a movie" a rather absurd choice for a writer who strives for truth, knowledge and inquiry? Are not movies "mere" fictions? Not necessarily.

Many movies are crosschecked biographies and historiographies that are carefully, one might say, scientifically, researched. What about a movie's emotional rhetoric? Movies do explore emotions, yet a filmmaker might criticize an academic for not exploring emotions as part of a serious investigation into people's thought and action. The world's first movie, Tait, Tait et al. (1906) *The Story Of The Kelly Gang* was a researched biographical documentary reenactment that also happened to be the first feature movie. All its interactions in that blockbuster were performed as reenacted scenes from local history around Melbourne. In the 2000s, two recent movies recount history about young Internet prodigies who made the media-sphere what it is today: Fincher, Sorkin and Mezrich (2011) *The Social Network*; and Connolly, Ayres, Davis and Dreyfus (2012) *Underground.* Fincher and Connolly's films are true-life biographies, as are many other movies. Movies are often serious investigations about relevant acts or (f)acts, such as the Internet prodigy movies about today's global politics and media-sphere. Both are insightful about our world of beliefs and actions involving the screen. But movies have been shown in this study to differ from "lecture-style" documentaries, although their research may start out the same. The originally choice to develop *Evelyn* as a "movie" biography or history considered the methodological strengths of movies compared with lecture-style documentaries. Movies are ideal for

following the lives of a few people (such as the Internet prodigies and their friends). If a demographic and statistical argument about South East Asia was desired, for example, then the more useful choice for *Evelyn's* development would have been a lecture-style documentary, where graphs and explanatory narration would be used.

Another mode of movie making besides biographies (like *The Social Network* and *Underground*) also formulates people's interactions in a straightforward feature argument. In this study, this other straightforward mode of movie development is called "typology." The *Evelyn* movie is typology. So is *Educating Rita* and *Contempt*. In a typology, relevant research data about "people's beliefs and how the world is today" are aggregated into character "types." In *Evelyn*, a sweep of all inquiry areas of the worldly agenda – from private thought to public culture – were collected. The inquiry area of "thought" includes Nguyen Ai Quoc's last "Testament" to his family and community (Nguyen 1969) and Dwight D. Eisenhower's secret plans for Indonesia (Weiner 2007). Public "culture" inquiry included collecting maps and photos of Hue city as the locals know it. The research was prompted by, and contrast to, aggressive strangers' "cultural" depiction of Hue in Kubrick, Herr and Hasford (1987) *Full Metal Jacket*.

In choosing to develop relevant data into a movie, the inquiry selected across the inquiry scope: people's thought, bodies, intimate relations, friendships, family, economy, politics, culture; and the flows of nature and cosmos. If the decision had been made to develop a documentary, then only one or two of these inquiry areas would have been developed and material research could have been complied and recorded rather than complied, redescribed in a typological screenplay and then recorded.

The most common mode of movie argument is typology. Writers developed their research into combined characters, times, places and action "types"

rather than biographies of individuals. A writer may decide to keep people's actions collected in their research but shift their mode of argument from a movie biography to a typology for reasons of protecting people's private spheres or combining the key indicators of a social group into one character among a few similarly-aggregated characters. For example, one might desire to argue a movie about one's family but, in order to preserve the family's anonymity, the story is rewritten with some trivial changes to names, places and action elements, all slightly reshaped as "types".

Another example of typology emerges from the world's public sphere. A writer might compile speeches from the five most powerful politicians involved in an area of history, but, as this compilation is developed as a typology, all the speeches are allocated to one powerful "political character" type. Such a type cannot be linked back to any one real person because, as an argument, the character is now a combination of actions and gestures from many people that can only be ascribed whole to one "real" individual falsely. This summative method in a typological movie is little different from aggregating the statistical data of a scientific field and calling the various totalized key indicators "justified and true" knowledge. For example in *Evelyn*, the historical character Andy performs a plutocrat politician who lies about peace when running for election, while secretly preparing and funding invasion. Upon election, Andy increases and manages the invasion they lied about to voters. With a puny judiciary at home and disenfranchisement and death imposed on the invaded, Andy's investors act with impunity. This "type" of person and their actions is elected to power five times in 25 years, 1945 to 1970, in Ehrlich and Goldsmith (2009) *The Most Dangerous Man In America*. Using Ehrlich and Goldsmith's crosschecked biographical history, it is a relatively easy development task for a writer to aggregate that documentary's five highly predictable politicians into one character type, Andy.

But movie research and development is not primarily about "actions" in that biographical history. It is not primarily about combining the actions into

typology. For filmmakers, actions are only one of eight an essential elements in the politicians' "interactions." It is "interactions" that matter foremost in film research. So a moviemaker would notice that, not only are the five politicians predictable in their calumny, but they interact with voters who are predictable too. By thinking in interactions, the researcher-developer watches for others in these historical scenes: how do others differ from the "Andy" character? What is the "dynamic" of relationships, actions and gestures? Having paid as much attention to the people Andy interacts with, it is valid to aggregate, say, the voters into character types too, such as Andy's loyal supporters, Bobby and Charlie?

In the original material for these interactions, in documentaries and history books, the supporters and detractors of these political leaders vary greatly. There is the occasional champion who stands up to this calumny, a few vocal politicians who give the appearance of justice, a heard of supporters who run roughshod over truth and friendly international relations – and millions of colonized people who are even more varied in their knowledge and experiences. Is the latter audience segment to be omitted from the supposedly "worldly" Anglophone discourse? Moving to other elements like gestures, how, for example, are the music and effects "audio layers" to argue all these people's feelings?

People's interactions in biographies, typologies and so on, are so varied, so dynamic and so shaded in their layers and changes that often the best approach for musicians is to improvise the music beat by beat in response to what the characters up on screen are thinking, saying and doing. Improvised styles are often jazz styles, and jazz can teach the filmmaker much about the soundscape developed in most movie modes, including biography and typology. Intuitive performance and recording are explored by Trevor Thwaites (2010) in relation to jazz band performance, which has

many similarities with the way sound is mixed into a film to empower its argument. An average movie shoots twenty times as much footage as is used in the final 20:1 argument. The recording's editor would reject nineteen takes of an action for every one take used. In the same way:

> "Not every collaborative jazz encounter is meaningful for those involved, for sometimes the musicians fail to connect, fail to relate to each others' ideas, sense of time, style of playing and so on. This might come from self-absorption, only listening to themselves or even just simply showing off, at other times it might be that the band do not trust what the soloist is doing, conversely, for the soloist, it might be that an accompanist is filling up all the musical spaces through over-playing. The affect becomes ruptured. [Quoting a jazz performer:] 'It's difficult because it's real intimate to play music with people. It's very intuitive and visceral, very sensual. There are certain things you know right away about people by how they respond and how they feel in the music'"

Thwaites goes on to compare this visceral or haptic mode (embodied touch, disposition and action in the moment) with story modes that use memory and control over time past and present to shape longer performances. Other than the nightclub scenes and the period historical court and religious scenes, there are few references to music styles in *Evelyn*. This is usual for an argument in its writing cycle. Usually the soundtrack score emerges in its final form from the recorded performances. But some composers start early and suggest the music to the director, based on the screenplay.

Shifting people's audio and motion-picture interactions from individuals' "biography" to types' typology is not the only modal shift possible in movie development. In Section-30, conjecture, fantasy and surrealism are

explored. It will be recalled that *Evelyn* jumped from biography to fantasy before settling on typological development.

30.

Modes of Biography, Typology, Conjecture, Fantasy and Surrealism.

Besides typology – which *Evelyn* is – what other modes of movie argument are there? Biography has been mentioned, as this inquiry focuses on two biographical movies about mothers who fought for their lives and their freedom; and one biography about a successful film couple in Chapter 3. A third way of developing questions and answers about "what is there?" and "what should we do?" is to shift the mode from biography and typology to "conjecture."

Instead of exploring, say, *Evelyn's* realistic (if concentrated) set of personal interactions among people A to G who spend some months in hotels for their work, the writer develops the research in a hypothetical mode. Instead of exploring a set of historical interactions in the *Evelyn* film-within-a-film, the writer develops a "conjecture" movie that both steps outside history and steps outside people's relationships known in the real world. The conjecture mode of movie thought asks for wild "what if?" ideas focused around a hypothetical scenario. The science fiction movie Geoff Murphy et al. (1985) *The Quiet Earth* is one such conjecture movie, as is the philosophical movie Gary Ross et al. (1998) *Pleasantville*. In conjecture mode, the writer does not just re-label people and places, or telescope time, developing the move away from biography to typology. The writer actually distorts screen elements. Time-place is distorted, embodied persons are distorted and the strength of their actions is distorted. Conjecture movies ask wild questions like "what if the world of people disappeared?" or "what's it like to get an education then be trapped living among the uneducated?" In conjecture, this one wild element is tied to all the other "normal or familiar" elements in the

movie's interactions, as the writer tries their best to develop realistic and authentic responses to the one wild element. *The Quiet Earth* asks, what if only three people remained on 1980s Earth after the world of people – but not its time, places, actions and devices – disappeared, except for three people who are strangers to each other? In terms of an argument strategy, a conjecture film works much like a thought experiment or a live test where one part of a system is removed, disabled or increased to discover how the measured change affects the whole system.

Pleasantville asks, what if the bodies, feelings, desires and beliefs of two educated liberal teens in a cosmopolitan town circa 2000 were trapped in a sexually repressed, myopic, bigoted conservative 1950s small town, and the teens became role models for their new high school peers, and became the loyal children of new buttoned-down 1950s nuclear family parents at home? Both these conjecture films, *Pleasantville* and *The Quiet Earth*, revolve around the wild element in their story (retard 50 years; limit world to three people) but the writer ensures all the other elements remain "normal and familiar." The unchanged elements are thus in constant tension with the wild element. So character Bud tries to manage his milk bar job after school – as per normal – but his year 2000 sexual relationship with his 1950 girlfriend and his 2000 suggestion that the fellow soda jerk of 1950 should use some initiative – both throw the milk bar, and then the "timeless" 1950's town, into a crisis that affects all areas of the human agenda: embodied mind, intimacy, friendship, family, economics, politics and culture. The conjecture movie's writer asks, what if wild thing x happened in otherwise extremely normal y, how would both x and y change in the ensuing movie? For example, some "people" are conjectured as Internet "devices" (or devices conjectured as people) in Oshii, Itō and Shirow (1995) *Ghost In The Machine*. In both Scott, Dick, Fancher and Peoples (1982) *Blade Runner* and Alex Garland et al. (2015) *Ex Machina*, the leading "person" investigating "devices" eventually conjectures if they too are a device.

Shifting the mode past biography, typology and conjecture even further pushes the screenwriter into the "fantasy" mode. With many similarities with the conjecture mode, the modal shift to fantasy movies not only changes element x in an otherwise highly normal y scenario – it opens a whole portfolio of elements up for wild, unrealistic changes. For example, all the people in the movie spend the whole argument as animals (other than people) and their politics also shifts to feudal. Written, costumed or animated as animals, the characters usually retain many of the notions of people such as desires, beliefs, and they speak these notions as utterances in the familiar realistic language of the audience. Many children's fantasy movies are obviously written in this mode. Notice, though, that this mode is often used to argue highly realistic ethical and moral problems, as met in real life by the audience. Often the time element in fantasy is written to detach the whole story from the present day – hence the "Once upon a time…" codicil that prefaces and distances many fantasy stories. Film fantasy does not need this codicil because film's modal shift dresses every interaction with the devised costumes, actions and gestures of that fantasy world. By contrast with fantasy movies, conjecture mode films (*The Quite Earth, Pleasantville*) keep a very strong link between the present day and the argument that runs through the movie. Arguments can sometimes shift modes for some sequences of their movie. When Harry Potter is locked under the stairs in the present day that opens the first episode, is that conjecture or fantasy?

The biography, typology, conjecture and fantasy modes of argument keep the "shape" of movie arguments. By "shape" is meant the writers' developmental notions that construct strong and controllable vectors of dramatic change inside a movie. For example, three-act structures, emotional arc and responsibility curve are all strategic notions that a strong writer can use inside a movie argument to

shape its dynamics – and a movie argument's shape is discussed soon. But there is a fifth uncommon mode of movie argument that no longer retains most of the strategic shaping methods of the four modes above. This rare mode of feature film is the "surreal" movie. In surreal movies, most of the strategic notions used to shape a movie are dispensed with. Instead, a piece of music is written and performed along the music and effects tracks; and hundreds or thousands of shots (rather than coherently edited interactions) are assembled and cascade through the timing device. Threads of a story or many stories may be glimpsed in this audio and motion-picture marathon "dance" plot where performers and actuality footage are choreographed as patterns, rather than investigated as people's somewhat rational interactions. The maker's intuitive aesthetic assembly of audio and motion pictures in the surreal mode may not tell a story that follows a few characters, rather, it performs something akin to an extended music video concert with many "dancers" or dancing objects. An example of feature-length surrealism is Fricke, Magidson and Stearns (1992) *Baraka*. The performance of music, recording of actuality, and editing of *Baraka* is an astonishing dream-like experience to behold. Although the story of a few leading characters is not argued, *Baraka's* surrealism still shapes a overall story of how the world is, using just a few of the strategic shape methods to hold the cascade together as a very strong yet unusual movie.

Forman, Ragni, Rado and Weller (1979) *Hair* has a surreal wedding officiated by a dancing Hindu goddess and court dancers. The surreal wedding marries a cowboy army recruit (on his way to Vietnam) and a nine-months pregnant New York heiress as they dance in a cathedral. The heiress flies over flames, flowers and a rider-less horse, as her husband imagines this marriage while tripping with another pregnant friend at a "love and peace" rock and dance festival in Central Park.

Filmmakers can delightfully weave typology and surrealism together. In Buñuel and Carriere (1972) *The Discrete Charm of the Bourgeoisie*, a cocaine-dealing ambassador's desire for roast lamb rather than philosophy

dooms his coiffed and ravenous clique to nightmare assassinations and waking ennui. The music and effects soundtracks hold almost all movies together, and this is particularly the case when other structures fall away in the dream-like surreal mode. It is usually an unusual challenge for a writer or performer of music in other fields such as classical or rock to develop the music for a screen argument that involves people's multi-tempo interactions: first, a face glances up calmly in a wise way a the doorway, then a figure runs and stumbles in across a beach: how does one write the underscore to such variegated actions, gestures and backgrounds? A modern classical composer may turn to jazz, as Peter Sculthorpe does in Powell, Lindsay and Yeldham (1969) *The Age Of Consent*, starring James Mason and Helen Mirren, but many of its beach scenes are without music. Instead, the tumble of waves and wash is recorded in background layers, mixed under the foreground recording of dog, artist, model and the rare local in conversation. *Baraka* develops as a cascade of patterns that lend themselves to regularly patterned music but most modes of movie like *The Age Of Consent* or *Evelyn* do not.

Between the modes of biography and surrealism there are typology, conjecture and fantasy modes too. The development of particular movies sometimes overlaps or mixes these modes. For example, a children's fantasy film may costume or illustrate people as animals but otherwise tells a real-world story of people's challenges by normalizing all the other elements of the movie. Hence this fantasy mode might better be understood as developing research in the mode of conjecture, where a "what if?" wild element is held in tension with familiar elements of place, device, utterance, gesture and so on. Other films distort most of the elements as fantasies, as in Burton and Carroll (2010) *Alice In Wonderland.*

If one reads say, a few thousand's writers' movie screenplays as they cross the desk of a creative executive in a movie studio, then most movies turn out to be written in the typological mode. That is, the writers have done some participatory or other tiers of research, collected and selected hundreds of interactions about people. Then the writers develop this material into a few character types in a typology. Much more rarely is a screenplay written as a biography or fantasy; rarer still are conjecture or surreal movies.

The desires – to give people privacy and anonymity, or combine true utterances and actions in fewer characters – have been mentioned as reasons for shifting biographic and historic research to typology. In cases where moviemakers face political interference and violence, their movie's research may shift even further from biography and typology to the fantasy mode. A modal shift may not be the filmmakers' first choice. Filmmakers may be pushed into fantasy mode's defensive, covert position. Perhaps the most famous case of this shift to the fantasy mode in Anglophone filmmaking is George Lucas et al. (1977) *Star Wars*. Lucas is photographed working with fellow young filmmakers – Walter Murch and Francis Ford Copolla – in Murch and Ondaatje (2002) *The Conversations.* In the 1960s and 1970s, Lucas was involved with developing the group's *Apocalypse Now* project, a typology about Americans in Le Ly Hayslip's region. As film school graduates, Lucas and his fellow filmmakers had little economic or political power among Anglophone movie distributors. They could not find a distribution studio willing to finance *Apocalypse Now*. Eventually, Lucas and his team's frustrations – about the massive political barriers to their screen argument – drove them to shift their screenplay mode. In order to fund the conflict argument, Lucas shifted the mode of writing to the fantasy mode, and rewrote the team's biographical and typological concerns about war and political censorship as a costumed fantasy in space. According to Lucas' Sydney keynote address to the *Screen Producers Association of Australia*, his fantasy mode's "Evil Empire" was, in real life, the censorious studio distributors he fought politically in

California. Arthur Miller made an equally obscuring modal shift from 1950s McCarthyism to 1692's Salem witch-hunts in Hytner, Miller et al. (1996) *The Crucible.* As the tabloid political mood changed in the U.S., Coppola was eventually able to raise finance for the *Apocalypse Now* typology as well, without having to shift the screenplay to another mode. Some movies – *Heaven And Earth* is an example – are mostly developed as factual biography, but a few real people within the evidence will be shifted to character "types" to protect their privacy. Le Ly remains a factual biographical character in her biography, but her husbands from the U.S. are combined into one character "type" who is named "Steve." Although this investigation refers to *Heaven And Earth* as a biography, its mode is more accurately stated as biography and, in relation to "Steve," it overlaps typology. On the other hand, Evelyn distinctly leaves its biographic mode behind and embraces character types. Modes are controllable, though, and a director might decide to record biographic figures inside *Evelyn's* history scenes. The flexible control over all the layers, elements and argument shapes in movie development means that some makers resort to fear and fallacy, which is explored next.

31.

Fear, Fact or Fallacy?

So far in Chapter 2, the new movie synopsis *Evelyn* is covered in Section-20. Following *Evelyn,* Sections 21 to 30 explored development notions that makers use to build and argue a series of "interactions" (people acting in time-place) as circa 100-minute arguments – such as *Evelyn* or the 170 movies listed in Section-50's timeline.

Evelyn's coverage synopsis was researched and developed from history sources in Sections 51 and 52. These sources discuss the evidence and context around Le Ly Hayslip's biography and the biographies of fellow sufferers in that widening time-place, such as the suffering inflicted on Lindy Chamberlain's family. Behind most of these movie arguments are teams who explore the holist thought of people such as Le Ly, Lindy or Evelyn. Holist thought is explored, say, when Evelyn believes Fred is trustworthy and Bobby is not trustworthy, and these beliefs are enmeshed in Evelyn's evaluations, decisions, feelings and actions in the *Evelyn* argument. The essential weaving of related "feelings" into an argument about beliefs is discussed in Section-22's *Climax: An Emotional Arc and its Music.* Often, an audience's decision to watch one movie argument and not another, is a decision to engage in the emotions of the most attractive movie, more than a decision to follow its rational argument – although a rational story is also desired. Video libraries are often sorted into genres of emotional journeys such as comedy, romance or violent action. We choose a comedy for its amusing emotional arc or chose a thriller for its thrilling emotional arc. Emotions are bodily effects. Genre choices allow audiences to select an argument that triggers progesterone into their bodies when listening to movies about intimate, affectionate friendships – and to trigger testosterone into their bodies when watching movies about injurious conflicts (Schultheiss 2004: 592). Both sexes trigger these hormones, although audiences do not need to know of these bodily changes in order to feel the

emotional affect we have chosen in our preference for a "romance" like (1992) *Enchanted April* over a violent "action movie" like (1978) *The Deer Hunter*.

Movie thought investigates "emotions" as much as it investigates "beliefs" and "decision-making" in a movie argument. When Evelyn believes Bobby and Charlie are not to be trusted, this belief comes with both an "emotional" feeling and also a "decision" to spend more time with Dale, who is trusted. An aspect of such holism is that feelings, evaluations, beliefs and decisions occur together but are somewhat independent from each other in this sense: both Dale and Evelyn may hold the belief that "they walk onto the film set to work" but Dale feels comfortable with the belief and Evelyn feels anxious. Again, when deciding, on two occasions, to approach Andy in the hotel, Evelyn's feelings may be anxious when making one decision, and joyful when making the other, "identical" decision.

A person's feelings – attached to a particular belief – are generally no indication of whether the belief is fact, fantasy or fallacy. One may feel admiration towards real person Le Ly in *Heaven And Earth* or attach the same admiration to a "Le Ly" fantasy character in *Star Wars*. One may feel fear when real young girls avert capture and torture by exploding a grenade and killing themselves in *Heaven And Earth* or one may feel the same fear when a fantasy space craft attacks an anonymous city in *Star Wars*. The young girls add to one's knowledge, the spacecraft adds to one's fantasy. The emotional reaction is similar and the feelings are no guide to the veracity or other mode of an argument.

Previous Section-30 demonstrates how original makers develop the biographical material of people's lives and may shift the mode of storytelling to typology, conjecture, fantasy or surrealism. Yet another modal shift is possible if makers decide to put forward a fallacious argument that scapegoats an audience segment and emboldens a lauded audience segment to express (ill-informed) outrage at the smeared segment. Such films claim to be typologies (or biographies) about all their

main characters, when in fact, the makers have developed a reasonably honest typology about only one group of lauded people that panders to the self-identity of the paying audience segment. Makers weave this story with another group of people who "appear" to be crucial to the overall story – but are, in fact, neither real people nor type characters aggregated from a fair sample of relevant people. Rather, the second character group is a fallacious straw man and hateful invention of the filmmakers. The scapegoat is not a fantasy character or audience segment, in the sense that fantasy characters are not claimed to be real. Rather, the makers do claim the detested group is real and this horrid group deserves the paying audience's scorn. To argue this mode, the makers film their invented straw man group attacking the praised group on screen – to the righteous outrage of the paying audience who identify with the attacked, lauded segment.

Filmmakers are aware of this power to either explore people as people, or split the world into credulous followers and scapegoats. Some filmmakers investigate such calumny. 1988's *A Cry In The Dark* explores such smearing of one audience segment by another audience segment. Schepisi films commercial Australian television audiences that are actively encouraged by their program hosts to attack Lindy Chamberlain and her family on television. Network hosts claim Lindy has murdered her baby, and they gather massive audiences together on screen to express outrage at this despicable "fact." Outrageous studio reaction to the "facts" is then broadcast to the avid national audience. Again, we listen to such calumny when 24-hour radio "shock jocks" in George and Pearson (2004) *Hotel Rwanda* incite Hutu listeners to arm themselves with a new shipment of cheap machetes. Media demagogues incite listeners to believe their Tutsi neighbours are not people but "cockroaches" and incite them to massacre half a million women, men and children in their homes in 1994. In both the Australian and African cases, local demagogic media lauds its audience of millions, while setting up lies, fallacious arguments and outraged emotions about the scapegoat. The media personalities repeat this slander incessantly until their argument tips their lauded audience into mob violence, either directly on those in reach, or directed through state and

business hierarchies funded by the mob. This demagogic screen mode is not the same mode as biography, typology, conjecture, fantasy or surrealism – none of which set out to smear and injure innocent people with lies, fallacies and high-impact emotional fakery. The fear drummed up in the demagogic mode attracts people to drama – as Aristotle similarly observed of ancient audiences (1149b20; 1452a1). Yet that same fear can emerge from fearful events in biography, typology, conjecture, fantasy or surrealism – modes that do not slander readily identifiable, innocent people who a lauded segment is encouraged to despise and think ignorantly about.

Unlike modes of biography, typology, conjecture, fantasy and surrealism, the demagogic mode relies on splitting the world's screen culture. The demagogic mode lauds one audience segment of followers and pits that honored segment against another despised audience segment that does not have the resources to defend their selves with friendly, experienced and knowledgeable arguments in the media-sphere. One movie in Section-50 strongly develops this demagogic mode of argument – Cimino et al. (1978) *The Deer Hunter* – for reasons that are examined shortly. Rather than put such arguments, there are many films that explore the demagogic mode of screen argument from within, as an aspect of their overall inquiries into people's thought and action.

In Radford and Orwell (1984) *1984,* a national security state churns a constant state of fear and hatred among its lauded "outer party" screen audience. This screen culture of fear and hatred drives the state's ongoing fanaticism, sexual repression, colonization and terrorism of "other" audience segments around the world. By contrast, Orwell's "inner party" screen authorities act very discretely when dealing with their closest followers. Such Orwellian discretion is explored in Gaghan and Baer (2005) *Syriana*, where the smearing of an overseas leader targeted for assassination is carefully constructed from official research that is discretely presented within a State Department as a series of calm, even-handed expert "knowledge" presentations to fellow officers and business stakeholders. So

demagogic arguments that laud one audience segment and incite them to injure a slandered other, can be loud mass campaigns (in Radford and Orwell or George and Pearson) – or the calumny can be calm, measured, academic presentations – in Gaghan and Baer, or the courtroom scenes of Schepisi, Caswell and Bryson.

Inside such movies, what is common to their depictions of demagogic arguments is that the calumnious filmmakers (or live presenters) have only a narrow positive impact on the world's audience. Filmmaking has been global, ever since the world's first short films – *Galloping Horse, Roundhay Garden Scene* and so on – were made by travelers working in overseas countries (1878, 1888). For forty years, up to the 1930s, makers distributed their films worldwide without the barriers of spoken language. For such makers, the potential audience for their arguments was the whole world – and it would be rather irrational to goad one audience segment to attack and ruin another audience segment with the demagogic mode that lauds one group and slanders another.

Section-50's list of 170 movies steers away from demagogic movies, even when it explores the drama and suffering of our time of predation and war. For example, Peter Watkins et al. researches and develops *Culloden* (1964) – a biographical movie about the last battle between Hanoverian and Jacobite soldiers in mid 1700s Britain. It comes as a surprise to hear one of these two native-born British armies not speaking English but Gaelic with English subtitles in *Culloden.* One is reminded of the variety of audience segments in the British Isles even today. Watkins comes across as friendly, experienced and knowledgeable – that is, philosophical – in his careful research into the conditions of many kinds of officers and many kinds of lower ranks on both sides of the battle, as well as historian-observers on the sidelines; and nearby civilians who were massacred after the battle. Watkins is interested in a variety of people's private and public agendas and their complex interactions. *Culloden* is a strong movie argument that has influenced styles of both documentary and movies that have come after it,

with its inclusion of *cinéma-vérité* battlefront correspondents and massacred civilians.

Watkins is interested in a variety of people and he has not suppressed his research about *Culloden's* time-place. Having done the research, he presents it – he does not fallaciously appeal to the ignorance of his audience, who may not know about this conflict. He does not unfairly attack an audience segment such as Gaelic-speaking highlanders or English-speaking Londoners. He does not fallaciously appeal to authority by only narrating the opinions of one of the commanders, or one of the historians watching from the sidelines. Instead, Watkin's recordists move among the bedraggled debtors, the hungry private soldiers, the foreign recruits, the wealthy officers, the unit commanders who do not see eye-to-eye, and the aristocrats of widely differing religious views on the battlefield. Nor has Watkins fallaciously argued that because Gaelic speakers are outnumbered by Anglophones today, then the opinions of the populous Londoners are to be believed and the highlanders' opinions dismissed. Nor does this filmmaker argue from association. For example, one unit of the highland force disobeys Prince Charles' marching orders, but Watkins does not generalize and tar all the highland units as "disobedient" by association. Nor does Watkins beg the question by arguing that the disobedient unit is disobedient because they are a recalcitrant rabble anyway. Rather, the filmmaker researches their history and discovers that the unit was highly honorable – so much so, too much so – because they took offence at not being maneuvered by inexperienced Charles into their usual place of honor in the battle lineup. Watkins did not simply repeat the assertion that the unit was disobedient, he searched for reasons for their out-of-character action. Nor does this filmmaker commit the fallacy committed in poorly researched conflict and war movies: Watkins does not set up the conflict as a false dilemma, claiming there are only two sides to the war. His sound and motion-picture recordists move among the many divers social groups that assembled at Culloden – soldiers and

Watkins, its makers are interested in a variety of people. The movie roams around the many contending groups invading or defending Le Ly's homeland – much as a serious military historian would do. It moves around the many fronts of the war and builds up a complex picture of diverse people's thoughts and actions. Recent conflict movies – Affleck and Terrio (2012) *Argo*; and Adamson and Jones (2012) *Mr. Pip* – do range a little around their fields, distinguishing more than two groups and slightly deflating the fallacy of "two sides" in a real dramatic conflict. Intriguingly, *Mr. Pip* explores a variety of civilians caught up in war. Civilians comprise most of today's war dead yet these courageous people are rarely argued in the foreground of Anglophone movies. Why is this? To explore this suppression of today's civilian history on screen would take another investigation, but the silencing of its suffering is at least worth noting here. What neither *Argo* nor *Mr. Pip* do – having set up roughly two sides with some other groups – is to slander a whole audience segment, even if they do not unfold a spectrum of people in the way *Heaven And Earth* or *Syriana* do.

Like *Culloden*, *Mr. Pip* and *Argo*, *Heaven And Earth* sets out to argue with facts rather than fallacies. Stone and Hayslip do not prey on most audiences' ignorance about Le Ly's childhood home by inventing a fake culture. We watch her life on the family farm (in the familiarizing first act) before she was attacked. The filmmakers do not set up a false dilemma, pretending the war was only one side of identically good people versus an inscrutable enemy. Instead of this fallacy, we are shown wave after wave of diverse people who attack Le Ly when she was 4 years old, and then 11 years old, and so on. All these different actions are "covered" in plot order, in Section-48. The coverage unfolds, like Watkins' *Culloden*, with many different interest groups – rather than muddying the water with another "one" sided movie conflict.

Particularly chilling is that we only get a brief glimpse of Le Ly's neighbor in the pay of the secret military police or Gestapo. Blink, and audiences would miss this traitor in the background layers: he has a quiet word with those attacking the village and he sends the girl to secret prison and torture. When her mother pays over the family's hard-earned business capital to the invaders, they release Le Ly from the secret prison. But Le Ly's local defenders no longer trust her. They plan to execute her. Rather than set up a false dilemma between one side and another, many complicated people and their complex interactions that occur in real war are filmed. Rather than leave this movie more ignorant than before, Stone and Hayslip contributes to audience knowledge.

But what if some filmmakers argue: "people acting in time-place" by lauding one audience segment and slandering another with fallacious arguments? Like any movie mode, such an approach can be unpacked into four cycles: its writing, performance, recording and distribution. All these cycles are explored in relation to *The Deer Hunter* (1978). Its original writer, Quinn Redeker, wrote *The Deer Hunter* as a personal expurgation of an irrational childhood fear that he carried since 1953. Child Redeker viewed a *Collier's* magazine tabloid photo-story about an insane American gambler. The gambler spun a revolver with one bullet in the chambers and pulled the trigger on his head (according to *Collier's*). Child Redeker believed this photo-story. He felt it so strongly his emotions were still affecting him twenty years later. In the 1970s, Redeker explored his childhood fear by writing this conjecture (or fantasy) as his screenplay *The Man Who Came To Play* (Deeley 2012: L1530). Redeker wrote and rewrote many drafts. He split *Colliers'* insane gambler into two American characters, a fool and a thief. The thief cons money out of gullible gamblers by having them bet on his fool. The fool pretends to spin a loaded revolver (it is safe) and pulls the trigger on his head. They collect punters' money from this scam. Redeker

rewrote many imaginary settings for this con trick: what became *The Deer Hunter* was originally set in the Bahamas, South Dakota and so on. Redeker finally set the con trick in a prisoner of war camp in Vietnam – where the thief plies his deception and profiteers from gullible people in the camp. The two profiteers escape the camp, and continue to ply their deception in Saigon. Then the thief betrays the fool by escaping alone to America with their loot.

Producer-distributor Michael Deeley purchased this argument from Redeker. Deeley hired advertising director Michael Cimino to "bump up" the screenplay (that is, strengthen its emotional, plot and story arcs) with a view to later hiring Cimino to direct the performance and recording cycles of Deeley's movie. Cimino subcontracted the writing to Deric Washburn, and over a matter of weeks, the two new writers rewrote *The Man Who Came To Play* as *The Deer Hunter*. Neither Redeker, Cimino nor Washburn had any participatory experience of Vietnamese culture. The new writers rewrote Redeker's childhood fear in America and wove it with their ill-informed views about people they did not know from experience or reliable sources. Washburn watched American television for a month to try to impart an "authentic" Vietnamese flavor to their fantasy script.

It was during this rewrite that three highly significant changes to Redeker's story were made. Firstly, Cimino expanded Deeley's brief familiarizing first act of *The Deer Hunter*. Distributor Deeley desired about a 20 minute familiarizing first act, where some poor young white smelter workers in a rural Russian-American community drink alcohol, hang out, shoot deer and participate in a lavish Russian Orthodox cathedral wedding. But with Deeley busy supervising another movie, Cimino rewrote and recorded this familiarizing first act as a one-hour feature film in itself. He directed the performance and recording of an argument that lauds America's poor white

alcoholic rural working class men – their hunting, their buddy relationships, their awkwardness with women, and a great celebration at a costly migrant wedding that also farewells these young conscripted men. If Cimino et al.'s changes to Redeker's script had stopped here, audiences would be watching a rich typology about small town America, rather that a movie that switched to demagogic mode. But following this ethnographic story, there is a non sequitur cut to a village of unknown extras in "Vietnam."

The significant second and third changes to Redeker's American con men story changed the whole mode of the argument. Rather than two American con men stealing from gullible people who believed their "shooting a loaded revolver" trick, Cimino et al. switched these criminal characteristics to all the supposed Vietnamese soldiers in the second hour of the film – and relieved the two American tricksters of their criminality and place in the story. Cimino et al. increased the depravity of "people acting in time-place" from a con caper by two individuals to a whole culture of supposedly immoral, depraved murderers. Rather than a con trick with an unloaded revolver, Cimino et al. ascribed the most sadistic torture and killing to the fallacious Vietnamese culture that the makers invented for this film. What had been a fantasy story based on Redeker's childhood anxiety switched to a glorification of poor white rust belt migrant American men and women, followed by these lauded young people's ruin at the fantastic, damnable hands of Asian sadists (invented by inexperienced Cimino et al.) At the time of *The Deer Hunter's* release, non-racist Americans and Europeans spoke out against the film because of its slanderous hatred and falsifications. In America, Academy Award-winning performer Jane Fonda led public protests. In Europe, Academy Award-winning performer Julie Christie protested the film:

"Julie Christie, serving on the jury at the Berlin Film Festival where

> *The Deer Hunter* was screened, had joined a walkout of the film … on account of its negative portrayal of North Vietnamese combatants." (Deeley 2012: L78).

Meanwhile distributor Deeley discovered he could not secure a strong sale to his Japanese business colleagues: "Perhaps they saw in it a disparaging treatment of their fellow Asians; but then in other territories, too, we were meeting with more resistance than we had grown used to." (Deeley 2012: L1996).

Distributor Deeley discovered that if the demagogic mode lauds one audience segment and slanders another, then that cultural attack begins to ruin distribution sales. Imagine if London distributors had commissioned writer Watkins to denigrate the highlanders at the battle of Culloden. Watkins' filmmakers could develop their project so the Hanoverians spoke English to the audience but the "hated" other would be gagged. The Highland Jacobites could speak Gaelic and French, and the demagogic filmmakers would know that Anglophone audiences would be none the wiser to what the highlanders were thinking. Cimino et al.'s *Deer Hunter* went one step further: Le Ly's people in *Deer Hunter* are written and directed to not even speak Vietnamese. These supposed "Vietnamese" are actually performed by Thai extras. The performers from Thailand were instructed to gibber, shout and gesticulate like monkeys for the Anglo-American recording.

As we know from Le Ly's biography and Red Cross records of torture in Vietnam, it was she that was taken away to the invaders' secret prison and tortured. But Cimino et al.'s third major switch in Redeker's screenplay – and their second major falsification of history – was to invent a barbarous submerged bamboo torture prison, for the gibbering "Vietnamese" Thai performers to inflict on the now lauded American youths. Rather than admit

the team had slandered a whole culture, and perhaps claim it was a work of (albeit hateful) fantasy or surrealism, Cimino et al. claimed their film was not in the demagogic mode, but, in "truth," based on facts and experience. When non-racists in America and Europe spoke out against *The Deer Hunter* as dishonest and racist, Michael Cimino courted the world press, claiming he was "attached to a Green Beret medical unit" and so knew what he was filming (Deeley 2012: L2316).

> But "Cimino had never even served in the regular army, let alone Vietnam ... [Investigative journalists] argued that Cimino's ignorance of the war was perverse to the point of being megalomaniacal. Buckley said that the movie didn't examine cruelty, it exploited it" (ibid.).

Harpers Magazine investigative journalist Tom Buckley's comparison – of typological or biographic movies that examine cruelty compared with the occasional demagogic movie – is a useful comparison even today. Most of Section-50's 170 films examine rather than exploit cruelty. Rather than admit that *The Deer Hunter* invents sadistic scenes and attributes them to an unstudied culture, Cimino lied to the press at the time and distributors still include similar claims in their current documentary extras. Riding a wave of pre-Academy Awards publicity, Cimino claimed the Vietnamese used submerged bamboo cages and Russian roulette to torture Americans:

> "These purging fables of Hollywood have become by default our popular history... Whereas Cimino himself finally admitted that none of it had happened" (Pilger and Munro 1995).

Today millions of audience spectators of this demagogic mode are likely to remain as ignorant of Cimino et al.'s deception as video store clerk Andrea

Barnes. When she was asked what she knew of the American War in Vietnam, Barnes responded that: "men who were tortured were laid in these bamboo cages" (Pilger and Munro 1995). In *A Cry In The Dark*, Lindy Chamberlain's father says of the demagogic mode: "A lie goes 'round the world while truth is still putting its boots on." The cultural injury inflicted by Cimino et al.'s "bamboo lie" continues to fester in government-funded films and some screenwriting today. In 2013, an "Indigenous" Australian television drama series *Redfern Now* screened a new episode about a lauded "Vietnam" veteran Aborigine who suffered from his bamboo "experiences" too (Blair et al. 2013).

As to reality, Cimino et al.'s fabrication against Le Ly's people upset Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation veteran soldier Robert Muller. Unlike the *Deer Hunter* makers (or subsequent demagogic mode writers), Muller actually served his country and was crippled in Vietnam. Interviewed in 1995, Muller states:

> "you've had a lot of influence out of the office of the President, particularly under Reagan, exploiting all these negative issues like missing in action, prisoner of war issue – to portray the Vietnamese as vile, rotten, evil people holding our boys in bamboo cages. Those are emotional buttons in America that have been pushed very successfully. You've had Hollywood come in and exploit that..." (Pilger and Munro 1995 *Vietnam: the Last Battle*).

Besides promoting the fake cages as real, Cimino repeated in the world's news media that Le Ly's people conducted psychotic gambling dens, where each American prisoner of war was forced to hold a loaded revolver to the head and press the trigger. As we know, this was a fallacy based on Redeker's childhood scare in America – but like the writers' fake bamboo cages, the roulette was foisted on millions of inexperienced customers too willing to believe such falsehoods. For over thirty years, dozens of male

video customers with access to home handguns have committed suicide after believing and imitating the fanciful graphic deaths in *The Deer Hunter*. The "video plus handgun" deaths continue with today's generation (Mikkelson 2014:1; Ostrander 2000:1; Seven News 2012:1). The bamboo and roulette beliefs are not factual – they are dishonest scenes publicized as true – and they have serious consequences for some, as well as smearing a 90-million strong culture and screen market in the Australasian region.

If we compare the U.S. domestic market receptions of *The Deer Hunter* and *Heaven and Earth*, this unreliably small sample suggests that the demagogic mode spends 1 dollar to return 3 dollars revenue; while factual movies about the time-place loose money – 1 dollar spent returns 17 cents (as expanded below). This domestic audience apparently prefers, even today, to embrace ignorance and reject knowledge. But more statistical research tells a different story.

Using unadjusted, rough amounts, in 1978 *The Deer Hunter* was made for 15 million and took 48 million in audience box office – roughly 3 dollars earned for every dollar spent (Box Office Mojo 2014). Almost a decade later, Oliver Stone (1986) *Platoon* was made for much less – 6 million – and audiences reimburse *Platoon* with a staggering 138 million dollars. That is 23 dollars earned for every 1 spent. So it is possible to tell a typology based on facts not fallacies, and earn massive profits to spend on making future films. Which is what Stone did. In 1989, Stone more than doubled his production budget to 14 million (still less than *Deer Hunter*) to make *Born On The Fourth Of July.* It returned a massive 70 million domestically: 5 dollars were earned for 1 dollar spent. Next Stone made the third movie in his trilogy, *Heaven And Earth*, for 33 million. As the distributor quoted below suggests, costly *Heaven And Earth* is superbly performed and beautifully recorded. But only one and a half million Americans attended cinemas and returned

under 6 million dollars, which is, as the quote states, "a box-office disaster" for the same project team. Only 17 cents were returned for each dollar spent. But on balance, Stone's earlier profits more than paid for the factual conclusion to his biographic-typological war trilogy. These numbers suggest that mainstream audiences will pay for fear, fact or fallacy, so as long as the audience segment's emotions, opinions and interests are pandered to.

A British movie distributor in the Czech Republic (CEO of Czech-Out, 2014) has suggested that people who ignore our "one species" origin (Roberts 2010) carry the fallacy of "race" prejudice, and fallacy is at the root of some white males' preference for say, *Deer Hunter* over Le Ly's truthful war story:

> "Where Stone won Best Director Oscars for both previous films [*Platoon, 4th July*], *Heaven and Earth* proved a box-office disaster and went unrecognized by the Academy, though Kitaro bagged a Golden Globe for his haunting score. It's hard not to suspect that racism underlay the commercial failure, for where the hit movies addressed the sufferings of white American soldiers played by Hollywood stars, *Heaven and Earth* focused on the fundamental victims, adapting the true story of a young Vietnamese woman, Le Ly, who goes from village girl to freedom fighter to wife of a US marine struggling to adjust to life in America to reconciliation in Vietnam. Superbly made, with a stunning performance by Hiep Thi Le as Le Ly, and powerful support from Tommy Lee Jones, this is intelligent, harrowing filmmaking that attempts to understand and bridge the divide between nations traumatised by war."

When this movie distributor says, "It's hard not to suspect that racism underlay the commercial failure," the distributor's suspicion is worth some

attention. Of the four cycles of any movie argument, it is the distributor who investigates what is a commercial success or failure with audiences and makers. It is distributors who research audience culture and thought, and distribution is explored in Chapter 3.

Around the same time as Le Ly's film, performer Tom Cruise, his agent Paula Wagner et al. spent 80 million making the first of their *Mission Impossible* movies: De Palma, Koepp et al. (1996) *Mission Impossible (One)*. Stephen Mulhall, a champion of "movies as arguments" in Section-02, explores Cruise's argument in (2006) "The Impersonation of Personality: Film as Philosophy in *Mission: Impossible*". The De Palma, Koepp et al. film returned 181 million in domestic box office, recouping 2 dollars for 1 spent. *Mission Impossible (One)* is similar to *The Deer Hunter* in that it invents a fallacious war argument that panders to one audience segment and demeans another audience segment. That said, this investigation does not consider it as demagogic as *Deer Hunter*.

The original *Mission Impossible* television series panders to one audience segment and demeans another. Series creator Bruce Geller's first pilot episode, like *The Deer Hunter*, turns facts about war on their head by inventing a South American nation with nuclear weapons that America's *Mission Impossible* team is forced to invade, killing people and confiscating its supposed weapons of mass destruction. When Geller wrote the 1966 pilot, only the U.S. possessed nuclear weapons in the Americas and it publicized threats to drop these genocidal weapons on "unfriendly" neighbors (Rhodes 2007:87ff.; Ritter 2010:117). As we have seen with this mode of argument – the writer replaces facts about war with fallacies that pander to one audience segment and attack another. *The Deer Hunter* attacks people in Pacific Asia. Geller's original pilot attacks South Americans. With Cruise et al.'s distributor's buy-out of the late Geller's franchise, who is attacked in 1996?

The movie's writers pose a false dilemma: they introduce one side that speaks English in the foreground and, in the background, they write a scary, enemy side that speaks a "gobbledygook" that is unintelligible to the project's Anglophone audience – most of whom do not read subtitles or read subtitles with difficulty. This difficulty helps explain why European and Asian movies are remade (often poorly) for popular Anglophone segments. Most audiences limited to English will not understand the jabbering, subtitled "enemy" in the opening scene of *Mission Impossible (One)*. Many may find the "enemy gobbledygook" annoying or scary. The film does insert a title "Kiev" which locates the movie's opening in Ukraine's capital, so the more educated amongst Cruise's audience will presume that the jabbering "gobbledygook" is either Ukrainian or Russian, which are the two main languages spoken in Ukraine. Moreover, the filmmakers do not give their despised enemy a personal name, whereas they give names to all the heroic English speakers.

In this opening scene, a demure young woman lies at the feet of a disheveled, jabbering, no-name straw man. The writers did named this person "Kasimov" in their screenplay, but the production decided to dehumanize their scapegoat further by denying him his personal name in the performance and recording cycles. Mulhall, in "The Impersonation of Personality" invents a generic name for the straw man. Mulhall calls him "a foreigner" but is Kasimov a "foreigner"? The disheveled, jabbering, no-name Kasimov lives his last minutes in Kiev and speaks Kiev's traditional Russian literati language, as did the Ukrainian playwright Gogol and millions of Ukrainians today. Unlike his attackers, Kasimov is most likely either Ukrainian or from Ukrainian cultural traditions in Russia. In contrast, Kasimov's attackers (led by Cruise's "Hunt") have secretly invaded Kiev from English-speaking military-industrial states far away from the Ukraine.

By identifying the disheveled jabbering local as the "foreign" person in Kiev, some confusion in film discourse ensues. The invading force is led by English-speaking Hunt – a revealing cultural name in this context. The filmmakers encourage Anglophone audiences to believe the English-speaking Hunt is not foreign – he speaks the audience's familiar sublanguage whereas Kasimov speaks "gobbledygook" to their limited ears. Another puzzle opens when Mulhall coins the term "theatre" to characterize invader Hunt's covert military assassination. Hunt's unit secretly kidnaps Kasimov, tortures Kasimov for information, summarily kills Kasimov extra-judicially, and obliterates his corpse from legal process. To name this "theatre" is confusing in film philosophy because "theatre" has technical meanings in drama history. "Theatre" is the opposite of ambush, kidnapping, torture and summary execution. Unlike *Mission Impossible's* covert military deceptions, the "theatre" of filmmakers and dramatists is a somewhat democratic place of attraction for its makers and its public. Audiences exercise their liberty to either attend the theatre or ignore it. Theatre is a fair free market institution, somewhat constrained by political interference but it is hardly an invader's covert ambush on a vilified stranger.

If film philosophy inquires into covert military ambushes and subterfuge, there is no need to muddy the water with "theatre." Terms such as camouflage and deception already exist in Sunzi (2014, c.500 BCE) *Art Of War*. In doing the research for *Evelyn*, various military media deceptions came to light, including two turning points in recent history. Evans describes Hitler's S.S. staging fake Polish terrorism for the world's media at a radio station on the night of Germany's invasion of Poland (2005: 699). McGee, in Pilger and Devenish (1982), describes his own involvement in staging a fake Vietnamese invasion for the world's media on the eve of America's mass ground troop invasion and carpet bombing of Vietnam. In *Evelyn*, Andy's deceptive use of the media for invasions is partly developed

from research into President McKinley's methods of media suppression during the annexing of Hawaii and colonial invasion of the Philippines (Brewer 2009:L269). Hunt's attack on Kasimov is explained in military subculture, not theatre subculture.

In discussing words like "foreigner" and "theatre," we should not lose sight of the stronger screen elements in Cruise et al.'s straw man argument. The stronger elements in this opening scene are time-place, people, their actions, gestures and devices. Cruise's disheveled "gobbledygook" straw man stands over a demure young comatose English-speaking ingénue who lies on her "hotel" bed at the straw man's feet. Tom Cruise performs the role of a well-dressed, handsome he-man who invades this place of the "foreign" male, towers over the groveling straw man, thus protecting the sexual and "racial" purity of the comatose young English-speaking ingénue. The scene's distinctive tableau is often found in violent films, and it is further discussed anon.

The plot moves to Langley Virginia, which suggests *Mission Impossible's* he-man Hunt is a C.I.A. operative. Research for *Evelyn* threw more light on this C.I.A. connection. In early C.I.A., a real operative Mikola Lebed, a Nazi war criminal, was ordered on a U.S. mission to covertly invade Ukraine:

> "The agency's own files described the Ukrainian faction led by Lebed as 'a terrorist organization.' Lebed himself had gone to prison for the murder of the Polish interior minister in 1936, and he escaped when Germany attacked Poland three years later. ... The [U.S.] Justice Department determined that he was a war criminal who had slaughtered Ukrainians, Poles, and Jews. But all attempts to deport him [from the U.S.] ceased after [C.I.A. director] Allen Dulles himself wrote to the federal immigration commissioner, saying Lebed was 'of inestimable value to this agency'..." (Weiner 2007:41).

Like *The Deer Hunter*, *Mission Impossible* exemplifies a mode of film writing, where the writers invert facts in government archives and rewrite a war criminal as the political military's "approved hero." Such fallacious arguments rely on appeals to audiences who don't learn from their own history archives, and, as Geuss says, repeat the wars of history. The argument also relies on the association fallacy or "guilt by association." In *Heaven And Earth*, the character Steve gradually unfolds as monstrous via his actions, not his accent. Many other American soldiers are explored in *Heaven And Earth*, including military police that befriend and protect Le Ly from their colleagues' monstrosities. By moving around Le Ly's war zone and exploring a variety of people, no attempt is made to smear all Americans with "guilt by association." But Cruise et al. argue: "no-name Kasimov speaks Russian and is therefore a monster." In a stronger screenplay, De Palma, Koepp et al. could have shown Kasimov to be monstrous, or angelic – or any other screen argument – by showing Kasimov's "actions." Stone and Hayslip show Steve's personality by his actions not his accent; and they also film a variety of Steve's compatriots who are soldiers with more ethics. Kasimov's audience segment is afforded no such courtesy.

Cruise's opening scene tableau depicts a strangely dressed "foreign" local threatening to rape or kill a prostrate, helpless young woman – until the local is stopped by the arrival of a well-dressed English-speaking he-man. The scene is an oft-repeated cliché. James Bradley (2009:233) writes:

> "For one hundred years – from 1853 to 1953 – American presidents took their oaths of office standing next to *The Rescue*."

On the U.S. Congress steps, the *Rescue* statue modeled an almost naked, savage-looking, crazed man, draped with a loincloth: His right arm is raised as he strikes down with a hatchet. A modestly clothed mother, cradling a child, cowers below

the wild savage. Towering above and behind the disheveled savage is an unflustered, elegantly clothed giant he-man. The he-man grasps the savage's hatchet arm and calmly stares down at the savage's surprised, upturned face. Bradley reports an 1853 U.S. Federal administration official who explained that the U.S. Congress commissioned and publicly displayed the tableaux to: "represent the conflict between the Anglo-Saxon and Indian races ... the superiority of the white man." (Bradley 2009:232).

The Congress statue has now been hidden but this colonial tableau is used in *Mission Impossible (One)* and also in *The Deer Hunter*. For much of *The Deer Hunter*, the writers explore interactions they know. The first hour of the movie depicts drunken coming-of-age scenes with Russian Orthodox steel workers in America. These are well written and performed. Then there is a fallacious, *non sequitur* cut to Le Ly's homeland where a strangely dressed local "foreigner" attacks a modestly clothed mother cradling a child, who cowers below his feet. All three locals are compatriots in their own homeland but the mother and child are written as cowering below a wild savage. "The strange male" kills the mother and child with a grenade. Then Michael, a "he-man" of the politically correct invading "race," appears and uses a flamethrower to burn the "male savage" alive. Fallacious arguments like this often come with an anti-trade political agenda to smear an overseas audience segment, rather than do business with the segment.

But the fraught writing cycle that develops movie arguments is not entirely burdened with hateful false dilemmas, guilt by association, an audience's declining education standards, willingness to accept argument from authority and war-mongering anti-trade habits. There are many writers who resist this hell on earth. One of these, in relation to developing *Evelyn*, is Graham Greene. Graham Greene lived in Vietnam and wrote of his participation there as his (1955) *The Quiet American* novel. The *Guardian* rates *The Quiet*

American as one of the greatest novels of all time, alongside Cervantes, Swift, Flaubert, Austen, Shelly, Dickens, Bronte, Twain, Dostoevsky et al. *The Quiet American* concerns a Vietnamese taxi dancer, an English investigative reporter, and one of President Eisenhower's spies who tried to seize power with proxy militias and terrorist bombings in 1950s Vietnam. Writer Greene creates three very complicated characters, along with another dozen or so secondary characters – all drawn from Greene's first-tier participatory research, living and working in Vietnam.

The Quiet American has been made into Anglophone movies twice. In both cases, the filmmakers – particularly the distributors – have falsified the leading characters and ruined Greene's English Literature as a movie. The 1958 film version "almost" succeeds in filming *The Quiet American* as an authentic and entertaining movie – up until the last minute or so of the film. If one ignores the racist, add-on resolution that the director and distributors added to Greene's story, then the 1958 movie is well-worth repeated viewings, up to its cop-out ending. How did the filmmakers fail? The 1958 distributors were not prepared to have a "White Anglo-Saxon" English journalist and a "Vietnamese" housewife live happily ever after – which was the whole point of the affection strand in Greene's novel. The film distributors rewrote the novel's conclusion to have the housewife desperately seek out a "racially correct" husband and abandon her English lover in the last minutes. In the genuine novel, Phuong's lover Fowler thumbs his nose at racist governments and happily crosses the color line with her, but the movie version fallaciously inverts the literature.

It is one of the tragedies of screen culture that distributors have hobbled the seminal 20th century South East Asian novel twice. In the 2002 version, the filmmakers dehumanize Greene's ending in a different and equally distorting way. The novel's ending is very sexy, soldierly and existential, as heard in performer Simon Cadell's unabridged audio-book reading of *The Quiet*

American. If Cadell is played over the mute 2002 movie's motion-picture layers, we hear Greene's sexy, soldierly and existential literati ending. The 2002 movie concocts a distorted, prim and sexually puritanical ending, which goes against the lovers as written or as performed in the audio book. Also, the movie ignores investigative reporter Fowler and taxi dancer housewife Phuong's shared private concerns with their families, undermining the lovers as caring, family people. Moreover, the 2002 Fowler is unsoldierly: the tone of his movie ending is wistfully apologetic.

The 2002 distributor's greatest distortion of Greene's characters is their shocking miscast of Michael Caine at a grandfatherly age of 69 years to perform Fowler, the book's active front-line battle war correspondent and Phuong's lover. The project ruins Greene's novel by rewriting Fowler's dialogue to offer excuses for casting a grandfatherly senior. The casting seriously undermines Greene's affection and liberation argument. Compare the novel's affection strand, which is sexy in the private sphere of the worldly agenda and celebrates cosmopolitan culture in the public sphere. The 2002 film version does not. In Greene's book, the sexual liberation strand is much like Kahlil Gibran's idea of marriage (1926:19) – Fowler and Phuong "grow not in each other's shadow" as soldierly Fowler rages against colonialism. The 2002 movie does not hit these notes.

Screenwriter Greene wrote the exceptional movie classic, Reed and Greene (1949) *The Third Man*, which Wartenberg says recovers Aristotle's "moral intelligence" over a decade before contemporary philosophers followed Greene's movie thought (2011:303). Greene found it galling that so many filmmakers ruined his novels by dehumanizing his leading characters with limp adaptations (Greene 2007:58). Strong movie adaptations of his novels are few and include: Shumlin and Greene (1940) *The Confidential Agent*; Boulting and Greene (1950) *Brighton Rock*; O'Ferrall and Greene (1953) *The*

Heart Of The Matter; and Reed and Greene (1959) *Our Man In Havana* – where we follow the leading characters much as Greene originally argued in the novels. Three of his greatest novels, *The Comedians, Travels With My Aunt* and *The Human Factor* are superbly realized as audio books but are sad, quirky travesties as rewritten movies – despite their stars.

Any movie argument today is developed in the global media-sphere where the struggle to put a carefully researched and dramatic argument jostles with some other truth-tellers – but also jostles with some makers who suppress or invert knowledge and deny or prey on audience segments.

Next: does *Evelyn* retell such ruinous scenarios or adopt a different perspective on the world?

32.

Inclusive Milieu or Expulsive Milieu?

If an analyst simplifies the overall shape of Section-50's *Timeline – 170 Movies*, almost every argument has this form: "A hurts B and C. B allies with C to either: change, escape from, or expel A." Aristotle promotes some of this overall shape by distinguishing three very different leading characters in his selected dramatic arguments. Aristotle viewed drama characters as either: they have a better disposition than the leading character, they have a worse disposition, or their habits are similar:

> "ethical differences depend upon vice and virtue – that is to say either better than ourselves or worse, or much what we are." (1448a).

In developing *Evelyn*, it is worth consulting earlier arguments. In (1942) *Casablanca*, the invading army is worse than the bar owner B. The bar owner's ex-lover C is better than him. The army hurt B and C. B and C reunite to escape and defeat the army. In *A Cry In The Dark*, the unjust are worse than husband B. Wife C is better than B. The unjust hurt B and C. B and C hold their marriage together to expel and escape from the unjust. In *Heaven And Earth*, the invading army is worse than Steve. Le Ly is better than Steve. The army hurts Steve and Le Ly. They unite (for a while) to expel the invasion from their lives.

In the historical story within *Evelyn*, the invaders are worse than Dale. Evelyn is better than Dale. The invaders hurt Dale and Evelyn. D and E unite to expel the invasion. This historical story could make a movie argument in its own right. To only go with this story was to follow the Aristotelian formulation where a protagonist expels a nemesis from the argument. But the study was concerned to not tell yet another story of expulsion – even though that is the most dramatic history of recent times. Therefore the inquiry also researched and developed a

different story shape to either replace the expulsive argument or overlay it. Eventually the decision was made to bring characters A to G back together, not in vicious war but in a band of friends who explore the war from the perspective of performers.

As a movie argument about friends together, Aristotle's expulsive shape is dismissed. Another developmental and argumentative shape is built. This study calls these overall shapes of the argument, "milieu." When *Evelyn* is put in this light, it interrogates an "inclusive milieu" up front among the friends in the hotel; and, within the film, it also explores seven performers who perform the "expulsive milieu" of the invasion.

All the movies in Section-50 are argued as "inclusive milieu" or "expulsive milieu." "Expulsive milieu" drama is the most common kind of movie thought. Most movies follow Aristotle's *Poetics* notions of expelling a disliked person or crowd from the whole. Variations of the expulsive milieu have the leading characters remove themselves from the group, or the expulsive milieu may combine expulsion and self-removal. Romeo and Juliet's families marginalized them but the teens also expel themselves by taking their own lives – although it could be argued their akratic families calumniate their expulsion – in both Zeffirelli and Shakespeare (1968) and Luhrmann, Pearce and Shakespeare (1996) *Romeo And Juliet*. In Nichols, Webb et al. (1975) *The Graduate*, the young man and woman manage to safely escape her authoritarian mother and both their families.

Aristotelian practitioners identify "protagonists and nemeses", "heroes and villains" among the expulsive milieu who instigate or deal with dramatic expulsions. Often movies have one group being destroyed by expulsion, only to fight back and, having gained knowledge and power, expel the previous bullying nemeses. For example, in *Heaven And Earth*, Steve's community, and Steve himself, attack Le Ly's community, killing five

million people in the region. Le Ly and her people fight back, eventually expelling their attackers. In gaining knowledge and power in her roles as farmer, soldier, businesswoman, mother and wife, Le Ly eventually emerges as the hero of her story; while Steve's upbringing and preferences crush him and he expels himself from the argument by committing suicide.

Most of *A Cry In The Dark* is an expulsive milieu drama too, where the majority of politicians, judiciary, forensic "experts," media and social gossips in a nation go on a massive witch-hunt to "expel" innocent and grieving mother Lindy from her young family, her livelihood and her culture – eventually jailing her for life and kidnapping her newborn. If Australian human rights politicians had not removed the death penalty in the 1960s, the witch-hunting 1980s Australians would have executed innocent mother Lindy. Human rights soldiers, lawyers, workers and families had emerged as the key victors who won the peace from World War Two. According to historian William I. Hitchcock, their human rights victory emerged out of economic talks begun in 1942, about how to switch from war, torture, starvation and deception to peace, co-operation, developed economies and knowledge after Germany and Japan's right-wing invasions were defeated:

> "After the Allied landings in North Africa in October 1942, and the smashing Soviet victory at Stalingrad in early 1943, the Allied [U.S., Soviets, U.K. et al.] nations began to see the need for an international humanitarian agency that could bring initial relief to newly liberated peoples. By March 1943, the great powers had sketched a draft for UNRRA [United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration] (2008: 217).

The United Nations grew out of this development. The dramatic stories of survivors include Reed and Greene (1949) *The Third Man*, Lee and Shute (1956) *A Town Like Alice* and Polanski, Harwood and Szpilman (2000) *The Pianist*. People

who could restore the public sphere in places devastated by invasion risked their lives in the hellholes of war's wake. Most of the military who defeated Germany and Japan had no strong experience or training in rebuilding families and a peacetime economy. U.N. aid coordinator Francesca Wilson shouted at a teenage male lieutenant who was out of his depth trying to order women and their babies (who had lost their homes to the Nazis) to move on:

> "Why do you meddle with civilians, with peaceable human beings? They are counters to you. You think you can move mothers and babies and sick people as you move companies and batteries in the war. Why don't you stick to something you understand?" (Wilson in William I. Hitchcock 2008: 223).

Victors who did understand they had won the War, demobbed, and returned to civilian life and business. The lawyers and politicians among them set up the U.N. to keep the peace and they declared *Human Rights* law in December 1948 to counter the resurgence of fascism around the world. Its preamble concerns the rights of filmmakers:

> "disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people" (United Nations 1948: 71).

As discussed in Sections -31 and -35, many in power, whose sympathies were with the Nazis or other oligarchs and opposed human rights, continued the War and colonialism after 1945 (Cain 1994; Chang and Halliday 2005; Brewer 2009; Dallek 2010). In Australia and other states, at least the colonial power to execute Lindy Chamberlain was eventually overturned. But the media expulsion of

Lindy's family continued for more than 30 years, despite the brief "proof of innocence" statement at the end of *A Cry In The Dark*. After the 1988 movie, North American television writers – alumni of Maryland, Harvard, Stanford, CUNY, Wisconsin-Madison, et cetera – mocked the killing of Lindy's baby in David, Seinfeld and Goldman's *Seinfeld*, Oakley and Weinstein's *The Simpsons* and Kiene and Reinkemeyer's *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* scripts during the 1990s – mockery that was broadcast all over the world and still exists in distributors' sales catalogues.

Why are most movies in the expulsive milieu? One suggestion is, movie screenwriters read Aristotle's *Poetics,* which discourses this milieu. Another reason may be that writers live in the world of people where so many problematic situations find us exploring solutions; and many of the most intractable problems involve the injustices of bullies, who have often grown "up" being bullied by an immature bullying parent or another bully before them – as is discussed in Chapter 3. Other families have a different history (or character backstory, as it is called in movie development). Where affection and liberation are enacted, and people's co-operation leads to surplus resources, productive people desire to get on with others rather than wreck their neighbor's lives. This is highlighted in the most amazing day of World War One when German subalterns decided they would stop the European war, and British subalterns followed suit. Instead of killing, the sides played football, picnicked and sang songs together in no-man's-land for over 24 hours before their generals got word and order them back to World War One. Unfortunately, the choice for picnics rather than obeying killing orders is rare – but it really does happen when courageous, ethical heads prevail. Nic Young et al. (2008) "The Christmas Truce" in *Days That Shook The World* explores the famous picnic that saved soldiers' lives for a day. But chroniclers (like J. Bronowski in *Ascent Of Man*) have reported: over millennia, thieves – who have not initiated compassionate improvement in their own upbringings, homes

and lifestyles, but divert resources to war on their neighbors – instigate an expulsive milieu.

A few moviemakers develop inclusive milieu drama. Inclusiveness is more frequent in comedy and in complex romance films such as Newell, Barnes and Von Arnim (1992) *Enchanted April* or Truffaut et al. (1962) *Jules And Jim*. Two inclusive milieu arguments are emphasized in this investigation. Chapter 3's *Hitchcock* is an inclusive argument, as is *Evelyn*. But both contain an expulsive film-within-a-film. *Evelyn's* present-day story (about seven screen performers) is an opportunity to explore the ups and downs of friendship in the same way that Newell, Barnes and Von Arnim (1992) *Enchanted April*; Kazdan and Benedek (1983) *The Big Chill*; Roach, Glienna et al. (2000) *Meet The Parents* and Waters, Fey and Wiseman (2004) *Mean Girls* are four inclusive movie arguments. People come together in the same place, are open about their differences, eventually celebrate those differences and are smart enough and gracious enough to work out a way of living together, supporting each other's freedom and affection, and enjoying better lifestyles.

This is *Evelyn's* present-day story. But like all the movies in this inquiry that have a film-within-a-film, the performers in *Evelyn* go to work each day and perform in another film argument which is not an inclusive drama. The working film project within *Evelyn* explores the colonization and re-invasion of a region and its long-suffering people, thrown from their palaces and civilized towns and forced to work until they die tortured in the international bankers' rubber plantations. When Evelyn and Dale rise up and expel Gerry2 and then Andy from here, the drama is expulsive. But this explosive film sits within the present day drama of friends and skillful colleagues under the same roof. Overall, *Evelyn* is an inclusive argument and milieu. Films like *Evelyn* offer to rethink a saner, happier world, where

people work together on comedies looking forward, based on what they have learned from looking back at history's tragedy – like two theatre masks – or like Roman Janus, protector against war.

33.

The Worldly Agenda and the Scope of the Argument.

In Section-08, documentaries were compared with movies such as *Heaven And Earth.* Movie arguments tend to have a wide inquiry scope, compared to documentaries. A movie investigates the world of people – people's worldly agenda – and extends into the flow of nature and cosmos (background trees and sky, for example) as it puts an argument. Le Ly's thoughts, her body, intimate others, friends and family are questioned by the movie. These are inquiry areas of Le Ly's private sphere. But wider than this private sphere, Le Ly (or any person) has a public sphere of economic exchange and agreements, politics and an overarching cultural area of inquiry. This is a person's public sphere. Beyond private and public questions of a person's worldly agenda, filmmakers ask after life, ecology and natural flows such as "majestic watercolor hills and organic verdant paddy fields" (in Section-48's coverage of the movie). Questions are always asked of physical cosmos, too: is this a DAY scene or are the Sun and Earth in a cosmic NIGHT geometry for this scene? In asking questions about a person's thoughts, body, intimacy, friends, family, economy, politics, culture, nature and cosmos, a movie covers a whole "scope of inquiry."

Besides makers, screen analysts can bring this inquiry scope to analyze a movie or screenplay too. In doing so, this investigation finds Le Ly's political area very shallow, compared with, say, Lindy's *A Cry In The Dark's* argument. *Heaven And Earth's* politics is understood from a politically naïve teen caught up in invasion battles, without knowing (or filming) the horrific politics behind her injuries. But an awareness of screen thought's inquiry scope highlights gaps in knowledge, and the decision was

made to investigate Le Ly's gaps by researching and developing *Evelyn.*

Part of the guiding argument for *Evelyn's* research and development was an awareness of its scope of inquiry. How did *Evelyn's* characters such as Fred and Gerry "think"? What was Fred thinking as Sailors rowed Fred ashore? What was Fred's "body"? What did it mean to die of dysentery? How "intimate" was Fred with others? Was intimacy characterized by affection or violence? What of "friendships"? How does the friendship initiated between Fred and Gerry unfold, from invasion to death? Fred is overseas but what is the backstory of Fred's "family"? The inquiry area of family is broad and encompasses household and the fact that Fred took orders inside a global religious family. Then a movie argument will cross into the public sphere of the inquiry scope: What were the "economics" of this time-place? The investigation discovered that *Evelyn's* economics included rubber plantations and the rise of the automobile and other engines with rubber – in European and American markets that colonized South East Asia. There were dramatic "political" questions of who invaded others or defended their family and economy. There were domestic political questions of Gerry fighting Dale and Evelyn when Fred first arrived. Overarching politics are "cultural" questions such as what languages did Fred and Gerry speak? What differences in medicine and health did they believe, investigate or practice? All these questions are positioned along the worldly agenda, from personal thoughts to widest material culture. Agenda questions involve people who take initiatives and deal with other people's initiatives – so movie investigations are "complex" as Aristotle observed – involving people's feelings, evaluations, preferences, beliefs and intentions which are experienced as awareness, and subject to reversals of people's expectations leading to initiatives and interactions among others. This worldly agenda becomes more understandable when inquiry is extended over the long term of a feature-length cascade of interactions. Unlike people, the trees and sky

in a movie have no attitudinal beliefs. Their flows are not driven by language acquisition after birth. So natural and cosmic questions are answered in terms of flow motion, such as light energy from the big bang, or maturation and decline of a person's body over a lifetime.

In developing a new argument about South East Asia and the world, this was the inquiry scope of *Evelyn*. Answers were found by listening to translucent layers of the binaural world, simultaneously watching actions binocularly, feeling interactions bodily, and touching time-place at many extremities – feet on the ground, handling devices – all at the same time, while a subjective non-linear time sense ran alongside people's shared external historical and "calendar time" (Ricoeur 1992:53). There was no one correct order for emphasizing all these unfolding subjective and objective layers and interactions.

We listen to, watch and interpret the populated world in many ways, including as cascading interactions. On any particular screen project, funding may shift the "interview" research to "compilation"; political pressure may shift the "biographical" mode of argument to "fantasy". The writer may have a sudden insight and renounce "expulsive" dramas for "inclusive" dramas, and so on. While all these developmental shapes are considered and reconsidered, an equally essential developmental shape is this scope of the worldly agenda and enveloping flows. Research among the worldly agenda may involve participation, interview, statistical collection, trace inspection, compilation of other thinkers' inscriptions and films, and lightweight tourism at the margin of participation. If the research is developed as a movie, the maker has decided to focus on a few leading movie characters. This study gave most focus to developing Andy, Dale and Evelyn. In movie arguments, performers explore actions from the worldly agenda (friendships, culture and so on) as researched and developed by the writing.

From a sound recordist or film recordist's perspective, the worldly agenda of friendship, family, economy and so on, can be roughly understood as "depth of field". In Section-11, when Jimmy holds Alex's camera to his eye and attempts to take Alex's photo, the Minolta lens only collects a particular "depth of field" of the Sydney street, depending on its calibration. Recordist Jimmy can adjust the lens to bring the distant background into focus, or blur the background and bring nearby Alex into focus. Microphones collect sound in a similar way. One microphone setting collects a narrow segment of distant sound. Another microphone collects 270 degrees of close surrounding sound, yet it only collects this "dry" (un-reflected) sound for a radius of 20 centimeters. For drama's audio and motion-picture makers, a "friendly scene" or an "economic scene" always includes dimensions that make for "close" or "panoramic" interactions. An aerial shot sweeping over Sydney's Woolloomooloo and CBD tells spectators something about Sydney's "economics" but not much about Alex and Jimmy "friendship" because their Kings Cross street is a mere dot in this landscape. Woo, Towne et al.'s (2000) *Mission Impossible (Two)* opens with this economic, political and natural panorama. Strong screenwriters are aware of depths of field when structuring and writing their screen arguments. Likewise, strong readers of the appended coverage appreciate the dimensions of each listed scene and action in arguments like *A Cry In The Dark.*

When a writer writes, "Alex turns her eyes to Jimmy" this is not prose literature; this is screenwriting. A very close depth of field (framing Alex's eyes) carries the argument. When a writer writes, "Alex turns to Jimmy" in the context of a mid-shot, this frames Alex's whole body and Alex's whole body is argued. If we read, "Aerial of Sydney's Woolloomooloo, botanical gardens and CBD," its people are distant, tiny marks. We do not expect to

listen to or watch "Alex turns to Jimmy" in any meaningful way in this long (wide) shot. In this large place, the argument has shifted to the public sphere of the worldly agenda.

The concept of screen "interaction" is very different from literature's concept of "sentence." An interaction's "place" element necessarily includes depth of field, as one imaginatively "looks around" screenwriting, performance or recording's scenes and actions. Like the other strategic shapes in this chapter, "worldly agenda" poses questions as to the area being listened to or watched. Is this sequence mainly about a character's thoughts, body, intimacy, friendships, family, economics, politics or culture?

Researching and developing dramatic arguments, movie thought's scope is the worldly agenda's whole range. What is a character thinking and feeling? How do audio and motion-picture traces of the character's body emerge? What strong or weak conditions of intimacy ensue? Compare, say, the agenda conditions of economics, politics, friendship, body and "intimacy" between men who desire each other in Van Sant and Black (2008) *Milk* – with men who desire Marilyn Munroe in Wilder, Diamond et al. (1959) *Some Like It Hot*. Who is friendly with another and who is not? Moreover, what "family," household, loyalty group, or groups, interact with the leading character? A stark contrast in families and women, for example, is found in young girl Manon's household/family conditions in Berri and Pagnol (1986) *Jeanne de Florette* and *Manon des Sources* – compared with the devious young actress who upsets a share household in Hilditch and McCall (2002) *The Actress*. In Berri, a traditional family covert their neighbor's farm and sabotage Manon's family – until the saboteur desires Manon and stalks her, vainly hoping to restore both families. In Hildich, an actress (of around Manon's age) joins a share household and then overturns everyone's desires.

In the public sphere, what economic relationships, exchanges and tensions drive the argument? What political changes are encouraged or forced? What "cultural" assumptions, habits, language limitations, anxieties and cruelties inhabit these characters' ways of thinking and dealing with self and others? For a serious screenwriter, performer or recordist, none of these questions of each character's worldly agenda is immediately answered with a glib label. The whole reason for taking the trouble to explore *Evelyn's* traveling workers in a hotel, or people overturning colonial invasions, is that serious screen thinkers like Ted Kotcheff (1971) do not have immediate glib labels for things. Strong filmmakers do research and explore lifestyles, rather than jump to conclusions. Kotcheff went to outback Australia to explore the worldly agenda of a rough and boozy male mining town in the 1970s, and additionally gave a 2009/1971 interview in *Wake In Fright's* DVD extras. When some Australian "literati" tried to censor Kotcheff, Jones and Cook *Wake In Fright*, he replied:

> "I'm a director. I don't come here to criticize human beings. I come here to observe them and to empathize with them. I'm capable of anything. I'm also capable of behaving badly. Chekhov had the great line about his characters: 'I'm not the judge of my characters. I'm their best witness.' That's what I do. That's part of my own artistic credo. I want to know about people. Why do they behave as they do? I'm not interested in judging them. As Socrates said, 'know thyself.' And I don't know myself. I try to know myself but I don't know myself. I'm very attracted to characters who don't know themselves."

In *Evelyn*, perhaps Evelyn is a quick student of the unfamiliar language and culture that Dale agrees to tutor; or perhaps Evelyn is a cultural lummox. We improve our understanding of Evelyn when the writer ask and answers this cultural (language) area of Evelyn's agenda. Again, political questions shape any movie argument (which is why *Heaven And Earth's* political silence

was a puzzle). Perhaps Andy's violent occupation of Evelyn's homeland is worse than the writer first believed – or perhaps the writer's beliefs about Evelyn's homeland have been mistaken. This political area can not be known, one way or another, unless writers and filmmakers ask questions beyond the immediate cubic meter close to the camera, microphone and thinker, and extend research out into the public area of a place.

Again, if there are "no economic imperatives" shaping the motives of the screen characters, the characters are probably going to come across as unbelievable and uninteresting. If the makers have not bothered to explore these and other areas of the worldly agenda – even if only to build a backstory – why should spectators bother with shallow exploration, either? This is not to say all movies should explore the areas of embodied mind, body, intimacy, friendship, family, economy, politics and culture in equal measure every time – far from it. The point of film discourse is that another filmmaker can explore the knowledge gaps in an earlier movie's argument.

There are plenty of strong and honestly written personal movies that unfold in limited places that do not at first glance appear to involve the public agenda of culture and political economy. A small-scale movie, say, may only follow two people during their first night of serious dating in a quite suburb where no one else enters the frame for 100 minutes. Where are the cultural, political and economic areas of such an argument? If this one evening is of great interest to a strong writer, then the worldly agenda will unfold. Slight differences in the cultural background of the two lovers will become amplified under these tense conditions of a first series date. One party may not even culturally approve of the evening together, unsupervised by political and cultural overlords. In being careful to ask agenda questions that amplify the filmmaking, answers to culture will either drive this "small" story as a massively inclusive drama that bonds the two characters together,

or subcultures may expel one from the other. Cultural difference may lead to intimate amusing or aggressive utterances, and so on. The key to exploring the worldly agenda is to ask questions. Politically, the couple may gesture injury (they poke and slap), or gesture bonding and affection (pet and smooch) as they spend time together. The nighttime suburb itself is political: seeking shelter for intimacy, does the couple transgress on another's private property in the dark? Who owns devices such as vehicles, roads or clothes? And what economic backstory pushes or lures the couple on to the streets at night, anyway? By having this worldly agenda and its areas of questioning – from the interiority of the character to the widest cultural questions among world – a writer shapes the scope of a particular movie. Similar questions would drive the writing of Evelyn and Dale's first date together. By asking the worldly agenda's eight questions – a character's thoughts (including feelings, desires), their body, intimacy, friendships, family (or household, loyalty groups), their economy, politics and culture – and these questions in relation to others – the writer expands the development of one movie scene into scenes that posit what happened before and after.

Overall, the worldly agenda consists of two spheres of questions about "the private life of people" and "things public." Movie thought is one of the few investigations designed to address both the private and public spheres of the human condition. In most movie arguments, especially expulsive milieu arguments, there will be an exploration of the dramatic tensions between some individuals' private actions and the power these individuals obtain in the public sphere. For example, in *Educating Rita*, Rita has her home life and then she has her public life at university. When she brings home her university books, her husband Deny interprets this as a threatening public intrusion on his private life with Rita. This private-public nexus is at the heart the lifestyles people (and movie characters) are born into, learn about,

initiate or deal with. In 1765, the British Secretary of State, Halifax, used the police to raid a law-abiding person's home – searching for the private individual's data records. In doing so, the state minister's action was judged by England and Wales' High Court Kings Bench (1765, 2013) to be much like Spain's Inquisition:

> "for ranksacking a man's secret drawers and boxes to come at evidence against him, is like racking [torturing] his body to come at his secret thoughts. The warrant is to seize all the plaintiff's books and papers without exception, and carry them before Lord Halifax; what? Has a Secretary of State a right to see all a man's private letters of correspondence, family concerns, trade and business? This would be monstrous indeed; and if it were lawful, no man could endure to live in this country."

The court defended citizens' "private sphere" and found against the tyrant minister in the British government. Yet privacy at home is only half of a free country. The following year, in 1766, and updated in 2012, Sweden's *Regeringskansliet* or Cabinet (2012, 2004, 1766) was the first modern jurisdiction to write and enforce:

> "The Principle of Public Access. The principle of public access means that the general public and the mass media newspapers, radio and television are to be guaranteed an unimpeded view of activities pursued by the government and local authorities."

The Public Access law also imposes an unimpeded (and hence honest and non-trivial) modus operandi on investigative journalists to report public affairs wisely in the media. It views the befuddling of news with tabloid cant as an impediment to knowledge of government or public activity. Taxpayers

or citizens have a right to that knowledge. In sum, there is a principle in the worldly agenda of one's private and public life to safeguard others' privacy and public life – or what Schepisi, Stoppard and Le Carre (1990) *The Russia House* call acting as "merely decent human beings." When weak politicians and media upend these protections and defend the "privacy of government" and lay bare people's private lives – we are, according to the quoted 1760s generation, living in a time-place of inquisitions: with its collapse of science, arts and liberty.

In developing a movie argument like *Evelyn*, or *Hitch* in Chapter 3, or any public movie argument, makers are faced with their beliefs, preferences and actions for either upholding privacy and open governance or invading privacy and pandering to closed, inquisitorial government.

34.

Time Shapes in Our History, Thought, Plot and Story.

The time element in *Evelyn* is somewhat complicated because it is developed from historical sources. "Fred" is based Pierre Pigneaux who arrived in Vietnam in the 1700s. Pigneaux used Vatican and French backing to support local prince Nguyen Anh's side in an ongoing civil war. "Gerry" is based on Nguyen Anh. Pigneux and Nguyen Anh gained power in Saigon in 1777 (Mantienne 2012:78). This scene is plotted twice in the movie as its opening and closing scenes. Audiences interpret the first scene as 1777 and the same scene "on the screen" at the film festival as the present day.

The historical "invasion and colonization" film, within the modern day hotel story, runs over 240 years. Only key events from its research are developed as scenes in *Evelyn's* circa 100-minute movie. The historical timeline is moreover divided into two periods: the past history timeline where the characters wear period costumes and the few months of the present day in which the present-day lives of the performers are explored. Moving back and forth between the past and the present, the film's plotting looks complicated in this written study, but audiences naturally watch parallel plots and easily distinguish "old costumes and the square-rigger" from "contemporary costumes and the airport." Audiences usually understand when they behold parts of the plot in the past and parts in the present day. Culturally, we are about the forth generation of audiences accustomed to parallel cutting between subplots, first watched in Edwin S. Porter et al. (1903) *The Life of an American Fireman.*

By following the actions – of rowing, sword-fighting, jogging on the beach in sports clothes, arriving at the hotel in the airport limousine, and so on – the shape of what is plotted in time is enacted as *Evelyn's* 100-minute "plot arc." This is perhaps the most obvious arc, of many arcs, that shape a typical movie argument. The plot arc is an overall strategic shape that positions what happens first, what happens second and so on, in the movie's "running time" order. This arc is clearly measured in the "time in" column of an AV script. In a movie plot like Section-11's *Two Hands* plot, we know the Sydney street scene occurs around minute 12 because its page number is 12. But "when" is that scene, in terms of Alex and Jimmy's life "story"? Is the script page from a flashback or memory that happens years after the event? Or is one of the characters dreaming this scene? Is the scene invented for a friend as a hypothetical? Unless we listen to and watch all the other scenes in the plot, we do not know how the Sydney Street scene relates to Alex and Jimmy's "story" – their actual lives. Similarly, we do not understand many new beliefs about Fred and Gerry, until we follow many scenes of *Evelyn's* plot.

From listening to and watching a whole plot, audiences usually understand the characters' "story." One person's understanding of the story usually varies from another. Usually, though, people agree on the plot. People in dispute can return to the written or filmed plot and check their assumptions about the order, duration and kinds of interactions arrayed. For example, Sections-49 sets out filmmaker Alma Reville's entire plot, action by action, as "coverage." Arguments are argued in actions.

Besides plot, the second most obvious time arc and "whole strategic shape" running through a movie is its story arc. The story is the chronological unfolding of people's lives in a screen argument, as interpreted by its audience. *Evelyn's* story arc is not necessarily the same as the plot arc.

Section-20 plots these three events in this plot order:

PLOT ON FILM:

1. In period costumes, Fred and Gerry occupy the palace. (1777)

2. At dawn, Andy intercepts Dale on the beach. (Now)

3. In period costume, Fred dies of dysentery. (1799)

STORY IN MIND:

***1777*. Fred and Gerry occupy the palace. (1)**

***1799*. Fred dies of dysentery. (3)**

***Now*. At dawn, Andy intercepts Dale on the beach. (2)**

> The history argued in *Evelyn* runs: 1777, 1799, now. When audiences interpret a movie argument, they usually pattern a story similar to a history chronology. When quizzed on the story, a spectator might say: "Fred and Gerry occupied the palace but Fred died. Centuries later, Dale and Andy met on Fred and Gerry's beach." In the movie, this story is shuffled in the plot. But the audience mentally rearranges the interactions, restoring the interactions to the chronological order of characters' lives

People do fascinating things with time. We participate in our world; remember what we our selves and other people have done; write down these

interactions as plots; and then interpret our plotted information as a story. We also conjecture and fantasize events and this thinking may be written into a plot, too. Often, a complicated plot is useful for makers. In *Evelyn's* case, the argument being put is that, in the past people have fought horrifically, but the same kinds of people can co-operate together today and profit from a movie that explores that past. To put this screen argument, the past and present are shuffled in the plot. The much more straightforward, chronological "story arc" is another shape – not necessarily the same shape – that people interpret for themselves in daily life; and when interpreting the screen.

In our ordinary lives, a friend may arrive late for a meeting. The friend gives a reason for their lateness: they tell a story of what unexpectedly happened: "Sorry I'm late getting here, but there were road work delays soon after I left home, and I'd forgotten to charge my phone."

This spoken plot is told in the reverse order of the real story of what happened in historical time. "Late getting here" happened last. The uncharged phone happened first. People naturally speak and write of the world of interactions in many permutations of plotting. Usually, the audience effortlessly untangles and reorders what is said into story order. People will naturally interpret a story from scattered information provided in a plot and people's dialogue. In fact, developing our understanding of a story appears to be one of the great pleasures of listening to and watching a movie. Whether that story is true is another matter that can be checked by crosschecking one's thoughts, actions, records, material traces and other people's arguments.

All manner of filmed people are written to interact in film plots and stories along timelines, but only some of these characters are real people in history

today or at some time in the past. In *Heaven And Earth*, Le Ly and her father visit their ancient family cemetery on their farm Her father speaks of people now dead who once lived in history. But some people in this movie invent for themselves fallacious beliefs about other people they meet. For example, Le Ly's village eventually believes wrongly that Le Ly has betrayed them to the invader. Le Ly believes that partner Steve will be her common law husband in America – but later, Le Ly discovers the deceiving Steve is still tied to his wife for alimony. In her thoughts, Le Ly's "future timeline" is proved false when the present catches up with her American situation. At other times what people imagine of others is not fallacious. Rather, what is imagined is fantasy, conjecture or typology. The children in young Le Ly's village play outdoor games, including "playing soldiers." They play soldiers of all sides, as types that they have witnessed, or as scenarios invented as conjecture (what if the invaders kill our parents?) or fantasy (what if legendary warriors defend us?).

The key to sorting out timelines and people (real and imaginary) is, this study contends, the element of historical (real-world) "action." Take a child running with a toy gun in the fields: The child's play is a real action. The child and the action – the whole interaction with other children – can be located on the historical timeline that all living people share with the past. We do things as time moves forward – we live forward. The child's play was sparked by witnessing real invaders. The interaction amongst real soldiers and village children who witnessed them, can be located some time earlier than the children's play on the historic timeline. Coming closer to the present day, Le Ly has recalled these children at play and written the scene in her movie. She carries the children's play as a thought: a feeling, a memory and a justified true belief. But Le Ly also has a thought about both of her brothers being tortured and killed. This belief is only half right. In reality, one brother survives the invasion. So it is possible to think about

actions that are true, and can be put on our shared historical timeline, and actions that are not true but hold just as much sway on our beliefs if we do not test and sort through what we believe.

Movie arguments not only explore what people believe and agree among each other as to how people interact in time. Next – movie arguments also explore people's evaluations and beliefs about: what a "person" is (like our self or another); what a "device" is, when a recording is mistaken for a person; and what screen believers believe in an expulsive milieu.

35.

A Lovers' History versus a Supplicants' Anthropomorphizing.

As we think and act in time-place, we touch the invisible air and devise this air with our mouths and ears. Although all of our skin touches air, filmmakers are particularly interested in the touch of mouth and ear to the envelope of air around the globe. The elements of speech expressions and gestured tones are transmitted from people's mouths to ears and recordings – and from recordings to audiences – through the unseen air.

In *Evelyn*, when Dale tutors Evelyn, Dale speaks the word "Paris." The air is devised in Dale's mouth to project air vibrations "Paris" that hit and vibrate Evelyn's ears. Dale also devises a sandwich from bread and vegetables, and hands this sandwich to Evelyn to consume. Similarly, Dale devises and transmits the "Paris"-shaped air to Evelyn's ears. One device is hand-devised and eaten. The other device is mouth-devised, listened to and interpreted. Spoken air is an audio device that is shaped by people's mouths, just as a sandwich is shaped by hand. If Evelyn is unsure about the meaning of "Paris," Evelyn could shape the air and ask: "Is Paris the Shakespeare character or the French capital?" But, whatever Paris is, neither Dale nor Evelyn believe the spoken air devised between them is a French city or a Shakespearean role, or anything else other than devised air and their meeting of minds.

There is devised air and there are people. We do not anthropomorphize the air, saying its Paris-shaped sound waves are a role or a town. Devices such as vibrating air are not people. People shape cosmic or natural places like air, silica and grain as clothes, instruments, working drafts, consumables or "devices." But turning to people: people "conceive" life as zygotes,

embryos and sometimes people give "birth" to babies that "mature" into responsible new people. Many complications of maturation are explored in John Duigan et al. (1986) *The Year My Voice Broke*. People are not devised devices – despite the fantastic conjecture in Whale et al. (1935) *Bride Of Frankenstein,* where Dr. Frankenstein devises wholly new "people" from a patchwork of dead body parts and electricity.

Let us take another device in *Evelyn* – a mirror. Preparing for a scene, Dale makes up in the mirror, and Evelyn watches Dale's face reflect from the mirror, while they speak together. Dale and Evelyn do not usually mistake Dale's talking reflection for the real person Dale who sits before the mirror. In the audio and motion-picture layers between them – the devised airwaves, and color emitted from Dale's skin to reflect from the mirror – we do not mistake these devised or natural transmissions to be people. After all, we usually listening to or watch a real person speak or do their makeup, close to hand.

Yet how easily audiences forget this difference between an "air and mirror device" and a real "person" when it comes to interpreting screen recordings of people's traces. What is recorded to a recording is color energy radiated from skin and spoken breath pressure – no more of a person's body than this. Layers of people's light and breath traces are recorded as news programs and movies. While a person would not mistake the same traces in Dale's dressing room for the actual person Dale interacting with Evelyn, billions of people do think and go through life as if they have engaged with a person (and not their reflected light and breath pressure) on their news or movie screen device. As White House filmmaker Bernays (2010) proclaimed early last century in Section-08's audiovisual script:

"The intelligent manipulation of the masses is an invisible government

which is the true ruling power of our country."

If Evelyn watched Dale in a live video telecom conversation, both Dale and Evelyn would know they exist because they are in conversation – much as Evelyn knows Dale is smiling, even though the smile is only watched in the mirror. Dale's smile is a live smile, which responds to Evelyn's conversation. But if Evelyn is listening to and watching the playback of their current movie scene on the film set, Evelyn is not about to confuse this recorded sound and image of Dale as "the person Dale" who sits nearby learning lines. The screen Evelyn listens to and watches is "a device of Dale's recent traces."

A similar screen device is the political campaign of "Big Brother" in Radford and Orwell (1984) *1984,* as well as George Orwell's 1948 novel manuscript published in 1949. Big Brother dominates millions of allied screen believers in the North Atlantic. Orwell argues: millions of English-speakers in a dollar-zone economy submit to a leader's screen image every day of their lives. It is the leader's recorded trace – and never the living person – who dominates the homes, businesses and public places of this alliance. This interaction – whereby a party records a talking head and a follower anthropomorphizes the "leader" screen device – is a theme of many movie arguments such as *Citizen Kane*, *1984, Dave, Pleasantville* and *Ides Of March* (1941, 1984, 1993, 1998, 2011).

In these movies, submissive audiences anthropomorphize recorded screen traces of a politician or a political proxy. Screen believers build their most important beliefs from the official recording, rather than conduct their own research, crosschecking, and conversations with live people. New knowledge is suppressed. Screen believers choose to follow a leader in a narrow channel of life and on screen. Initiative is quashed and those seizing power wield fear as a blunt screen weapon on their domestic and international markets. These "fear" diseconomies eventually rupture or

collapse into war (Paxton 2004: L3582: Tuchman 1984: 242; Curtis 2004; Pilger and Munro 1994b; Bushkovitch 2012: 369).

Individuals – who reject the anxious, politicised, following crowd – struggle to continue their inquiries, befriending others in participatory interactions with "other real people" in "actual places" rather than screen places in *Pleasantville*, *Hotel Rwanda, Syriana* and *State Of Play* (1993, 2004, 2005, 2009). This includes connecting people and places with telecoms in the latter three films. The hotel manager calls his overseas investors for help, a fugitive calls his attacker in *Syriana* and a victim's phone leads an investigator to break a conspiracy. But In *1984*, everyone with approved social status faces forward to the government-controlled home screen or public screen device. They only deal with their neighbours and overseas countries within the stringent limits of screen orders, approved news and lifestyle habits that screen personalities broadcast or pipe from the alliance's elite. Followers' anthropomorphizing interactions are explored in *Evelyn* when Evelyn negotiates new friendships with Andy, Bobby and Charlie – who are devotees of tabloid news channels. Their anthropomorphizing of "national leaders and enemies" on their tabloid screens makes it difficult for Evelyn to hold a rational conversation with Andy, Bobby and Charlie at first. So Evelyn is more attracted to Fred and Gerry, who are more careful in their television listening and watching. But most of all, Evelyn is attracted to Dale who also prefers to reject A, B and C – the anxious, politicised crowd followers.

Many movie arguments explore couples who reject the well-beaten, "follower-the-leader" path. Like Dale and Evelyn, Edward and Laura (in De Niro and Roth 2006 *The Good Shepherd*) conduct a mature relationship away from the anxious crowd until Edward is seduced by Clover, whose family are part of a secret society. Edward and his secret society "family" set up C.I.A. in the 1940s. Similarly in *1984*, Julia and Winston reject the crowd's anthropomorphizing of the colonial war screen as must-see TV. Instead, the couple deal with each other's bodies and actions as real, living

people in a mature sexual relationship in the small "private" sphere they construct for themselves in real time. But the Oceania alliance stamps out privacy, room-by-room, network-by-network, across the Atlantic (as it elites in *Eurasia* and *Eastasia*). Eventually the alliance's secret police capture, torture and crush the capability of both Julia and Winston to befriend each other and know any strength of self or history. Edward and Clover's son and the son's lover in *The Good Shepherd* face similar ends. Here is this private-public inversion discussed in Section-33: private families are open for inquisition and public power is closed to scrutiny. Why? Since 1945, anxious over-rearmament investment (especially nuclear), ongoing colonialism under new labels, fear and hatred – are at the root of many movies arguments in Section-50, and at the root of dramatic conflicts today in Horner 2014: 29, 196; Rhodes 2010:156, 282; Ritter 2010:18; Rees and Dallek 2008; Chang and Halliday 2005:502; Cain 1994:23; Graeber 2012:5, 367; and Dallek 2010: 106).

The North Atlantic citizens of "Oceania" in *1984* respond to a screen argument as if it is a person – a violent "Brother" who must be obeyed. The talking head promises his or her followers to protect them from national security emergencies (Curtis 2004; Pilger 2010). What is not admitted on official screens is that various elites' colonial invasions overseas have created the endless emergencies (Graeber 2012: 5, 367). In his landmark essay, "You and the Atomic Bomb" (1945) Orwell invented the term "Cold War" to describe 1945's war victors' ongoing colonial invasions, such as their invasion into South East Asia. Criticism of the media's role in these invasions was then argued in his 1949 novel *1984*. Given incessant official screen versions and schooling that rationalizes invasion, millions go quiet and anthropomorphize a deeply felt and preferred relationship with an official's "air and mirror" traces on screen. But an audience's recorded screen device is not a person. It is a devised argument – distributed by media people and interpreted by audience people – or suppressed and not open to

question, which is Bronowski's conclusion in "Knowledge and Certainty" in *The Ascent Of Man* (op. cit.).

The recorded screen is an electrical device that moves air and emits light. The screen is simply a fan heater – moving air, emitting light and kinetic energy – but with a "recorded gossamer addition" of some body traces "performing an argument." When we hear news of a courageous politician, hated enemy or star performer's death, we are briefly reminded of the truth about the screen recordings we have of the person: Nobody is home in the device. No body was ever there. The recorded screen is a devised, miniscule trace of a person, similar to body heat or dandruff. It is not the living body. We need to look behind the screen, beyond the instrument, across the network, into other pubic subcultures we do not understand, into closed government or into the maker's studio, for any "people" other than ourselves – when we interpret or follow a recorded device as another person. For a while, the lovers in Mendes and Ball (1999) *American Beauty*, and the lovers in *1984,* touch and live their own history in their private rooms. They deny the screen alienation of their "betters." In *American Beauty*, they escape Big Brother and film their own lovers' history in another city.

For this study to argue a lovers' history between Evelyn and Dale – in dynamic interactions with anthropomorphizing supplicants Andy, Bobby and Charlie – then *Evelyn* has to control the shape of its plot and story argument in the next Section.

36. Familiarity, Shadowlands, Climax and Resolve.

In Chapter 1, Kaye (2009:6) says, "An argument is a discussion in which reasons are advance in favor of a proposal." If *Evelyn* is an argument, what is its proposal? In *Evelyn*, its historical film-within-a-film explores colonization and genocide. But every day, the performers put down their arms, remove their period costumes and live together in the real world of the hotel. *Evelyn's* proposal is that:

> "We can move on from the five million genocide in South East Asia if thinkers and actors from many backgrounds interrogate that invasion as screen inquiries, while learning to live together today in the real world."

Redescribing "argument" differently, Murray Smith says: "What is needed is an analysis of how a narrative can deliver the basic constituents of argument – premises, a pattern of inference, and a conclusion." (2006:34). What are the premises of *Evelyn*? The premises in Evelyn are the early interactions in the movie where leading characters are introduced. So Fred going ashore and meeting Gerry is a premise, for example. Evelyn meeting Dale for the first time is premise too. What follows from Fred and Gerry's meeting is that they combine strength to occupy the palace in the historical story. What follows from the Dale and Evelyn premise is that they fall in love. The details of how their love develops is set out as a "pattern of inference" based on the researcher asking hundreds of questions of participation, interview, compilation and other research. The inferences are made that:

> "on a movie shoot, real singles X and Y were sexually attracted and slept with each other – Dale and Evelyn are on a movie shoot, and sexually attracted – therefore it is inferred (and written in the argument) that they sleep with each other, subject to every other interaction in the argument."

As for *Evelyn's* conclusion, a movie "conclusion" consists of two sequences:

"climax" and "resolution." The crucial factor of an argument's climax has been discussed in depth earlier in Section-22, where the most emotional sequence is put towards the end and the rest of the interactions built around it. Movie climaxes are quadruple climaxes, where the leading characters' dual "strands of liberation and affection" both climax and resolve. Moreover, these liberation and affection strands are argued in both the private and public sphere of the movie, making a total of four interrelated climaxes in strong movie arguments during the climax sequence. *Evelyn's* liberation and affection strand is argued in its public history film-within-film: Andy's military state visit and death at the airport is its climax. Cascading with the public airport and funeral scenes are scenes and interactions that explore the climax of Evelyn and Dale's private liberation and affection strands.

If this is *Evelyn's* climax sequence, what is its resolution? There is a funeral for Andy, involving all the main characters and then Evelyn, Bobby and Charlie deliver Andy's eulogy at the premier of the *Evelyn* movie. The premiere movie runs, the lights go down and Evelyn leaves with Dale and the others. This resolution proposes that "today we can honestly interrogate an invasion as a movie inquiry, while learning to live together in the real world" – and *Evelyn* so concludes. In combination, the airport climax and aftermath resolution are the "conclusion" to *Evelyn*. Where movies differ from Kaye and Smith's argument form is in developing the premises, pattern of inference and resolution proposal "around the climax."

In order to develop this overall argumentative pattern for a movie, makers call on the "three act/climax" shape which is also called "familiarity, shadowlands, climax and resolve" in this study. The first act "familiarity" sequence in *Heaven And Earth* introduces Le Ly as is a happy, contented and loving farm girl. In *A Cry In The Dark*, Lindy is introduced as a hard-working, well-organized, loving mother, devoted to her children. These are

first act premises. Later, in Alma Reville's movie *Hitchcock*, Alma is introduced as a highly successful global woman filmmaker in America. In *Evelyn*, all the characters get together in the first act scenes and become familiar.

After these familiarizing premises are put to the audience, the argument rolls into the second act "shadowlands." Dramaturgy analyst Ian Robinson (1993, 1997) developed shadowlands theory from Joseph Campbell's analysis of world mythology, notably *Hero With a Thousand Faces* (1972, 1949) as well as Christopher Vogler's journey archetypes (1992) and a century of earlier theorists. Robinson and others discern from movies and other myth-telling that the familiar first act rolls into a threshold and turning point where main characters are thrown to challenging places of doubt, uncertainty, and heightened emotions – fear, lust, exuberance of adventure, estrangement, curiosity, suffering, and so on, depending on the movie argument in question. Leading characters are thrown in the deep end, whether poor or elite, good or bad. This shape is discerned in all 170 features in Section-50. For instance, in Ford and Steinbeck (1940) *The Grapes Of Wrath*, a young farmer leaves prison on parole only to discover his family have been evicted from their farm. He joins them "on the road" as destitute refugees in their own country with no social security. The elite family in Polanski and Shakespeare (1971) *Macbeth* want more power. They assassinate their leader and are thrown into shadowlands. In Wilder, Diamond et al. (1959) *Some Like It Hot*, gamblers lose their shirt and are thrown into the shadowlands of sexual deception and organised crime. *Evelyn*'s second act shadowlands begins as South East Asia is invaded and colonized, and, in the private sphere, Andy undermines Evelyn's new intimate relationship with Dale.

What is filmmaker Alma Reville's shadowlands in Chapter 3's *Hitchcock*? The turning point in the following short synopsis is marked with an asterisk*. Shadowlands comes as they fear business decline, reinvent their brand and risk their life savings, in order to make their desired argument:

Hitchcock **(2012)**

In the late 1950s, Alfred Hitchcock and his life-long creative and sexual partner Alma Reville were the most successful filmmakers in the world. But* they fear their business is in decline. They reinvent their business image by making the 1960 blockbuster *Psycho*. The studios are too scared to invest in their controversial movie, so Hitch and Alma risk their private home and business fortune to go it alone and make *Psycho*. Hitch is jealous of Alma's business relationships with other men, he must cleverly outwit America's religious fundamentalist film censors, and he collapses in a nervous breakdown. As Alma has developed the *Psycho* screenplay, produced her husband, and cast *Psycho's* stars, Alma has no trouble commanding her crew and directing the *Psycho* horror film until Hitch recuperates. Having risked everything, Alma steps into the limelight at the world premiere of blockbuster *Psycho*. This movie contrasts a film industry's anxious thinking and action – with Alma Reville's logical, masterly, friendly thinking and action.

In 1959, Alma and Hitch mortgaged their personal capital in order to finance *Psycho*. They met further reversals when the American censor threatened their investment. In the affection strand of their argument, Hitch and Alma's private relationship and their public relationships with colleagues were also in jeopardy – such is a movie argument's typical shadowlands.

Section-15 suggests a movie's second act shadowlands is an "existential crisis." Chapter headings in Wartenberg (2008: L88) list the kinds of existential predicaments that burden people. This study observes that these predicaments are also embraced in strong movie arguments. Characters cope with reversals and discoveries around: existence, freedom, others

(companions and strangers), anxiety, finitude (limitations and mortality), absurdity, authenticity and oppression.

Considering "existence" first in the case of *Evelyn's* second act shadowlands: Evelyn is a person who is sentient – has a body and thought (feelings, desires, beliefs) in the private sphere. Being a person, Evelyn develops their maturity, competence and responsibility curve among other people. Evelyn is capable of thinking through "action, gesture and speech along a variety of story scenarios," including a scenario Evelyn thinks is most likely to occur at time 2 if Evelyn first prefers to initiate action x at time 1. For example, sentient Evelyn feels sexual attraction to Dale. Evelyn believes that if Evelyn initiates friendliness to Dale in the hotel, then Dale will likely reciprocate and friendliness will cascade into intimacy and loving intimacy will, in their case, result in sex. Having thought through and acted on these expectations, Evelyn and Dale are faced with "drama's complex actions" when Andy surprises them by seducing Dale and snubbing Evelyn. Out of this "complex" reversal to Evelyn's sentient expectations, Evelyn reconsiders their existence and initiates a different path of interactions with fresh intentions of regaining Andy's friendship and Dale's intimacy. A filmmaker develops such an "investigation into consciousness, being or existence" from the standpoint that "Evelyn is a person whose thoughts are not separate from their embodied actions, gestures and speech among others." The filmmaker is existentially capable of putting themselves in the shoes of Evelyn, feeling, evaluating, believing and initiating action much as Evelyn would do – both from inside Evelyn's dynamic emotional point of view and from without as an observer of scenes in the argument.

Turning to the existential idea of freedom in *Evelyn's* shadowlands reversal, this is explored in the historical film-within-the-film. Fred arrives in a place where Gerry is defeated and in retreat from Dale and Evelyn (performing their historical roles). Fred believes Fred's kind are superior to people who have not ascended into

Fred's religious hierarchy. Fred offers to liberate Gerry by taking Gerry into Fred's conceptual scheme and – from a preference and belief in this scenario – Fred and Gerry will defeat, kill or enslave Dale and Evelyn, and so free the people who follow Fred and Gerry's bureaucratic rule over their instigated colony. But, in mutually supporting each other's liberty, Fred restores more room to initiate actions for Gerry – and Gerry increases Fred's competence to initiate actions too. Both people have had to find the courage to go their own way in the face of greater numbers who would follow Dale and Evelyn to quash Fred and Gerry. As liberty requires courage, followers are usually happy to give it up (in the case of "followers" renouncing freedom in *1984, The Good Shepherd, Pleasantville, The Crucible* and so on). Liberty becomes an existential dilemma in a colonial reversal – especially as the person who prefers to believe they have the most power and liberty – Fred – abhors liberty for anyone lower in the hierarchy, even Gerry, despite Fred's public relations propaganda about freedom.

When a screen thinker chooses to develop a movie argument, implicit in that choice is the decision to explore a few foreground characters against background and backstory layers of "the whole world of others initiating action in time-place." Movies explore the relationships, especially the liberation and affection conditions of those relationships among people with others. How this is usually argued is to introduce people by their familiar actions in the first act and then upset their expectations going into the second act shadowlands. Evelyn journeys through *Evelyn's* second act patterns of inference by discovering people who are helpful or injurious – and how these relationships are changed over time.

Anxiety is a fourth predicament for people. Not only is Evelyn slightly anxious about reestablishing friendship with Fred and Gerry after Andy overturns Evelyn's friendships with Dale, Bobby and Charlie, but the break with Dale tips Evelyn into a much more general malaise about existence, day to day at the hotel and on the working film set. Evelyn feels cut adrift from Evelyn's own actions,

gestures and speech. It is in this state of existential ennui that Evelyn grapples with a return to genuine or authentic friendship with Fred and Gerry – and from that subsidence of anxiety, Evelyn initiates a plan to spend time again with Dale. One feels a sense of this anxiety when Guess, Nguyen and Pilger discuss the collective suppression of knowledge in the media. It is out of this existential unease that *Evelyn* was written.

Finitude or awareness of one's own limitations and mortality is an attribute of people and their maturity, competence and responsibility curve. A less mature and competent person is one who less aware of people's limitations and mortality. For example, Bobby is a tabloid news screen believer who irrationally believes whole far-away countries are depraved – and this justifies the bombing of women, men and children in their homes and businesses. Via Bobby's screen beliefs, Bobby prefers not to understand that children everywhere have limitations – finitude – and are not as responsible for their thought and action as, say, older Bobby is. Evelyn considers Bobby is an anxious, foolish and cruel person for believing that other people's children are born omnipotent and with an depraved destiny that requires Bobby's profitable war investments and tabloid subscription. If Bobby had the maturity to accept their own mortality and give up their all-pervasive denial and fear, then Bobby would recoil from causing other people's deaths. With maturity, Bobby et al. may leverage their own limitations in support of self and others, mind their own business, and live and let live. Perhaps that is Bobby's shadowlands journey.

How does *Evelyn* shift its argument to the existential predicament of "absurdity"? Unlike the trees, people think and act, and our thinking sometimes gets entangled in our actions and vice versa. Andy must feel in an absurd situation when the massive personal success of gaining a starring role in *Evelyn's* historical film is randomly intersected and disturbed by the fact that Andy's ex-lover Dale comes to live in the same hotel and work in the same film. The intersections of so many

people's subjective timelines (Andy thinking about: "my career, my ex-lovers, Dale's shoes; are we on the same floor?") with the group's shared objective clock time at home and work means that there are often awkward conjunctions of time, place, people and their actions. In Gilles Mimouni et al. (1986) *L'Appartement*, people think their own selfish thoughts as they bump into each other in public; they awkwardly borrow identities; or the main character's internal reverie replaces external time. As directors say of film shoots: success is a matter of keeping everyone on the same page – and the page is a time concept in movie thought. Andy is a highly competent professional performer who manages to avoid absurd intersections most of the time amid *Evelyn's* emotional, evaluative, belief and relationship shifts. Andy matures. Yet sadly, Andy slips up and dies absurdly in the airport climax.

As to, authenticity, Dale and Andy have been in an intimate relationship before. In the backstory, they presumably had a good time for a while but the relationship had unraveled for many reasons that *Evelyn* explores again when, in *Evelyn's* second act shadowlands, Andy seduces Dale at the beach and the stars are back together again. Yet there were reasons why Dale and Andy broke up once before, and neither of them has matured that much more since their intimacy unraveled. Consequently Dale becomes alienated from self and Andy – their fragile friendship is imploding – and Dale (and eventually Andy) realizes their relationship is inauthentic. In parting and saving a stronger friendship, both Dale and Andy lead more authentic lives.

Finally: oppression. There is the obvious sense that *Evelyn's* invasion argument-within-an-argument explores horrific oppression and its overthrow. For example: "new workers are beaten to within an inch of their lives by Charlie and Bobby's police force, which keeps the plantation workers virtually imprisoned for their working life." At other layers of oppression, this study explores how a screen argument is built up by its element of "gestures" which are used to recognize or

derecognize other people as friends or even as people. In the layer of gestures that weave a strong screen argument about people, the argument is always positing its views or tones that oppress or uplift self and others. Yet, as emphasized in Section-35's *A Lovers' History versus a Supplicants' Anthropomorphizing,* careless, anxious, even foolish people will take a quick glance at another person's image or hear their accent and immediately invent a whole lifetime of praise or hatred for the other, even if that other is no more than an advertiser's device in aid of invasion or local state violence. When Bobby's police glance at Dale the plantation worker, what is watched is color energy radiated from Dale's skin and what is listened to is spoken breath pressure – no more of a person's body than this. A flimsy gossamer (a film) of people's light and breath traces refresh Bobby's desired belief that Dale is of the tormenting and expendable class. We have seen this lack of effort to get to know a fellow person by their actions in Hunt's torture and execution of Kasimov in *Mission Impossible (One)* and in distributors' dehumanization of lovers Phuong and Fowler in two versions of *The Quiet American.*

The shadowlands is a negative notion of – "characters thrown and rising to the challenge of their familiar world turned upside down." This strategic shape takes a whole familiarizing first act to set up, before its negation can be understood. In the ongoing world or "vira-old" (Section-09's "heroic time") of people taking the initiative, the thoughts and actions of self among others become highly uncertain. The journey becomes one of inference, and exploratory co-operation, towards re-establishing *eudaimonia* or "good lifestyles" for the characters. Some characters like Andy do not gain this for long, and all people pass the way of dust sometime after an individual story is made. In movie arguments, this journey of return to future happiness is either written as an expulsive drama – of protagonists expelling some nemeses – or the shadowlands journey is written as the milieu of some relatively mature, competent and responsible people who converse

everyone's desires and beliefs to deal with life on Earth without suffering, and with increasing pleasure and happiness (Epicurus 2014).

Evelyn's "familiar/shadowlands/climax/resolution" shape is found in historic and biographic movies such as Mann, Roth and Brenner (1999) *The Insider*; Howard and Goldsman (2001) *A Beautiful Mind*; and Scott, Jacobson and Zaillian (2006) *American Gangster*; all performed by Russell Crowe et al. In developing *Evelyn's* historical subplot, a burdensome writing problem is that the real world of human history is open-ended. Ongoing history does not reduce to circa 100 minutes with a climax. It has a beginning, as filmed by Alice Roberts et al. (2010), but a problem of history research is that it goes on and on with little hope of peace on Earth, other than our efforts to improve self and the world community in the face of anxiety, folly and cruelty. Researching the appended documentaries and historiography often produces the overwhelming emotion: "will the horror of this time-place ever come to an end?" Suddenly, one realizes – as *Evelyn's* writer – it is up to the writer to assign "start and end dates" to what history will be explored in the movie. History is not like the personal stories that have the existential predicament of limit and finitude in our lifetimes as people. For reasons of history's scale and the limits of our own lives, we have little control over history but we do have complete control over the time shape we write into a new movie.

With "historic time" settled for Evelyn's movie argument, the plot shape for exploring fear and pity (and other emotions) is crafted with Aristotle's warning: movie "spectacles" like the massive show of imperial weaponry and collective suppression of thought that accompanies Andy's airport visit and climax should not swamp the arrangement of emotional expectations, reversals and initiatives that explore people's complex actions in a movie drama:

> "Fear and pity sometimes result from the spectacle and are sometimes aroused by *the actual arrangement of the incidents*, which is preferable

> and the mark of a better poet" … [Spectacle is] "an effect which is not fearful but merely monstrous." (1453b).

Every interaction has to progress the argument in a movie. Interactions either introduce characters' dispositions; explore the struggle to flourish amid the reversal of expectations; build better responsibility curves that survive the most challenging climax; or put a resolution that follows from the characters' previous actions. In setting out hundreds of interactions in a movie array, each interaction involves people's decision-making along a responsibility curve – and this is explored next.

37.

Filming Decision and Responsibility.

In order to explore decisions and responsibility in a movie argument, this study turns to *Evelyn* and its characters A to G. As theory, Andy or Gerry can be any gender. So "hers, his, he, she" is replaced by "their, they" in this inquiry. In Section-20, when A for Andy (the present-day performer) arrives at the hotel for the historical or period film shoot, they encounter a mild or strongly absurd situation of living under the same roof as their ex-lover Dale. Unbeknown to Andy, Dale has been cast to the film too.

Such a sequence in a movie demonstrates that the writer or writers of the argument are exploring people's thinking, decisions and responsibility curves through the way characters act and respond to interactions among others. Andy's "maturity competence and responsibility curve" places Andy's age in a very large range – from circa 12 to 102 – whereby they are capable of auditioning for a movie part, negotiating contracts with their creative management, putting themselves on an international flight, checking into a hotel and discovering that a person they would rather not see at the moment is working on the same project as themselves. One could look at these extremes of age – 12 and 102 – and apply a "skewed bell curve" to this: very few 12-year-olds have the friendly experience and wisdom that gives them the maturity, competence and responsibilities to do these things today and most 102-year-olds would be well into the decline of their curve by this age. A declining curve means their maturity, competence or responsibilities go into decline (Winston 2001). Filmmakers understand the world in shapes. Andy is understood to be on the maturing end of their curve, or the mature part of their curve, or having the mental maturity and competency to deal with their decline, up to a point where they hand over aspects of their care to others, hopefully friends. Normally a complete

screenplay gives approximate ages for leading characters, e.g. ANDY (22), when they are introduced. But *Evelyn* is a theory synopsis that embraces a range, so Andy and Dale's ages have not been specified.

Not only does Andy arrive at the hotel and bump into Dale, later Andy discovers Evelyn has initiated a sexual relationship with Dale. For Andy this is a complex reversal of Andy's personal feelings, preferences, beliefs and actions vis-à-vis ex-lover Dale. Andy's response is to purposely "bump into" Dale on the beach during one of Dale's early morning beach runs and re-establish a friendship and sexual intimacy with Dale.

In terms of the Andy and Dale's story in *Evelyn*, two sequences of decisions and changes in their maturity, competence and responsibility curves are researched and then developed into the draft screenplay – and focused on here: Andy stumbles upon Dale at the hotel and Andy intercepts Dale at the beach. Both the hotel and the beach are interactions. The filmmaker distinguishes two places, two times, two people, their actions, gestures, speech and so forth. Decisions that Andy makes at the beach and the hotel are moreover interwoven with Andy's backstory with Dale (they were once lovers who separated) and interwoven with the backstories and current thought and actions of Evelyn, Gerry et al.

When Andy stumbles upon Dale at the hotel, Andy has not decided to do this. Their meeting, or hearing of each other's arrival at the hotel, is an unexpected almost random coincidence. What adds an air of absurdity to the interaction is that both people are engrossed in their careers and work as performers – neither performer has any intention of breaking their contract with the project and leaving the hotel. They find themselves unexpectedly thrown together for the duration. But in other areas of the interaction, Andy has been making decisions. Andy's preferences are determined by the value

Andy places on various outcomes a, b, c, along with beliefs about the likelihood of these various outcomes are, if the decision to act one way or another is taken.

In other words, when Andy checks into *Evelyn's* hotel, Andy has already weighed up various scenarios: whether to audition for a part in the film, whether to accept the part, or accept another project that Andy has been offered. The part in *Evelyn* was believed to be a more valuable role for Andy and so Andy contracted to the role. Andy made and signed decisions in the contract so that Andy was promised and provided with airline flights of a certain quality and the hotel living conditions of a certain quality. Being a reliable airline, hotel and economy, Andy's expectations of the value of the flight and the hotel were met. Drama complicates these interactions. Andy's evaluations, beliefs, preferences and actions experience a reversal with the unexpected discovery of ex Dale at the hotel. Unexpected drama also complicates some of the working scenes Andy has contracted to perform on set.

In a movie argument, characters are always preferring one outcome or another, taking on new information, making decisions and acting among other people – as well as thinking of these scenarios and interactions, to a degree. So Andy or Dale – whoever found out first – has spoken with reception and made sure they are not on the same floor of the hotel together. Both performers tend to eat in their suites rather than face the public in restaurants. This is another decision made by Andy and Dale that might not be obvious to an audience; but is a decision that Evelyn's screenwriter makes for the characters when putting the argument. As audiences, we can assume that, in the backstory, Andy and Dale's breakup was reasonably civil because Andy does not storm out of the hotel or insist to the distributor or producer that Dale is moved to another hotel (of less value to

either of them). In making the decision to stay, Andy has evaluated the worth of that scenario – such as: it will be good to prove to myself that there are no hard feelings. After all, we work in a pretty small industry, so this is likely to happen again. Besides, my close friends Bobby and Charlie are here. These types of reasoning and feelings are evidence in the movie argument about Andy's relative mature and responsible attitudes along their curve in life.

But when Evelyn and Dale fall in love, Andy feels gutted. Here is another reversal to Andy's expectations. Perhaps Andy has not matured away from Dale as much as has been believed? Some addiction for Dale's affections is still there. While Andy had decided to strengthen the self in the face of an ex-lover, the strong interaction between Dale and Evelyn has been too much of a challenge. Andy protects the self by putting the "responsibility" for feeling unhappy on Evelyn and Dale. To blame others in this way is to live "inauthentically," on an existential view (Wartenberg 70, 133). Evelyn does not even know of Andy and Dale's backstory when Evelyn initiates a friendship with Dale. And Dale is cautious and discreet in getting close to Evelyn. Certainly, Dale doesn't flaunt Evelyn as a trophy in front of Andy – although Andy evaluates this situation in this unhappy way. So how can Evelyn and Dale be held responsible for Andy's feelings? An answer comes from the layered interaction. Dale has a strong or weak sense of responsibilities that Dale acts on, across the scope of the worldly agenda, nature and cosmos. Dale owns forest as an offset to Dale's carbon footprint in the Earth's natural and cosmic flow. As a performer, Dale acts on cultural responsibilities among others. Dale takes a political stance that has brought Dale into conflict with Andy in the past. Part of the Evelyn's attraction for Dale is that they are energized by exploring political inquiry together. Dale is economically responsible, in the sense of being honest and not predatory in dealing with others – Dale is a reliable performer who works hard to not

betray the trust of fellow workers on a project. In terms of the private sphere, Dale acts on some responsibilities to family – including the "family" of movie workers on this project. Dale acts on some responsibilities to friends and intimates – such as Evelyn and Andy – and it is this area of Dale's responsibility curve that the movie argument explores. Dale also takes responsibility for his or her body and mind, at this point in Dale's responsibility curve.

But Dave's curve is not a fixed device inscribed with a label "Dale." As a development of Dale as a person, Dale's responsibilities evolve in interactions among other people. When Dale met Andy in the backstory, and they become friends and intimates, both of them shared and took on new responsibilities like sexual health, contraception, friendship, conversation and trust (Tone 2001). They agreed to shed many of these responsibilities in relation to each other when they split up. But when Andy comes upon Evelyn and Dale deep in conversation at the hotel, the question of what responsibilities Dale and Andy still have for each other surfaces.

Notions such as "decision-making" and "responsibility curve" are development notions in the hands of writers who argue dramatic movie arguments. As notions, they are not readily recordable, without unpacking in ways like the above discussion, and without stripping specific notions down to their recordable elements. For example, if anyone has sex in Evelyn – or any other movie – does the writer put in the argument what contraception or lack of contraception the couple uses? The notion "lack of contraception" is almost always what is performed and recorded in movies, and yet only rarely does pregnancy or a baby result in the argument. Perhaps this fallacy can be added to Section-31's common film fallacies. Movies that do discourse responsibility for contraception include Weitz, Weitz and Herz (1999) *American Pie* and Clooney, Heslov and Willimon (2011) *Ides Of March.*

There are whole complicated notional and recordable layers of "responsibility" in any movie argument, including *Evelyn*. There are whole complicated notional and recordable layers of "evaluation, believe, decision-making and preference" in any movie argument too. Responsible and irresponsible decisions, in a character's beliefs – and in the beliefs of others about that character – may arise in any area of the worldly agenda including body or politics. Whether particular characters are aware of how they develop and act on responsibilities – and are aware of their negotiated responsibilities with others – is a measure of the self and another's maturity along their curves. In *Evelyn*, Dale, Andy and Evelyn reach a happy agreement amongst each other that Evelyn and Dale share an intimate relationship, the three share a friendship that has matures, and Andy devotes more time to maturing friendships with Bobby and Charlie.

To create all the interactions in *Evelyn*, or any strong movie argument, a guiding argument helps arrange the research. *Evelyn's* guiding argument grew out of the puzzling gaps in *Heaven And Earth*. Its silences about South East Asia – no public history to learn – appear symptomatic of a post-war "fateful myth" (Evans) that Geuss, Bronowski, Pilger, Curtis et al. also agree drops us into the next war. Filling some gaps of silence, screen research may involve participation, interview, compilation, statistical, trace inspection, tourism or a mixture of research. Research segues into feature development that must choose between documentary or movie. The writer may arrange a pile of research data somewhat intuitively. But usually a knowledgeable writer uses development notions that interrogate the shape of the argument. A key notion is the climax sequence of the emotional arc that is put towards the end. The familiarizing introduction and the shadowlands existential crises (or second act) build to the climax. A strong climax has private and public, affection and liberation strands. The climax of characters' responsibility curves turns the argument, cascading into its resolution.

Chapter 2 has hardly touched on is the fact a movie argument is also performed, recorded and distributed by teams of people working together. This team has been likened to a "medley relay" round the four corners of a ziggurat in Section-24. Any movie argument is built and rebuilt four times. In order to explore these four phases of a screen argument, the study sets Evelyn aside until the Conclusions and turns to the whole making of a famous movie argument in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3

FOUR ARGUMENT CYCLES in their REAL-WORLD CONTEXT.

38.

Alfred Hitchcock's Senior Team Partner.

Chapter 3 extends the research and development of written arguments like *Evelyn* into the next three cycles of building and rebuilding a movie argument. The cycles of writing, performing, recording and distribution are explored together in a movie project that accomplishes distribution. Chapter 3 interrogates Alfred Hitchcock and Alma Reville's project to make (1960) *Psycho.*

The cycle that overarches a movie project like *Psycho* is the film's distribution cycle. Distribution is a two-way cycle where makers do the work of putting an argument as writing, performing and recording – while distributors manage the public sphere and raise funds to pay, support and resource their makers. Reading the coverage of (2012) *Hitchcock* in Section-49, many "distribution" actions unfold: The filmmakers are seen marketing their 1959 argument to the world press at its movie premiere, they market their new film *Psycho* using crime scene photos. In meetings with their major studio distributor, they are refused finance if they continue to put the *Psycho* argument. Raising private finance, Hitch and Alma then spend months fighting the ultimate "distributor" in the U.S. – the Government-connected and religious-right-connected Motion-Picture Association MPAA and its censor. Because of any movie argument's public distribution cycle, movie thought is enmeshed in politics and background history layers of the world population – as well as its private sphere focus on individual biography.

Hence, the four cycles that built Hitch and Alma's *Psycho* are explored in its

historical context. To help with this: *The Milwaukee Journal* of November 21, 1957; Judge Robert H. Gollmar (1984) *Edward Gein* legal reports; and Stephen Rebello (1990) *Alfred Hitchcock and the Making of Psycho* are consulted. In 2012 Rebello published a new preface to his book, as part of releasing the *Hitchcock* movie based on his investigation. Gervasi, McLaughlin and Rebello (2012) *Hitchcock* stars Anthony Hopkins and Helen Mirren – and the movie's detailed actions are translated into "coverage" in Section-49. What makes *Hitchcock* a landmark movie for this investigation is that it explores Hitch and his lifelong partner Alma as joint filmmakers; and it focuses on their thoughts and actions in both their private and public spheres.

Similar to Rebello, the biographer Vincent LoBrutto (Section-28) has published comprehensive research into (1997) *Stanley Kubrick: a Biography*. In chapter after chapter, LoBrutto echoes this study's claim that screen thinkers such as Kubrick and Reville put their movie arguments in four cycles of writing, performing, recording and distribution. For example, LoBrutto discusses the writing cycle of Kubrick, Southern and George (1964) *Dr. Strangelove*. After the writing, he discusses *Dr. Strangelove's* performers and their performances. Then he discusses the argument's recording and finally its distribution to audiences. In LoBrutto's following chapter, he discusses the writing of Kubrick and Clarke (1968) *2001: A Space Odyssey* before he discusses its performers and performance. Then he discusses its recording and finally its distribution to audiences. Like Kubrick's building and rebuilding of screen arguments, Hitch and Alma develop their movie arguments in four cycles: first, they manage the writing the *Psycho* argument; then they cast and direct performers Anthony Perkins, Vivian Leigh, Vera Miles and so on; then Hitch and Alma record and edit the argument; then they distribute *Psycho* in 1960. Filmed on a comparatively low budget, *Psycho* took the American and international public by storm. It was the most profitable worldwide blockbuster of the early 1960s (Rebello 2012: 163; and other box office data).

The fact that Alma Reville worked on the *Psycho* screenplay, directed the performers and recordists, and co-distributed *Psycho* globally is important for this study. Alma is virtually unknown in film discourse, including film philosophy. Her husband Alfred Hitchcock is referred to thirty times in *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy and Film* but – although she worked as the senior filmmaker in her partnership with Hitch all her life, Alma Reville is never mentioned in *The Routledge Companion's* six hundred and seventy pages. This male bias is also seen in this study's Section-50 *Timeline* of movies, which has many more male leads than female. This study intends to restores some balance to Anglophone film philosophy's preference for popular and classic movies that ignore women filmmakers or arguments about women heroines. The emphasis on equity is found in the choice of three key movies where Lindy, Le Ly and Alma are the protagonists of their films. Similarly, in earlier chapters, the emphasis on broader thinking turns the focus on little-mentioned Australia and South East Asia as part of Anglophone film. The study's philosophical origins are moreover in equity in screen thought "theory" which is neither biased to women or men. Equitable theory is why this study and its *Evelyn* scenario are written with un-gendered character names Andy, Bobby, Charlie and so on – or more generally A, B, C et al. Screen thought uses a gender-neutral theory in order to then consider sex and sexuality as a large part of people's thinking bodies and relationships. In particular, the practicality of exploring a real individual in the writing, or casting an individual in the performance cycle means writing or casting a real person who has sexual qualities. All the more reason for the general theory not to have bias.

For example, in the Evelyn synopsis and theory of Chapter 2, Andy can be male or female. Only when detailed scenes are written would a decision have to be made as to Andy's sex, as "a present-day performer" at the hotel. As to the historical roles this individual performs in the film-within-the-film,

Andy could be made up and costumed to play either sex in the parts they perform. Again, gender and sex comes into the casting of most movies, including *Psycho* that is considered here. In *Hitchcock*, *Psycho's* owner Alma Reville: "suggests casting romance heartthrob Anthony Perkins, rumored to be gay, to the Norman [Bates] *Psycho* role. ... In her garden, Alma suggests casting Janet Leigh for Marion [Crane]" (Section-49). As the *Hitchcock* argument makes clear, both men like Hitch and women like Alma can and do act as distributors. As distributors they own capital (like the garden that Alma mortgages to make her film) and they cast both sexes as performers and roles in *Psycho*. As such, their "filmmaking" is a kind of "action" – writing, performing, recording and distributing a screen argument. These actions are neither impregnation nor giving birth. The cycles are hardly actions where a particular sex defines how film is made. Watching the actions of the men and women dancers who peopled the first short drama *Roundhay Garden Scene* (1888), both men and women have always acted to make film arguments and gender is not a defining characteristic of filmmaking actions qua actions.

Yet there appears to be a sexual politics bias in much Anglophone discourse so this study firmly puts its entire theory and terminology in non-gendered terms and, in this instance, it chooses to right the discipline's balance – by preferring three leading females in their biographies and offering a theory that both men and women can use in their scenarios of any political stripe. Hence the element of "people" is used throughout this study, rather than "man or woman, he, she" and so on.

Part of screen thought theory emphasizes that the research object of screen thinkers, particularly movie thinkers, is the world of people acting in time-place. Filmmakers study the world, and few makers are preoccupied with narrow film culture as their target of research. So Chapter 3 is not so much

interested in "explaining" the devised argument *Psycho* or "explaining" the devised argument *Hitchcock*. The arguments speak for themselves. Chapter 3 prefers to jump from these two arguments to the wider context of those arguments and the people acting at that time in our 1950s and 1960s world. The two arguments emerged out of what people were doing in that time-place, which is where the 21 November 1957 issue of *The Milwaukee Journal* is useful for exploring how screen thinking researches and develops the interactions of people acting in time-place. *Psycho* was supposedly based on *The Milwaukee Journal's* headline crime story, although this Chapter disagrees with that popular supposition. In exploring how a Alma and Hitch's team began the blockbuster *Psycho* project, this Chapter returns to the archaeology of the 1950s and works its way forwards and backwards along that time element. Thousands of film arguments come out of that period, including sequences in Chapter 2's *Evelyn*. *Psycho* is used here, though, as it demonstrates a full "medley relay" of putting a screen argument in writing, performing, recording and distribution. Then the conclusion to this study returns to *Evelyn* to draw screen thought terminology and notions together.

In 1990 Stephen Rebello published his interview research conducted with surviving members of Hitch and Alma's *Psycho* project team: *Alfred Hitchcock and the Making of Psycho*. The book is a great vindication for industry filmmakers. Until Rebello, references to Hitchcock as the "auteur" of "his" many films was particularly galling for filmmakers who knew Hitch learned much of his craft from his more experienced movie editor, screenplay reader and partner: Alma Reville, whom he married in 1926. Hitch and Alma met when young and became intimate partners in their private lives – while supporting each other to become one of the most powerful screen teams of the 20th Century. Shy Alma was as much the power behind their screen business's creativity – but because someone had to do their publicity, Hitch took on this public "auteur" role. Leveraging existing urban myth publicity, the *Hitchcock* movie trades on the "Hitchcock as auteur" fallacy in its title. But the actual argument explores Alma

and Hitch's equal contribution to moviemaking, thus stripping away Hitch's "auteur" mystique. The 2012 film restores Alma Reville to her rightful place, but, as we shall see, it continues to promote some other urban myths about *Psycho* that are questioned here, while praising Hitch and Alma's successful medley relay team.

Usually Hitch and Alma specialized at the top of the "writing and recording" corners of the studio management "ziggurat" discussed in Section-23. They both supervised the writing and recording (Alma was a film editor), and Hitch usually directed performers. Over the century, U.K. and then U.S. studios managed the couple's film distribution for them. But their usual distributors declined to support *Psycho's* development in 1959, so Hitch and Alma fell back on their family company to finance and co-distribute it. Their film company has out-lived them. It still co-distributes the original version of *Psycho* (1960) fifty years on. This study's copy of *Psycho* says "Shamley" productions – their family company.

39.

From People's Biographies to Conjecture-Fantasy.

It is worth outlining *Psycho's* plot because many people today have not listened to and watched this movie. Some have read about it, watched its unpopular 1998 remake, or its *Simpson's* parody. When *Psycho* was distributed in 1960, consumers interpreted it as a major horror film. Fifty years on, the same film is more of a period thriller, enjoyed as a musically innovative piece of art history – which demonstrates profound changes in screen culture over the decades. This is *Psycho*:

> **An Arizona realtor's secretary, Marion Crane, is entrusted with a large cash sum. Instead of banking it, young Marion skips town and drives to California. Weary of her road journey, Marion spends a night in an empty motel off the highway. Norman Bates, the young motel owner, spies on Marion as she dresses in her bedroom. Bates' mother appears and stabs Marion to death in her motel shower. Bates arrives on the scene and is horrified. He disposes of Marion's body in a murky lake. On Monday, the realtor realizes Marion has stolen money. He dispatches a private detective. The mother kills the snooping detective, too. Marion's boyfriend and sister come searching. The mother attacks Marion's sister but the boyfriend subdues the mother. The "mother" turns out to be young Bates, disguised as his deceased mother, whose corpse he treasures in their home alone. At the courthouse, Bates is diagnosed as a *psycho*(path) and the case is closed, to the strains of Bernard Herrmann's score.**

Psycho has been remade but this study refers only to the 1960 original. People often think of the original *Psycho* movie in terms of the translucent "audio" of Bernard Herrmann's screeching staccato strings, layered over the "motion-pictures" of naked Janette Leigh defending herself from Mother's knife attack in her motel shower. These translucent screen layers form an "interaction" that cascades with other interactions through the argument's screen array. This inquiry claims that screen thought is put and interpreted in "interactions" like these layers. Sentences spoken or written about these interactions are another way of thinking. *Psycho's* "shower" interaction weaves elements of time (evening); place (isolated motel); persons (Norman Bates and Marion Crane); actions (injury, defense, murder); gestures (brandishing, screaming, cringing); little dialogue; and devices (clothing, knife, curtain, shower bath, soap, flip-flops, running hot water).

The shower's murderous interaction was developed by one original writer (novelist Robert Bloch) and four subsequent writers during its cycle of development. It was cast with stars and recorded on a tight budget. What makes *Psycho* unusual in the context of the four cycles of a movie project is that makers Hitchcock and Reville distributed it themselves. It is quite an achievement for two people to risk their life savings and put strains on their lifelong relationship in order to distribute a new screen argument around the world. But this is what Alma and Hitch did in 1959-1960, as they recruited and managed their *Psycho* project team. Californians Hitch and Alma crossed the U.S. to premiere their 48th film in New York City on June16th, 1960.

Not even one extract of 1960's *Psycho* movie is shown in Gervasi, McLaughlin and Rebello (2012) *Hitchcock. Hitchcock's* makers assume that audiences already know the luminous black and white (1960) *Psycho* and will recognize all the scenes they allude to. Gervasi's movie features 21st century stars Anthony Hopkins (Hitch); Helen Mirren (Alma); James D'Arcy (Anthony Perkins), Toni Collette (Peggy), Jessica Biel (Vera Miles), Ralph Macchio (Stefano) and Scarlett

Johansson (Janet Leigh). Together they perform Hitch and Alma's 1959-1960's private and public world of fashions, automobiles, social habits, and stars of that era. A pleasure for the audience segment that first watches (1960) *Psycho* is Gervasi's beautiful 1950s colors, textures, costumes and other design elements from *Psycho* that are viewed for the first time in color. But *Psycho* itself is not glimpsed on screen in the 2012 film – it is only "recalled" by the audience segment that watches *Psycho* before watching *Hitchcock*. Movie viewing order is another example of real-time-base: if the reader watches the two movies out of historical order, they are going to interpret both movies differently from people who listen to *Psycho* and then interpret *Hitchcock*. Maestro Danny Elfman wrote *Hitchcock's* score, and Elfman does not attempt to outdo Herrmann's famous staccato strings. In terms of making *Psycho*, *Hitchcock* repeats its four "medley relay" processes chronologically, so the movie is easy to follow as four cycles:

- 1a. *Psycho's writing* is sourced by Hitch and approved by Alma.
- 4a. Hitch negotiates with Alma, the studio and business partner Lew to raise distribution funds off the back of the writing and Gein publicity.
- 1b. Hitch develops the screenplay with writers. Alma oversights it.
- 2. The writing is *performed.*
- 3. The performances are *recorded.*
- 4b. *Distribution* – including exhibition – returns income to its risk-takers, Alma and Hitch.

Hitchcock is not obviously chaptered like this list. It is not an educational documentary dealing with the economic public sphere of "how to make a movie." Consumers don't relax at the movies to listen to and watch other people's normal working hours – only the dramatic highlights of a project. Being movie thought, *Hitchcock* explores drama across the scope of all eight worldly agenda inquiry areas, both private and public. So we are taken into Hitchcock's dreams about *Psycho* at night. During the day, Hitch attends the public censor office, where he

defends a liberal screen culture that, during the 1920s put its arguments freely. But during the 1930s depression, with the resurgence of religious fundamentalist minority pressure groups and national government controls, strict public censorship had been imposed in America. After World War Two and 1945, with the rise of the national security state, censorship still controlled the public sphere and invaded people's private sphere.

Movie thought 's inquiry scope of both private and public agenda considers a filmmaker "a whole person among others" – as well as a specialist in various fields. For example, young star Janet Leigh (performed by Scarlett Johansson) performs "Marion Crane" on set, which is her workplace in the public sphere. Then the film explores her private sphere as Hitch accepts a lift in Leigh's car and she drives him home. Privately, they discuss Hitch's feelings, desires and ruined business plans for his ex-favorite performer Vera Miles. Any strong movie entwines the private with the public as it explores the agenda of whole people's lives. Often in the arts, people's private and public lives greatly overlap. Businesses also overlap the private and public, for example, protecting their public intellectual property with private confidentiality agreements during writing and production. Movie artists, whether unknown or famous, initiate creative projects across the private and public agenda. The written development of such research is usually a mostly private activity, even though the complexity of feature films necessitates co-operating closely in public teams who perform and distribute. The origins of Hitch and Alma's new project in 1959 were very much centered in the couple's thoughts and private conversations at home, then spread to negotiating their idea at the public distributor.

In 1959, Hitch and Alma were two of the world's most powerful filmmakers. They had late-career power to explore a version of any screen argument that took their fancy, within the political constraints of Eisenhower's "national security" state (Dallek 2010: 106). Alma, as the senior in their life-long partnership,

searched with Hitch for their next project. Goaded by unfavorable press and his anxieties about losing his competencies on life's responsibility curve, Hitch searched for a "nasty" little horror movie that might shock his critics and his European competitors. As a top filmmaker in America, Hitch was an easy target for the critical press. They compared Hitch unfavorably with European *nouvelle vague* (new wave) filmmakers such as Claude Chabrol; Jean-Luc Godard (Godard and Moravia 1963 *Le Mémpris, Contempt*); Joe Levine and Carlo Ponti (de Sica and Moravia 1961 *Two Women*). The *nouvelle vague* was making inroads into Hitch and Alma's audience segments. Fearing the competition and fearing a declining responsibility curve as he aged, Hitch planned to surprise his vast fan base. The fans expected another stylish spy thriller like Hitchcock and Lehman (1959) *North By Northwest*. With a nasty little horror film, Hitch would cock a snoot at his critics.

Researching "nasty" events in the late 1950s for his new project, Hitch had plenty of horrors to choose from. Hitch eventually selected novelist Robert Block's new 1959 novel *Psycho* and received Alma's approval to buy and develop it. With Bloch's novel, we find that the *Psycho* argument has already shifted its mode from biography to fantasy and conjecture. Moviegoers often believe that the Norman Bates character in Robert Block's novel *Psycho* is drawn pretty much from a 1950s notorious murderer, Ed Gein. But Hitchcock inflated the connection between Robert Block's novel *Psycho* and the history of Ed Gein's murders and his sensational arrest in 1957. The 2012 Gervasi film also promotes this fallacy. *Hitchcock* opens with a standard screenplay's Courier font subtitle:

"Gein's Farmhouse, Wisconsin, 1944."

We listen to and watch Ed Gein (38 years old) and his brother Henry (43) outside their farmhouse, as Ed kills his brother Henry with an unexpected, cold-blooded blow from behind. Such a scene is not in *Psycho*. But the implication throughout

the 2012 film is that Hitch developed farmer Ed Gein's "real-life" murderous interactions as an almost "biographic" movie, lightly disguised as a typology with some name and scene changes. But this is not so. Before Hitch and Alma began developing the movie, many writers developed Gein's story through many modes – from scientific biography of police court reports – to novelist Bloch's conjecture, fantasy and surrealist modes that suited Bloch's interest in Freudian and Jungian psychology and his professional interest in mystery/science fiction – rather than any strong interest in Ed Gein's life and community. As Bloch says:

> "following on Freudian precepts, I made Norman Bates a transvestite who dressed up as his mother with a wig and dress whenever he committed these crimes." (Rebello 2012: 12).

The facts are, Ed Gein was not a transvestite but Robert Bloch was interested in Freudian inquiries into diverse sexual habits. Gein wore normal farmer's clothes when he killed his victims. Bloch was not interested in Gein as a person, more as a spark for developing his own Freudian/Jungian/Victorian Gothic literature explorations. *Psycho* is a conjecture or fantasy, not a biography or typology. Its modes were shifted from, and ideas were developed from, hundreds of incidents in the real world, mostly via Freud and Jung's patients, other popular psychology and psychiatry, and American crime reports, including some aspects of Gein's case.

But back in 1959, by the time Hitch and Alma completed their shooting script, there was little trace of Gein. Their argument mostly consisted of other influences. Still, the real Gein case is of interest to filmmakers who develop arguments from people's actions in the world. Gein's characteristics appear in later horror films, more than they were developed in *Psycho*. Gein's skin pelt fetish appears in Demme and Tally (1991) *Silence Of The Lambs*, for example. But it is distributor publicity and a fan myth that *Psycho's* motel owner Norman Bates is Ed Gein.

Nonetheless, the actual development of *Psycho's* argument away from "Gein" to the fantasy "Norman Bates" interests this study because it demonstrates how complicated research material changes in the hands of many writers, performers, recordists and distributors.

Edward Gein was born in 1906 and raised by Augusta, his Lutheran *Old Testament* fundamentalist mother. She preached the bible at home, as there was no Lutheran church in Plainfield. Augusta disapproved of Ed's alcoholic father George. George had many jobs but didn't stay long in work. George and Augusta raised their sons Ed and older brother Henry on their somewhat isolated, marginal-fertility Plainfield Wisconsin farm. Early on, father George tanned animal hides. He also hunted and ran his farm. By "1944" – the subtitle in Gervasi *Hitchcock's* first scene – Ed's father had been dead four years. Mother Augusta lived as an invalid in the background house, and she passed away in 1945. In Gervasi's first scene, Ed murders his brother Henry. The murder is likely a fact about the brothers (it was never proved); but the brothers' relationship is not argued in *Psycho*. Neither the Gein farm nor the Gein fratricide appeared in the *Psycho* movie. Rather, Gein is leveraged in ongoing distribution publicity and screen culture that associates Hitchcock and *Psycho* with Gein. It is possible to wind back from this fourth cycle of putting a screen argument as a publicity stunt, to the first cycle of writing and researching the real world of the Hitchcock's and the Gein's.

Although law officers attended Gein's farm in 1944, they assumed his brother Henry's death was accidental. They assumed Henry had asphyxiated in the grass fire that the brothers lit to clear some land. Ed Gein escaped suspicion of fratricide. Thirteen years later in 1957, Gein was arrested for the murder of a local storekeeper, Mrs. Bernice Worden (58). These interactions are reported in *The Milwaukee Journal* of November 21, 1957, and Judge Gollmar's documents. Gein claimed Bernice reminded him of his deceased mother, Augusta. Police had

evidence of a previous 1954 unsolved murder victim Mrs. Hogan – and Gein confessed to that murder and claimed in official interviews that Hogan also reminded him of mother. Judge Gollmar believes Gein had killed some young girls too, but once convicted of Worden's murder, there was no cost benefit in pursuing Gein's earlier killings with almost no evidence.

In Hitch and Alma's *Psycho,* there is no suggestion that its young victim, Marion Crane, reminds shower murderer Norman Bates of his old mother. Screen murderer Bates's mind, body and intimacy in 1960's *Psycho*, and the real-world agenda of Gein's mind, body and intimacy in 1957 when he was arrested, are almost entirely different personalities and screen arguments. The filmmakers shifted the mode of the argument. The mistaken impression – that *Psycho* was mostly based on Gein's perverse rural killings – is strengthened by Gervasi's opening: "Gein's Farmhouse, Wisconsin, 1944" murder scene, and other Gein scenes in *Hitchcock.* The 2012 film, being a movie, explores the thinking of Hitch and Alma. Gein is used as the subject of Hitch's creative thinking and his dreams. Photos of the crime scene are also used by Hitch to shock journalists and attract publicity. But the more person Gein and the screen argument *Psycho* are compared, the more one realizes that Gein's interactions with his family and local economy were hardly used by Hitchcock and Reville. Most of their *Psycho* story was 1959 novelist Robert Bloch's conjecture and fantasy based on Jung, Freud and many sex cases in popularized psychiatric literature. Bloch was very interested in Freudian and Jungian psychology books – but not interested in investigating Gein – even though Bloch lived quite close to the murder scenes. Many other "writers" at the time – police detectives, psychiatrists, court reporters in Gollmar's book and investigative journalists – took a much more careful interest in Gein. These writers were involved with collecting the murder facts and offering their interpretations of Plainfield in the hours and months that followed Gein's arrest. Much was written before fantasy novelist Bloch glanced at the case.

From Gervasi's *Hitchcock* (2012), we know that Hitch used the power of his distributor's funds to buy up all the copies of Bloch's recent novel in the

American market. Hitch did not want to alert fans to *Psycho's* details before Hitch and Alma released their 1960 movie. Yet anyone could read the real 1957 Ed Gein case in the press or local library. This also alerts us to the fact that Hitch and Alma were not researching and developing the Gein case, but rather were developing novelist Bloch's fantasy story, to which they had bought the film rights. But fans and journalists have believed Hitch's public relations about "the Gein source" that continues to bump up distribution publicity for *Psycho.*

40.

Authoritarian Beliefs and Actions.

The Milwaukee Journal's Thursday November 21, 1957 front-page proclaims:

"Obsessive Love for his Mother Drove Gein to Slay, Rob Graves."

Already in the press, a week after Gein's arrest, his murders and grave robbing are detailed. But Hitch did not develop the grave-robbing scenario at all. Not only that, when Stephen Rebello interviewed Robert Bloch for his *Making of Psycho* book, Bloch states that he "was not positively aware" of grave robbing in the Gein case (2012: 8). Whatever the reason, Bloch's novel omits it and Hitch follows Bloch. According to official interviews and the press, Gein believed that two local fifty-something women were of similar disposition and appearance to his dead mother. Both women ran small customer-contact businesses, as Gein's mother had done too before moving to Plainfield. In both murder cases, unassuming local customer Gein conducted usual purchases with each rural business before returning to shoot the women dead when witnesses were not present. Gein was expert in managing time and expert in knowing the places and actions of other people in his local community, and yet his lawyers pleaded insanity and he was committed to an asylum.

It is instructive to consider the element of gestures in the Gein reality and the *Psycho* fantasy. Unlike Norman Bate's frenzied stabbings in the shower and in his mother's home, Gein's real-life shootings were the patient, quietly-spoken, cold-blooded and yet opportunistic attacks of a trophy hunter who elevated himself morally above everyone else, judging everyone in Plainfield district, except his saintly mother. Mother Augusta Gein was a hard-working, self-righteous *Old Testament* fundamentalist who had brow-beaten Gein into judging all the neighbors

and the district as moral failures compared to her conduct and that of her sons. Gein grew up in a contradictory home where his male role model – his father – was judged a moral failure by Gein's adored mother. A neighboring man Smith, who treated his own family violently, was another depraved sinner, in Mother and Gein's eyes. Gein said Smith was "an evil man" who had brought a married woman to live with him (Gollmar 1981: 68). After his arrest, middle aged Gein often wept at the way women were treated in his district. He denied every having sexual experience with women and declared that:

> "in this connection he was taught the moral code by his mother that sexual experience before marriage was wrong – 'If a woman is good enough for intercourse, she is good enough for marriage.' – 'I almost fell in love with another girl, but I found she had many affairs with other men.' – 'God knows best.'" (Gein 1957, in Gollmar 1981: 58, 64).

Aloof from the other families, Gein was an avid, well-read reader who tried to maintain the family farm after his father and brother died. But once Mother died too, the property was too much for him. He was eaten up, yearning for his Mother. He would often visit neighbors and play with their children. After butchering Mrs. Worden, Gein went to neighbor Irene Hill who fed him pork chops:

> "Gein often came to the Hill home because he enjoyed TV and he had no electricity in his home... Gein had kind of a sly grin which bothered her but otherwise he was personally clean and always agreeable... he liked to eat at various homes and he worked on threshing crews and so on and often got to eat around." (Gollmar 1981:105, 190)

Gein's next-to-godliness cleanliness, his quiet, retiring, agreeable disposition, these were contradictory gestures that were also troubled by "a sly grin." Did Gein

understand his neighbors from a world view encouraged by a henpecked alcoholic hunting Father and self-righteous, sexually phobic, judgmental Mother? Had the well-read Gein distanced himself from women, men and all life as doctrinal "objects" – without an empathetic, participatory understanding of people's individual thoughts and initiatives? He hunted and killed "people as objects." He did not want to damage the aesthetics of the body parts he desired and watched. Gein carefully shot both women and trucked their corpses to his isolated farm where he butchered them for body parts. He used the body parts as memorabilia and Nordic spirit-tokens of his fantasy world and in memory of dearly beloved mother and *Old Testament* teacher, Augusta. In the days after his 1957 arrest, Gein confessed to digging graves and removing bodies and skulls to his home:

> "old songs the Norwegians used to sing, and they were supposed to have used these skulls – for what was that drink? Mead?" (Gein in Gollmar 1981: 44)

The newspaper describes the heads from the two murdered fifty-something women and other corpses dug up from graves: "He kept all the faces and was particularly intrigued by women's hair." The paper mentions "specific parts" a few times, but the press distributor censored out the detail – that these "parts" were preserved sexual parts. But from police forensic records at the same time, the press-censored "specific parts" were many, many vaginas, breasts and faces removed and preserved from robbed graves, and from various murder victims. Gein had learned to hunt, skin, tan and preserve animals with his father. He also wore some body parts – a "mammary waistcoat" – over his naked body. Much was known of this "mild-appearing 51 year old bachelor" from papers that Hitch and Alma would have access to:

> "His father died about 20 years ago. A brother, Henry, died in 1944. Before her death in 1945, his mother suffered two paralytic strokes. Gein

> nursed her" … "After his mother's death, he boarded off her bedroom. Several hats apparently undisturbed since, were found on a dresser there this week." (*The Milwaukee Journal* op. cit.)

Novelist Bloch combined his strong ongoing interest in 1950s American psychology and psychiatry, including forensic psychiatry and sexually related crimes, as well as his interest in 1840s Gothic literary styles such as Edgar Allan Poe but his link to Gein came from a local free junk mail newspaper he read. From all these sources, Block wrote *Psycho*. When Hitch read Bloch's new *Psycho* novel in 1959, much of the movie story Hitch hoped to perform and record was on the pages created by Bloch.

Despite Robert Block being a major contributing writer to Alma and Hitch's *Psycho*, Bloch never appears as a character in the Gervasi's *Hitchcock* film. Rebello researched Bloch and devoted a whole book chapter, but only two faint traces of Bloch are introduced in the 2012 movie:

1. Bloch's name appears in secretary Peggy's book review and analysis file.
2. Bloch's name appears on the novel that Hitch takes home to read.

Despite the film's omission of Bloch, most of *Psycho's* argument is Bloch's creation as written in the novel that Hitch and Alma licensed. Bloch invents the psychopathic character Norman Bates. Bloch invents the fugitive secretary and murder victim Marion Crane. Bloch invents the Bates motel and Marion's famous stabbing murder in the motel bathroom shower. These iconic components of the *Psycho* argument are neither screenwriter Joseph Stefano's, nor Alma's, nor Hitch's creations. Bloch's omission from the 2012 *Hitchcock* biopic is not problematic for consumers; but for scholars, Bloch's contribution to *Psycho's* successful medley relay is key, as are the researchers who collected the real Gein story.

Mystery and science fiction writer Bloch was "between projects" in Wisconsin in late 1957 and into 1958. He searched for inspiration for his next tale. Bloch, like the general public he wrote for in the 1950s, was extremely interested in Freudian and Jungian ideas – and also Greek and other mythology. These popular 1930s-1950s trends are important because novelist Bloch merely glances at the Wisconsin reality he lived in. Bloch shifts the mode, from tragic biography for old Wisconsin rural people who knew each other, to his fantasy about strangers.

On a wintry Saturday in rural Plainfield village, Gein (51) murders a hardware storekeeper who he knew, aging Mrs. Bernice Worden (58). Mrs. Worden's grown son, Worden Junior often worked with her in her hardware store. Junior was Plainfield's deputy sheriff. Gein carefully chose a day when Worden Junior was deer hunting with his male friends and not working in the store. After Gein shot Mrs. Worden, he locked her store. He removed her body via a series of carefully coordinated vehicle changes to his isolated, run-down farmhouse. Gein had inherited the farmhouse from his dead parents and (probably murdered) brother in the 1940s. Returning from hunting to the empty store, Worden Junior soon traced the murder of his mother to Gein via a purchase receipt Gein had dropped in the store. By Wednesday, a few nights later, America's newspaper journalists working from court and police forensic reports that detailed Gein's arrest and the many horrific crimes he was charged with. It was easy for police to charge Gein because Gein collected and displayed the material evidence of his crimes in his isolated home. *The Milwaukee Journal* reported much of Gein's crimes in detail, while censoring themselves about details of the sexual body parts or details of Gein's religious fundamentalism. Along with plenty of crime details, *The Milwaukee Journal* staff reporters also offered cultural theories and speculations. They wrote:

> "In Sophocles' Greek drama, Oedipus fell in love with his own mother, not knowing her identity, and slew his father. Medically, the Oedipus

> complex refers to an obsessive attachment for the mother on the part of a son." (*Milwaukee Journal* op. cit.)

An average Anglophone school education anywhere in the world in the early 1900s included study of Greek myths. Theatre writer Sophocles influenced the interpretation of crime in the press – even before Bloch detoured even further into Greek myth and Freudian theory while writing his *Psycho* novel. Moreover, Ed Gein himself was an avid reader. He read sexual psychology books at his farmhouse and often wanted to discuss psychology and sex change operations with uncomfortable Plainfield locals he cornered in conversation in the district. Four days after the murder was discovered – and Gein had answered a lie detector test and other interviews – his lawyer, the police, forensic doctors and the press all developed the story of his killings in Freudian and Greek mythology terms. Novelist Robert Block's free junk paper's account of Gein's crime was enough for Block to leap into his ongoing interest in Jungian and Freudian psychology and sexual pathology and ignore Gein's nearby reality. Bloch's inspiration and conjecture came from reading forensic clinical psychology. To a great extent, Bloch's *Psycho* was already a conjecture and certainly not even a "typology" that typified real Plainfield biographies. Bloch avoided researching Gein's fundamentalist beliefs, yet mild aspects were reported, along with other fundamentalist news in the press; and later investigated fully by Judge Gollmar.

Gein's fundamentally religious mother Augusta "trained" her two young sons daily in her interpretation of *Old Testament* beliefs, including "the coming eternal punishment in hell" in retribution for the little boys' thoughts or actions related to their natural sexuality. Any such thoughts or actions would be damned. The fanatical mother indoctrinated her two boys with the kind of anxieties that, years later, writers Bloch, Stefano and Hitch would have read casually, because Bloch, Stefano and Hitch shared a populist interest in Freud and sexual suppression (Rebello 2012: 12, 47). But all three *Psycho* writers chose "not" to explore the

Gein children's abuse. All three writers turned away from the reality of Augusta, abusing her young sons with nightmares of a hellfire afterlife as punishment for their natural sexual desires. Instead, they shifted the mode to fantasy that avoided the reality of fundamentalism.

Writers Bloch, Stefano and Hitch also ignored the real interactions of Gein's father with his son. Young Ed Gein learned his politically gendered role from his alcoholic father George – and from what he saw and heard of other Plainfield men. Gein was trained to hunt, kill and butcher sentient animals in the local forests and on the farm. Gein learned from George how to preserve the skins of animal carcasses. His alcoholic father died in 1940 but Gein continued to follow his parents' diverse trainings. He most likely stalked and killed his brother. On the other hand, he gently and patiently caring for his ailing mother until her death in 1945, aged 67.

Screenwriter Joseph Stefano worked from Bloch's fanciful novel. Stefano did not research and develop real Gein family characteristics – Old Testament condemnation of others in the district, or hunting and tanning – in his screenplay. In Hitch and Stefano's screenplay, a "brow-beaten fundamentalist hunter in his fifties" (or Bloch's "middle-aged motel owner") is rewritten as a handsome, graceful, manicured, agnostic matinee idol in his early twenties. Anthony Perkins was cast to this youthful role. Perkins was a heartthrob and pinup poster boy to millions of American teenage girls. Perkin's "Norman Bates" character is a loner who manages the family's vacant motel that has been bypassed by a highway and forgotten – a fantasy location invented by novelist Bloch to explain how his hypothetical murderer would lure hypothetical young strangers like Marion to nakedness, peeping and shocking murder.

Marion does not know her killer and Norman Bates – his mind and his motel – are not Gein's private thoughts and Gein's real-world public place. Old Gein's

familiar, aged murder victims were hardly *Psycho's* matinee idol strangers. As distributors, Hitch and Alma desired to appeal to the emotional arcs of enthusiastic young audiences. If the young fans were attracted early, older audiences would follow. This is an example of how distribution notions may curve back into the writing cycle and drastically change the development of screen arguments.

Ed Gein, Mrs. Hogan and Mrs. Worden lived in the same village district where marginal farming land was supplemented with forest hunting. Gein grew up in a severe militia culture for youngsters that punished inquiry into natural human sexuality. Gein looked inward to limited beliefs. His was not a worldly community like some American cities accustomed to cosmopolitan people. Given Gein's lifetime obedience to his haranguing mother, Gein was too anxious and browbeaten to converse with young Plainfield women. He had not explored natural sexual relations as he grew into forced immaturity. Such a twisted responsibility curve is of interest to filmmakers because is often has dramatic consequences. Yet, despite his perverse immaturity, Gein was a competent and devoted nurse of his ill mother; and sometimes locals gave Gein responsibility for babysitting their children.

Back in the early 1930s, Gein would have been an anxious young man in his twenties – much like the young Anthony Perkins' character Norman Bates. But Gein did not turn to murdering people he knew until he was in his forties and fifties. Old Mrs. Hogan and Mrs. Worden looked and behaved like his departed mother. For Gein, these women (as objects) belonged in his home. Gein had his father's competence to hunt, kill, butcher, preserve and display their bodies at his isolated farm. He enjoyed the self-centered immature authoritarianism of both his parents to justify his murders to himself. The way that a righteous, unquestioned, authoritarian upbringing can produce a stunted responsibility curve – both in parents George and Augusta, and in Gein – is of interest to filmmakers who desire

to set out the family's interactions on a timeline. After 50 years of living at home, including the last dozen subsisting at home alone, Gein's "actions" were immature and irresponsible in the extreme, but also his "speech" element reveals this. He appeared to know all the gossip, most of it false, about the marriages and sexual status of the district's men and women and, copying his mother Augusta, he passed judgment on everyone – especially his two victims whose bodies proved his more recent murders. According to Gein, victim Hogan was "a dirty talker" and Worden:

> "wooed her husband away from another girl and married him shortly after the other girl committed suicide" (Gein in Gollmar 1981: 64).

After quietly pronouncing this gossip-monger's "judgment" of Mrs. Worden, Gein "became tearful when describing his sorrow for the other girl" (ibid.). This speech is typical of a person who has grown up in fear of violent punishment for their own transgressions, and who has learned to use speech to put the responsibility for error or crime on other people – and never on themselves. Too fearful to have a normal sex life of his own with women he had been taught to fear, Gein secretly preoccupied his body and mind with their gossipped sexual relationships, rather than his own relationships. He was so practiced in objectifying everybody else and distancing himself self-righteously from those around him, that he was calm, normal and even "showed an interest in going back downtown" to the murder scene, when news arrive at the Hill's home (where he was having dinner) that a State forensic unit had arrive. This "objective" well-read psychopath also read up on court processes once in custody. From his reading, Gein offered ad hoc legal procedural advice to counsel in court.

For filmmakers, though, it is difficult to unfold a whole movie argument about Gein, his family and his community because of the community's understandable fear and outraged reactions to his crimes. An outraged sheriff

assaulted Gein and this ruined Gein's early confessions as evidence. The town went silent in reaction to the deluge of gossipers and media who descended on Plainfield. Gein was quickly shunted into America's psychiatric bureaucracy, with its 1950s Freudian explanations for his statements in interviews. All the victim body parts were photographed and then "decently" disposed of, precluding DNA trace inspections today that might link up missing people in the district. Locals burned down the Gein house to stop its iconic rise as a meeting place for the curious. His family was deceased. Of average I.Q., Gein was practiced and clever in not revealing any more of his crimes than the police had material evidence for.

It is a matter of the conjecture mode to extrapolate back along Gein's youth and childhood responsibility curve, growing up with his family and going to school and, later, casual work, where he learned to fit in with the district's strongly divided male-female subcultures and separate duties, discourses, recreations and ways of thinking and speaking among men and women. Perhaps the most frightening thing about Gein is his life-long attempt to be extremely morally upright, do the right thing by his judgmental mother and hunting father, and get along with Platonic normality (plus private smile) among the families of the district's public sphere. Perhaps audiences were too fearful to explore how close the authoritarian Gein family was to their own revered way of life. Hence the jump to fantasy by Bloch and other writers, which tended to silence inquiry. It was up to other American writers explore authoritarian parenting, sexuality, friendship and the body in ways that overturned the horror of Gein, including: Hallström and Irving (1999) *The Cider House Rules*, where a young medical man sees the horror of rural violence against women and defies an authoritarian culture to help loving couples in their private and public lives.

41.

Silencing History, Biography and Other Modes.

If Hitch and Alma had developed a movie from the real-world research that had riveted American newspaper readers – would that "Gein" movie had been successful? We shall never know, although *Silence Of The Lambs* was a later blockbuster. It is unlikely that Hitch and Alma could have developed the factual story as this investigation develops it because of the censorship that was imposed in America at the time. The 1957 *Milwaukee Journal* was distorted by censorship restrictions, too. It reported Gein's killing of two women in graphic detail – much more graphic detail than Hitch and Alma's 1960 movie. But it did not report the fantasy religious "hell" anti-sex upbringing that mother Augusta hammered into Gein. It did not detail Gein's sexual hunting trophies. In these areas, 1950s press journalists censored their writing along the lines of the Motion Picture Association of America (1930-1955) *A Code to Govern the Making of Motion Pictures* (MPAA in Section-54). This *Production Code* controlled screen beliefs in America for two generations of Americans. In 1930 during the public turmoil of the Great Depression, two conservative Roman Catholic activists pressed the *Production Code* on studio distributors. Distributors feared religious fundamentalist attacks against their cinemas and patrons, unless they reversed America's freedom of thought enjoyed in the 1920s. The 1930-1955 censorship *Code* was still in force in 1959, and it dwindled to an end in 1968. In the *Code*, "profane or vulgar expression"; "sex perversion or any inference of it"; and "sex hygiene" were absolutely banned from screen thought. Characters could not say "hell" unless a character propagated it from biblical text.

In the U.S., Catholic Right activism pressed the studios to impose their *Code* censorship. Unlike the U.S., many nations censor movies via a political party leader. In Australia, its Prime Minister's Office selects of a small classification committee and an appeals committee. The committee screens all submitted,

unreleased films and imposes age restriction warnings and criminal statutes, much as they do in the U.K. In some teenage categories, it imposes criminal law restrictions on movie arguments. Distributors must pay a hefty tax fee to have each argument classified, and if the distributor appeals the decision, another tax fee is imposed. The tax fee advantages large global distribution companies and penalizes small local companies that make Australian movies. The tax fee also penalizes artists who make low budget arthouse or independent movie arguments.

Having said that, people concerned with mentoring children believe a classification system is very helpful for choosing movies – although is surprising how may extremely loud soundtracks, prejudicial stereotypes, jingoism and violent "solutions" to problems are allowed through the classification system as lower rated "PG" (parental guidance). Violence is favored while films to do with affection and mature thinking by young people are likely to be warned against with an "M" (recommended for mature audiences). The same differential between violence and affection applies when the Prime Minister's Board lifts rating levels to "M" and "MA" (legal restrictions on under 15s). The highly violent and horrific *Alien* (M) and *Aliens* 2 (M) are available for 12 year olds to watch whereas a 14 year old is banned from watching the superb, even profound, Ishihara, Ito and Tanigawa (2006) *The Melancholy of Haruhi Suzumiya* (MA). The *Suzumiya* anime series and anime movie are about highly realistic, friendly, law abiding 15-16 year olds in a cross between *Seinfeld* and *Dr. Who*. It is a political puzzle that live action horror *Aliens* (about deafening, heavy machine gun marine battle violence and butchering horror jeopardy) is legally allowable for Australian 12 year olds while the droll concerns of mature 15-16 year olds is legally banned from their 14-year-old peers. *Psycho* has an M rating, with its necrophiliac cross-dresser Bates stabbing a naked woman to death in her shower; whereas the Japanese youth animation *Suzumiya* does not have such a live-performance scene yet is restricted with the more severe MA classification.

Some interesting ideas of what is meant by violence, friendship and "maturity" are on display here. Another puzzle is thrown up with the next Australian ratings level: "R" legally restricted to 18 plus. A university's best and brightest youth – including their best screen thinkers – might be 17 years old, and some as young as 16-years old, but in Australia and many countries, politicians demand that academics not show "18+" to their best and brightest young screen makers in university screen courses. Politicians still allow film courses that screen these films to the culture's often mentally slower first year students (18+) while making pariahs of talented young filmmakers who are banned from attending.

One such R film is de Heer et al. (1993) *Bad Boy Bubby.* It a rich and complex film about people's maturation, competence and responsibility curves; liberty, affection and human language acquisition – yet a smart Australian 17 year old, who may be studying freshman philosophy, humanities, linguistics or film, commits a crime if they consider de Heer et al.'s amusing and thought-provoking argument about a perverse upbringing. Many teens ignore the ratings system anyway, but the Department of the Prime Minister legally corners film academics in universities. Academics either reject their best students or reject films like *Bad Boy Bubby* and *The Killing Of Sister George* (which has no killing) – and so undergraduate research is distorted. While a classification system is better than draconian police state censorship (which Australia and many places had before classification), classification is still no substitute for education in screen thought. The underlying problem is that no state law can be fine tuned in individual cases for an individual's belief systems that are a matter of life education and interpretation among others in our worldly agenda.

Currently, there is a big difference between censoring literature and censoring movie thought. The censorious believe different things about an argument put in a book and put in a film. This also applied in the 1950s when Bloch published the *Psycho* book without censorship in America. But if we consider innovative English language novels of the 1930s in Britain and America, then Lawrence

Durrell (1938) *The Black Book* and Cousins, Matthews and Greene (1938) *To Beg I Am Ashamed* were banned by Washington and London's politicians. The books raised the 1930s taboo topic of sex. Both authors crossed the Channel to be published (in English) in Paris, France. In 1938 T.S. Eliot wrote:

> "Lawrence Durrell's *The Black Book* is the first piece of work by a new English writer to give me any hope for the future of prose fiction." (1938 Paris edition blurb).

But this didn't stop London banning it from England and the British Empire. With the overturning or retirement of such English language politicians after the 1930s and the World War against fascism, Durrell satisfied the scrutiny of more liberal post-1945 censorship regimes to publish his *Alexandria Quartet: Justine, Balthazar, Mountolive* and *Clea* (1957-1960) about human sexuality in place. Greene published *The Heart Of The Matter, The Quiet American, The Comedians* and *The Human Factor* (1948-1978) about race, contemporary colonial oppression, relationships and the human condition. These authors published without censorship on both sides of the North Atlantic. In the Anglophone world of today, the writers and readers of text articles (such as academics) do not consider that their published arguments are subject to political redaction before putting the argument to colleagues. Redaction, no, but the censorious work in politics today to have all Internet readers, writers and speakers monitored by the government's secret police.

Turning from the changing lot of writers, movie thinkers never enjoyed the "liberty" that literature enjoyed in supposedly liberal or once-liberal countries. Using Livingston and Archer's term, "coerced" completion (2010:444), there is a coerced distribution cycle for movie thought that is not imposed on other published arguments. Peppered throughout the *Timeline* of 170 movies and Section-51's list of documentaries are many films that have been banned or politically reshaped during their distribution cycle. Granaz Moussavi et al. (2010) *My Tehran For Sale* was (and is) banned in its country of story location – Iran. When its director (who lives in exile in Australia) could not be imprisoned and

tortured with 90 cuts of the lash, its female star Marzieh Vafamehr was arrested and sentenced to the same torture. The two key historical documentaries in Section-08 – Adam Curtis (2004) *The Power of Nightmares* and Pilger and Lowery (2010) *The War You Don't See* – are available thanks to their British distributors but both have been refused normal distribution in America. Radford and Orwell (1984) *1984* was banned in 1984 China, although it screened in British Hong Kong. Makavejev and Reich (1971) *W.R. Mysteries Of The Organism* is not banned but quite difficult to source. It is mentioned here because Freud scholar William Reich escaped communism in Europe only to have his psychology books burned in a mass book-burning by the U.S. Government, and jailed as a thought criminal, where he died in jail. The *Code* was determined to keep sexuality out of America: (1966) *Persona's* opening montage had its penis removed and Andersson's story of her enjoyable beach sex was overwritten with a garbled U.S. censor's story about strangers touching her arse. This inverted her character and had paying audiences puzzled in America.

Watkins et al. (1965) *The War Game* was banned in Britain, although it later screen in Australia. *The War Game* is another movie that is difficult to source – it is most readily distributed from France these days under its French title *La Bombe*. Despite repackaging, *La Bombe* is the original English movie, screening in its original English. After *The War Game's* ban, Peter Watkins made Watkins and Gosling (1968) *The Gladiators*. *The Gladiators* is about young conscript soldiers who survive or die in a worldwide, brand-sponsored endless war that is televised. Two soldiers fall in love across nationalist and racist "enemy" lines. It was hardly distributed in 1968, although Watkins and Gosling's *The Gladiators* movie is much copied today by fashionable, parochial American blockbuster Ross, Ray and Collins (2012) *The Hunger Games*. Kubrick, Trumbo and Fast (1959) *Sparticus's* writer Dalton Trumbo was tried as a "communist" thought criminal in the U.S. but he still managed to write movies (about fairytale monarchies) while his friends fronted his screenplays. When distributors digitally restored Trumbo's classic

romantic comedy, Academy Award winning (1953) *Roman Holiday* (with Audrey Hepburn and Gregory Peck), the distributors decided it was now politically expedient to admit Trumbo's writing credit. Dalton Trumbo's name is digitally painted, frame-by-frame, into its correct place in the head credits of the restored version. Audiences would have no idea that the movie author's name has been suppressed for decades. The rags-to-riches wealthy movie capitalist and founding owner of United Artists, Charlie Chaplin (1916) *Behind The Screen: The Bewildered Stage Hand*) was drummed out of America and sought liberty and affection in Switzerland where he died of old age.

The film *Hitchcock* doesn't background the severity and lack of freedom in America's 1950s, and it takes some historical understanding to know what beliefs and actions Hitch and Alma lived under. The witch-hunt movies (1996) *The Crucible* and (1998) *Pleasantville* give some indication of the way rational argument was distorted in those times. Compare one witch-hunted family in *A Cry In The Dark* with millions of victims in *Heaven And Earth*: one victim multiplied millions of times becomes an invasion – devastating what local people think and do in their own homes. Hitch and Alma knew of colonialism around the world but they turned a blind eye. Perhaps the decline of the British Empire gave them pause. Much like the German empire in Section-22's *Mephisto*, the British drove a "living-space" ideology across parts of their empire, including the Australian continent's Aboriginal nations in the 1800s (Perkins, Nowra et al. 2008 *First Australians*). In its "No Other Law" episode, an early short film by the Arrernte Nation (1901) *Chitchingulla* records a traditional millennia-old song, dance and drama performance that was gifted from one nation to another nation, a thousand kilometers apart on the Australian continent. In the 1700s, and for thousands of years before, the continent was crisscrossed with public and natural "song lines" – a communications network typified by *Chitchingulla* and inscribed in hand-held network maps (Aranda Nation 2012). The pre-British culture is often suppressed in movie arguments. Unlike Europe's *Mephisto,* Polanski, Harwood and Szpilman

(2000) *The Pianist* or Daldry, Hare and Schlink (2008) *The Reader*, "strong" Australian invasion dramas are almost always watered down in the writing cycle and undermined in distribution. Schepisi and Kenneally (1978) *The Chant Of Jimmie Blacksmith*_stands out as a notable exception: it has an Aboriginal lead who resists invasion.

Hitch and Alma did make films about international conflict and spying (*Notorious*) but *Psycho* is the other kind of drama – a domestic drama that explores violence in the private sphere. As English speakers in America, Hitch and Alma were removed from the *Mephisto*-like politico-military crushing of screen thought in Europe and Asia in the 1930s and 1940s (Evans 2005: L2463). In Europe, Germany's fascist cultural gutting and attempted colonial expansion left surviving young 1950s-1960s German artists feeling like orphan children – the flotsam of an older generation's appalling "parent/child hunt the neighbors" witch-hunt. Says European director Werner Herzog of the European 1950s:

> "As a German filmmaker after the war, we grew up as – not only me, but all my peers – we grew up as a fatherless generation – as a generation of orphans. Our fathers either had fled the country, were chased out or they had sided with the barbarism of the Nazi regime. So we had no one to learn from, and we started to look out for our grandfathers. And that was Murnau, Fritz Lang and others. So I just needed to connect myself with a culture, with a legitimate, great culture of Germany. And that was the culture of the grandfathers or even earlier than that." (Stubbs 2014: 1).

When Tait et al. created the world's first movie in Melbourne Australia – the behemoth blockbuster (1906) *The Story Of The Kelly Gang* – audiences clamored for it. *The Story Of The Kelly Gang* argued that Irish people lived in a British colonial state that intruded on families' private sphere and stamped on ambitions in the underclass. Fearful of the massive audiences for this argument, veteran colonial politicians moved with their police powers to quash the argument, which only demonstrated the truth of the first movie's argument (*quod erat*

demonstrandum). The undermined Tait et al. business struggled on, making some more of the world's first feature movies for a few years, despite police restrictions. Then British and European colonial powers destroyed a generation of young filmmakers in World War One. In the 1910s, far from Europe's war, young Los Angeles filmmakers rose to dominate world movies. L.A. was still dominant when Alfred Hitchcock and Alma Reville were invited to work there in 1939, on the eve of World War Two. It is against this background of armed power curtailing screen arguments that moviemakers and other subcultures rise or disappear. Within this global historical agenda, national censorship further puts a maker's writing, performing, recording and distribution cycles into doubt.

As *The Milwaukee Journal* demonstrates, the strictures propagated in the American fundamentalist *Production Code* were also apparent to a lesser degree in mainstream press reporting. The *Journal* did not strongly investigate Gein's religious brow-beating, and it was coy about sexual detail. Perhaps it omitted Gein's hunting connection as it was too commonplace. Press journalists were permitted to report violent crimes, violent pastimes, and superpower threats of genocide in detail – interpreting them as the unquestioned backdrop. The culture of violence was not seriously questioned. For screen dramatists like Hitch and Alma looking for fearful violence, there was plenty reported in the press. Sharing the Thursday front page with Mrs. Worden's murder are two other stories of inward-looking male group killings. Fittingly, the *Journal's* "Gein" front page was shared with news that a diabetic Wisconsin forest hunter was lost overnight in 40-centimetre snow. When he did not return that night with six other shooters: "the others assumed that he had killed a deer and was dragging it out." According to Schechter, the 1957 Wisconsin deer season ran 9 days, during which 40,000 deer were shot dead – and 11 people were shot dead during the hunt. The 11 do not include Mrs. Worden's murder (1989 :71). With all this killing and manslaughter in the woods, Gein counted on the fact that Mrs. Worden's store would not attract much attention.

On the world scale, Presbyterian fundamentalist U.S. Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles (brother of C.I.A.'s Allen Dulles) decreed on page one of the *Journal* that President Eisenhower would not decide nuclear war. Instead, U.S. field commanders occupying European countries (such as young Herzog's Germany) were handed individual personal power to trigger world nuclear destruction. Atomic "Fire certainly would be returned" by American nuclear forces occupying Western Europe, said Dulles. The nuclear brinkmanship polemic that Hitch, Alma and their audience lived under had shades of Ed Gein's mother Augusta – with her fierce, no-questions-asked terrorizing of her boys about Hell's burning afterlife if they explored affection. Around the same time, Stanley Kubrick researched Washington's nuclear war preparations with nuclear war expert Peter George. They were horrified and fearfully overwhelmed by the military literature and the frequent times U.S. air commanders had almost destroyed humanity in the years after 1945. For their own sanity, Kubrick and George had to laugh at Dulles' absurd "national security" scenario. Kubrick hired a third writer Terry Southern to redevelop their serious research as a comedy: (1964) *Dr. Strangelove* (LoBrutto 1997: 227-228).

The post 1945 world economy was set back by the costs of researching and developing nuclear weapons that were tested in "other" people's communities (Dikötter 2010: L474). "Race" minded nationalists possessed a graduating scale for classing "lesser individuals" who could go under the bomb, such as the Lester family in Australia. In the same year that Gein shot Mrs. Hogan, Washington-backed London (UKUSA) scientists exploded nuclear weaponry in Australia, radiating all the men, women and children of Yami Lester's perimeter community:

> "Seven in the morning, we felt the ground shake and I heard the bang. Black smoke came over from the South to our camp … Everyone got sick in the camp … sore eyes, skin rash, diarrhoea and vomiting. Old people, everybody got it. I had a problem with my right eye. It didn't take long, I

> just went blind." (Lester 2008).

Also, Britain's nuclear fire at Windscale-Stellafield irradiated Western Europe; and the Soviets irradiated people in Soviet failures (Roberts 1999a: 578). In the 1950s, Hitler and Stalin's bureaucrats had only recently curtailed their torture and mass killings. The U.S. threatened to nuclear bomb non-nuclear Chinese and Vietnamese cities (Ritter (2010:58). Mao killed forty-five million rural people, diverting food resources to nuclear research and defense: a police state famine genocide that reached its height around the time *Psycho* was written and performed (Dikötter 2010: L6363). Like every press reader in the 1950s, Hitch and Alma would have glimpsed text and photos of thousands of appalling interactions all around the world – more horrific and just as complex as Ed Gein's murders or Bloch's fantasy. In the main, though, many countries' politico-military censorship and spin meant that almost all the millions in the 1950s/1960s, in this Chapter, died un-remarked as individuals. How different was the audience attention lavished on an officially permitted fictional character: shower "victim" Marion Crane's "life" – her body, thoughts, actions, relationships and gestures were built and rebuilt in four cycles as a sympathetic screen character for screen believers. As for all the real dead, John Dewey philosopher John J. Stuhr says about the censored screen and other lack of communication:

> "Without true communication, men and women only manipulate one another like machines, paying no attention to the quality of the others' experience." (2012: 48).

Whether our scope of inquiry is broad or never leaves our selfish preoccupations, most audiences also desire escapism and amnesia from their choices and patchy knowledge in sleep and at other times. Famously, William Shakespeare did not write about the unnatural plague deaths of one-sixth of all London in 1603 (an extra 700 horrific deaths a week, all year, on top of the high "natural" death rate).

He wrote not for the dead but for London's frightened and ignorant plague survivors. Like Shakespeare, Hitch and Alma pointed at the looming shadow in the room, rather than its gorilla.

> "In 1603, around the time when Shakespeare was writing *Measure for Measure* and *Hamlet*, plays full of verbal reference to death and disease, one-sixth of the inhabitants of London— thirty-six thousand persons— died of the plague." (Millicent Bell 2002:11).

Recent officials also demand makers refer to unnatural deadly devices obliquely. Fifteen years before *Psycho*, Hitch and Alma touched on deadly uranium, nuclear superpower politics and covert war – in their Hitchcock and Hetch (1946) *Notorious* movie about German Nazi agents in the U.S. and South America. During its screenplay development, the F.B.I. visited Hitch. They inquired about the writers' reference to uranium nuclear fuel and espionage. Although invited to Los Angeles and working there since early 1939, Hitch and Alma were not yet U.S. citizens in 1945. Moreover, Hitch harbored childhood paranoia of the police and his father. Around 1905, Hitch's abusive religious father sent five-year-old Hitch alone to the local police station with a note requesting that the little boy be locked up for bad behavior. Hitch later said he was scarred for life. Was this "shades of Augusta"?

John Foster Dulles' threat of genocide for billions of disenfranchised people was on the front page of *The Milwaukee Journal*, next to Gein's killing of two. On page 3, President Eisenhower's military-industrial bureaucrats bickered as they diverted resources from children's education and health to weapons investors for yet another "mutually assured destruction" arms spree that, years later, was dismantled as a danger to Americans (Ritter 2010; Rhodes 2010). Gein was a blip in today's mega-death information churn. But Gein's "two" murders were a number that average *Journal* readers could imagine and dwell upon without getting

too frightened – especially as Gein was spiced with sexual taboos in a culture built much on Augusta's beliefs.

The F.B.I.'s visit to Hitch over *Notorious* ensured Hitch never again directly mentioned the nuclear weapons diseconomy that has driven domestic and international politics after 1945, but the plucky Hitch and Alma still pursued superpower counter-espionage in their popular spy caper comedy thriller *North By Northwest* (1959) without going into details. Instead of uranium, *Northwest* only has "the microfilm." They pointed at the shadow in the room, not the gorilla. Their next film, Hitchcock, Hunter and du Maurier (1963) *The Birds* has background layers of world ecological collapse – but again, it is not directly connected to ecology and international politics.

By contrast with Hitch and Alma's *Notorious* and *North By Northwest* spy films, *Psycho* is performed as a small "private sphere" drama. It explores family or household. But *Psycho* probably could not have referred to Gein's family upbringing and responsibility curve even if Bloch had developed the facts. Item V. of the censor's *Production Code* limited Americans from recording the word "hell" or listening to the word "hell" on screen, unless "hell" was "governed by the discretion and the prudent advice of the Code Administration" (MPAA 1955: V). *Psycho* does not explore Gein's forty years of religious "hellfire" upbringing at his mother's hands that would illuminate his perverse behavior in his 50s. Until the *Code* was overturned in 1968, "ridicule" of the clergy (Item VIII) was banned by American distributors at the behest of fundamentalist lobbyists, much like today's religious "police state" bans discussed in *The Power of Nightmares* documentaries (Curtis 2004).

Despite "collective suppression," young, critical and perhaps wiser Americans resisted their parents and political masters in the late 1950s. On page one of *The Milwaukee Journal* next to Gein is a report of a local youth rebellion, "Students

Dance Defiance at Baptist Ban on Dancing." Young "white" people danced to "black race" music in public:

> "Students at Wake Forest college jitterbugged Wednesday night on the campus plaza and burned in effigy the retiring president of the Baptist state convention after the convention ruled out campus dancing. About 500 or 600 students, mostly male, participated in the demonstration... record players blasted at full volume... [many students] wore dark glasses or obscured their faces with handkerchiefs."

U.S. newspaper writers had permission from their editors to write about Wake Forest's youth jitterbug opposition to fundamentalist political beliefs. But U.S. screenwriters were censored from exploring, in film, the same youth criticisms of their elders. The movie censors at the main distributors were out of touch with the predominantly young cinema audience of the 1960s. B-moviemakers with weak distribution cycles were exploring "troubled youth" issues such as: Bernds et al. (1957) *Reform School Girl* and Corman, Waters et al. (1957) *Sorority Girl.* Parents were leaving the cinema and staying home to appreciate television. 1930s consumers had been introduced to television but it was withdrawn and closed down by World War Two's war diseconomy. Television was revived in the 1950s. Public cinema, which had always attracted youth, continued to be the preferred screen venue of 1960s youth escaping the previous generation's thinking at home. Hitch, Alma and other filmmakers knew this young demographic was a key audience segment. Liberal thinking Anglophone and European youth culture expanded in the 1960s (Hanks and Goetzman 2013). The fundamentalist censors' *Production Code* became unworkable and it was withdrawn in 1968.

Just as people's exploration of their own liberty may be suppressed by authoritarians in power, so to people's medical knowledge about their own bodies and health was suppressed for the 1500 years before 1700, by the very people –

doctors – sworn to uphold knowledge. During that period, scholars preferred to believe biologist Claudios Galen's arguments published in his canonical books, rather than conduct further inquiry and experiment into the nature of life. Galen's "human" anatomy books were actually compiled from an earlier liberal culture's human anatomy drawings, plus his own dissections of other animals – after Roman Law banned the dissection of human bodies (Nuland 2008: L907).

After reading a small selection of the many dramatic incidents that are suppressed or diverted in screen culture, are we in for another 1500 years of discipline-lead suppression in historical and biographical fields too, much as medicine pretended? When makers single out Gein as a "psycho," or invent Norman Bates as a "psycho," audiences may stop asking questions about their own relationships, callous pathways, fears and upbringings. Certainly at the level of public power, there is plenty of political action aimed at not knowing. And this ignorance and fear crosses over into private upbringings too, as the next section explores.

42.

Parent-Child Responsibility Curves and Violence.

Unlike the youth demographic's anxious knife-wielding fantasy matinee idol "Norman Bates" – the real middle-aged Gein killed his victims like the trained hunter he was:

> "Using the same technique he used in butchering Mrs. Worden, Gein strung up Mrs. Hogan's body by the feet in a shed at the rear of the house. He used an overhead pulley arrangement to hoist the body above the dirt floor in the shed in which his father had once slaughtered hogs." (*The Milwaukee Journal,* p3).

These cold-blooded "violent details" were deemed suitable for 1950s quality newspaper readers whereas "sexual details" were hidden behind Freudian and Greek mythology terms such as "sex complex" and "Oedipus." Gein's years of submission to sexual fear and silence, perverse violence, authoritarian parents and a bookish fantasy life retarded a path to maturity, competence and responsibility – and led to horrific actions in his case. As a rural boy, it was usual for Gein to practiced shooting and hunting with his father from the age of 8. Farmers control nature at their boundaries by various methods, including shooting. But Gein grew up in an extreme gun culture: 11 men were shot dead in the nine days of the 1957 annual Wisconsin deer season and yet all these "usual" second-degree murders didn't rate one mention in Judge Gollmar's investigation of the same time-place. Presumably, silence on these 11 other hunting murders meant this father-and-son way of life was "normal" in the region's thought and action. What was less "normal" was for an overly righteous family to move to Plainfield and set

themselves apart from what they believed were the "immoral" locals of the town.

Much like Mother and Bates, or Mother, Father and Gein, the idea of "fathers and sons" arriving in an unfamiliar place to judge and "hunt" local families is found in Lay and Thompson (2006) *Long Tan* for example. *Long Tan* is a battle-level military history. That is, it is a very narrow, well researched but one-side military account of a battle, without extending its thinking to the economics, politics and culture of why mostly conscripted soldiers battled a local families' defenses on a colonial plantation in the defending families' country, home and business. The narrator opens in the voice of a youth who pretends he hunts fish. "We were going fishing," he says. He is not talking about fishing but about killing Le Ly Hayslip's people in their homes, kindergartens, streets, farms and businesses in 1966. The colonial youngster's senior "father substitute" officers do not patrol with him. "Fathers" command the "sons" from their hilltop headquarters' radio, much as these roles unfold in the helicopter gunship footage in Pilger and Lowery (2010) *The War You Don't See*. The "fathers" order their artillery fire into a rubber plantation and order their "fishing" youngsters from a distance of two hours away by foot patrol. Similarly, in Hitch and Alma's film, housebound Mrs. Bates commands the heights above her motel and instructs her hunting son below.

This parent-child predation is one of the world's most painful, dramatic triangulations. Thirteen days earlier than Lay and Thompson's "fishing" in Vietnam, and further north in distant Beijing, a patriotic "father" instigated a "father and daughter" version of this hunt of people dehumanized as lesser animals. Beijing "daughters" tormented and murdered people that "father" instructed them to hate. 73-year-old patriarch Mao Zedong's senior bureaucrats commanded Red Guard high school girls to destroy, not just a few teachers, but spread destruction of Chinese culture and schooling nationally in 1966. Is this familiar pattern of generational violence why *Psycho's* mother and son struck a chord with audiences? Jung Chang and Jon Halliday write:

> "Learning from their fathers and friends that Mao was encouraging violence, the Red Guards immediately embarked on atrocities. On the 5th of August in a Beijing Girls School packed with high officials' children (which Mao's two daughters had attended), the first known death by torture took place. The headmistress, a 58-year-old mother of four, was kicked and trampled by the girls and boiling water was poured over her." (2005:537)

Thrashed with the girls' brass buckles and nail sticks, the headmistress died. Compared with these real actions in the world around them, Hitch and Stefano's *Psycho* is a light fantasy of parent-child predation but it hit a chord in 1960. A few times in *Psycho*, young Bates imagines he hears the criticisms and commands of his dead mother. He not only hears his mother, he performs, off screen, "mother's criticisms" in loud falsetto as if he is his mother. In the motel office, Bates' target Marion is lined up alongside his stuffed animal trophies. He feeds Marion with a sandwich and he refers to her as "eating like a bird." Before he arrives with the sandwich, Marion believes she hears Bates' aged mother issue orders to the boy, but hunter Bates has decoyed her with Mother's call. Other than this decoy, and the stuffed birds in the motel parlor, writers Stefano and Hitch do not attempt to explore Ed Gein's real father-and-son hunting and skinning subculture. They don't explore the mother-and-son hellfire mumbo jumbo – nor other "parent child predator" triangles of state violence in the news. Rather than things public, *Psycho's* worldly agenda focuses on "family" or household. *Psycho* only glances twice to the public sphere: when Marion steals her employer's money – money already stolen from the government by her employer's tax-avoiding client – and when Bates is brought to justice in 1960's Freudian psychiatric bureaucracy.

Gein was sexually repressed and he was also aware of America's racial discourse. He was amazed, perhaps in awe of his brother Henry, who was the only white

who could work with Jamaican immigrants on a district farm. Among violent issues, racism was enshrined in the movie industry's *Code to Govern the Making of Motion and Talking Pictures*. Stefano and Hitch submitted to the *Code's* controls. *Production Code* censors abhorred consenting sexual relationships between what the uninformed invented as "race." With their "race" fallacy, bureaucrats "climbed into bed" between all screen lovers and filmmakers, exploring their skin for "racial correctness." They profiled some couples with the *Code's* mumbo jumbo term, "miscegenation." Classed with "brutality and possible gruesomeness", and "the sale of women" – miscegenation "must be treated within the careful limits of good taste" decreed the *Production Code* (MPAA 1955).

Unlike Hitch and Alma's films, a contemporary director, Douglas Sirk's (1959) *Imitation of Life* rejects racism. Sirk's argument includes a harrowingly tearful scene where a "white" teenager "discovers" his beautiful girlfriend is "black" and summarily drops her – rather than defend her before his racist male and female friends in 1950s middle class America. Sidestepping the racial *Code*, Sirk's *Imitation of Life* explores the tragic rise and fall of two families and two generations of performers. They live and work together under a succession of shared roofs – from single-mom poverty in an East Coast tenement to opulent West Coast socialite ranch. The two families struggle, in different ways, with the cruelties of contemporary plutocracy, racism, sexism and bigotry. Eight years on, Jewison, Ashby and Silliphant (1967) *The Heat Of the Night* also highlighted the absurdity of racism in a stylish homicide thriller.

Educated people today dismiss the "race" fallacy (Roberts 2010; Goldman 2015:Ch.23) and sometimes people of different skin hues are allowed to become couples in screen arguments. The thriller Mann and Yerkovich (2006) *Miami Vice* – about the vast criminal business world of international drug trafficking – is typical of movies that could not have been argued under the *Code* because of its realistic multicultural affection strands. Alice Roberts (2010) *The Incredible*

Journey science documentary demonstrates people globally are all one species from the same ancient ancestors. Educated people who understand this are not the problem. But the uneducated supported the 1930-1955 "miscegenation" *Code* and flooded world markets with racially distorted movies – Canada, Britain, Australia, Europe, Japan as well as America, and these old fallacies circulate today.

43.

Worldly Argument or Colonial Tableau.

MPAA's *Production Code* meddled in people's private lives at the inquisitorial level. Race politicians enforced what skin tones could perform what roles in U.S. film arguments. Yet young children in real life on their home streets naturally explore and co-operate with other children. Children do not unnaturally instigate "race" distinctions for their friends' wonderful skin of whatever its hue. "Race" is the deluded imposition of blighted adults and media – variations on Augusta's mumbo jumbo "hellfire" imposed on her sons. Today, anxious and cruel parents, neighbors, academics, politicians, religious fundamentalists and filmmakers continue such "race" psychosis from elder to child – in the absence of more tolerant, sustainable upbringings. In 2014, a Sydney University professor, commissioned to "improve" children's conversations, was discovered to delight in bigoted conversations (Graham and Bacon 2014: 1).

Problematic for writers of screen arguments is that, in the fourth cycle of distribution, movie investors, bureaucrats, special interest groups and distributors will set the political agenda of the argument. If they support invasive parent-child predation of locals in rubber plantations or high schools, or they believe race or sexual fallacies, if they suppress genocide knowledge as silence, or don't want sexual conjectures like *Psycho* – they will rewrite or shut down the writer's argument at some point along a screen project. Hitch and Alma's success only came by battling and sidestepping the censor for every page of their *Psycho* screenplay. But unlike Sirk or Greene, they made hay from the racial status quo enforced in the *Code*.

Statistically, Edward Gein is an aberration. Almost all people (in Plainfield, or America, or around the world) just want an enjoyable life with family and friends, without bigotry, cravings and perverse upbringings via troubled parental

powerbrokers or judgmental media people. When *Psycho* was built four times then offered to consumers, audiences did not appreciate it because they expected *Psycho* to typify the weekend they were having. They attended because *Psycho* was exciting and unusual. *Psycho* was conjecture, a thought experiment that cleared out mental cobwebs. At the same time, *Psycho* follows "development notions" that familiarize audiences with an empathetic first act. Empathetically, we follow Marion to her decision to return to her employer and give back the money. Then Marion's story turns to shadowlands with a highly unusual second act. Leading character Marion is dead and buried, yet she "lives on" as her "familiars" who continue the story. Her familiars are Bates (her new friend whom she trusted to the grave), her wronged employer's detective Arbogast, her boyfriend Sam and her sister. It is not Marion but Marion's boyfriend and her sister who initiate the climax and survive.

Refreshed with *Psycho's* storytelling that took people out of themselves, many 1960s audiences returned home to improve their days in the face of overbearing and unwise upbringings, media and communities. Not only did students jitterbug in defiance of fundamentalists – a decade on from the dance protest, students at N.Y.C. Columbia University occupied Columbia's administration building and exposed the university president as a cruel racist. Columbia's occupying students demanded a funding halt for academics who made new weapons and policies for hunting and killing five million ordinary people in South East Asia. President Kirk resigned but not before he dispatched one thousand armed and helmeted NYC police at night. The police bashed one hundred and fifty unarmed students and arrested seven hundred and fifty – according to Talbot and Lindsay (1998) *1968: The Year That Shaped A Generation*. How different are the friendly well-meaning authorities and police in Hitch's *Psycho* eight years earlier.

One of *Psycho's* few scenes of homely wisdom is Marion's sister's visit to the local sheriff and his wife. Marion's sister reveals her fears about Norman Bates'

motel. The sheriff and his wife are friendly, somewhat wise authorities – although they haven't made a local health inspection of the Bates motel recently. Despite this oversight, the friendly sheriff and wife are people most of us would desire to have, protecting us in our communities. This simple, philosophical family, holding an easy-going community authority, contrasts with the "colonial tableau" in *Psycho's* climax. Earlier, Section-31 discusses a colonial themed tableau that dominated the U.S. Congress' Roman-style steps for a century: a strangely dressed savage man raises a weapon to kill a modestly clothed woman cowering below him. Towering above and behind the savage is an unflustered, elegantly clothed giant he-man. Section-31 matches the colonial tableau in *Mission Impossible* and *The Deer Hunter's* fallacious scenes.

In *Psycho*, the colonial tableau is redone domestically. *Psycho's* climax is initiated when crazy Bates, defiantly dressed in a wig and frock, raises his right arm and savagely strikes down with a butcher's knife. A modestly clothed woman – Marion's sister – cowers below the motel savage. Towering above and behind the savage is Sam, an elegantly clothed giant he-man. He-man Sam grasps the savage's knife arm. The strangely dressed savage turns up his surprised face, his wig drops to the floor and his face distorts. Then the sexually charged tableau cuts to a night scene on the imperial Roman-style steps of the nearby County Court House. We go inside. A police psychiatrist explains Norman Bates' "condition" – much as *The Milwaukee Journal's* Oedipus reference hastily "explains" Gein for its readers.

Other filmmakers interpreted the private and public world reported in *The Milwaukee Journal* differently. Writer Graham Greene probably would have ignored Gein – and considered John Foster Dulles to be much more "psycho" and insanely consequential for world audiences when he proclaimed field generals and not Congress would decide "nuclear war in Europe". Greene published his 1958 novel on empire-building nuclear one-upmanship and filmed it as Reed and Greene

(1959) *Our Man In Havana.* Greene's 1958 warning went unheeded by pro-war bureaucrats, and White House nuclear brinkmanship in Turkey became the Cuban Nuclear Missile Crisis of 1962. Previously in 1955, Greene wrote on America's covert Vietnam invasion in *The Quiet American.* The buildup for a massive "hot" war was another Greene prediction about world history that became agonizing fact for millions of families in the 1960s, including Le Ly's. Hitchcock's writers were not in Greene's historic class.

Around the same time as *Psycho* played on people's fears about sexuality and outsiders, Truman Capote explored affection and liberation for two young prostitute outsiders in 1950s New York City: Edwards and Capote (1961) *Breakfast At Tiffany's.* (*Breakfast At Tiffany's* has one of the all-time best "wild party" movie scenes). As mentioned, novelist Fannie Hurst's *Imitation Of Life* explored the life of a talented, poor young African-American woman growing up in plutocratic, racist 1950s America – issues Hitch and Alma never touched. Sirk's (1959) *Imitation of Life* cleverly sidesteps racist distributors and censors to explore the family affections of African and European Americans under the same roof as "one family" of children, teens and adults working in the movie business.

Over the course of their long and successful careers, Alma and Hitch tended to give their majority Anglophone Caucasian demographic what they and the censor desired: reluctant, athletic white ordinary Joes and cheesecake blondes, who had minor heroism and mutual passion thrust upon each other. Unlike the more Socratic writers – Capote, Hurst and Greene – Hitch and Alma only made light of, but did not engage seriously with, the world's dramas on a reformist level. Rather than press investigations into their cultural markets, Hitch and Alma were happy to spin fables to the status quo.

44.

Psycho's Four Screenwriters.

Hitch had steered away from real politics and turned inward to romance, local crime, psychiatry, psychoanalysis and psychology before – notably fourteen years before with *Spellbound* (1945). By 1959, Hitch was in the invidious economic position where he could make almost any screen argument in the world, once censorship was discounted. During a surprising scene in *Hitchcock,* Hitch turns down distributor MGM's offer of their Bond spy franchise to direct, beginning with *Casino Royale*. The offer came two years too late for Hitch to be interested in writer Ian Fleming. As Hitch says: "I just made that movie, it's called *North By Northwest*." Hitchcock was hasty in his denial. He and screenwriter Ernest Lehman's movie is actually a very different story from the Bond franchise. For example, Lehman's spy hero "Eve" is an American femme fatale and not a British he-man. A philosopher's "little puzzle" might consider where "Eve" may have gone as a spy franchise.

Hitch made many spy thrillers over the 20th Century. Now in 1959 he searched for a new challenge. He and Alma were thinking as distributors who desired to reposition their brand in markets where the name "Hitchcock" was in danger of being eclipsed by Europe's *nouvelle vague* generation of filmmakers. Although only small independent U.S. "art house" releases, the European movies challenged uncritical people's regimented conventions, appealed to America's youthful intelligentsia and reaped free publicity in the press. As a distributor's gambit, the development of Bloch's novel *Psycho* came at the right time. The novel avoided a lot of the banned screen topics about sexual suppression and religious fundamentalism that typified Gein, yet it offered a *nouvelle vague* titillation.

Having purchased Bloch's intellectual property under license, Hitch and Alma had to ask themselves how free or restricted they were – politically and economically

– as they developed the *Psycho* movie from its novel. As for political restrictions, every studio system artist had, after the liberal 1920s, buckled under the *Production Code* of 1930. Screen culture was not to interrogate: (1) profane words; (2) the nude; (3) trafficked drugs; (4) sex perversion; (5) "white" slavery (although Stanley Kubrick, Dalton Trumbo and Howard Fast (1959) *Sparticus* films it); (6) sexual relationships between "races"; (7) sex hygiene and venereal diseases (classed together, sic); (8) contraception is not even alluded to in the code; (9) childbirth; (10) children's genitalia; (11) ridicule of the clergy; and (12) offense to any "nation, creed or race". The last "offence" – fallacious attacks on whole audience segments – this study applauds the *Code's* view. It also agrees with not glorifying guns in the hands of criminals (13). But one would break most of the other film rules exposing pedophile priests today, for example. The fundamentalists frowned on screened images of "mixed" couples in America – three years before Hitler ruled Germany with the miscegenation restriction, and for another 20 years in the U.S. after the fall of European Nazis.

Why didn't U.S. censors restrict Bloch's written *Psycho* argument but they restricted Hitch and Alma's development of the same as a screen argument? This problem of literate quietism and screen idolatry is a big problem for culture worldwide today. Some book readers are quietists who know that words are marks they choose to read and interpret or ignore on the page. But pedants in book idolatry subcultures still believe a book or magazine's words to be the very physical actions referred to (Curtis 2004). This study has discussed the problem of poorly educated audiences idolizing a political talking head and hating a State-designated enemy in Section-35. Beverly Goldberg (2002:19) relates a recent case of New Mexico fundamentalists terrorizing literate *Harry Potter* children.

Among "enlightened" literati who are quietest about words not being actions: many continue to believe – with the book idolaters – that a written and recorded movie performance of corruption is not an argument about corruption but the corrupt action itself. As neither a book nor a film is an haptic action, what are the

"actions" that a censor is paid to stop? Whose action in what time-place? What interactions among real people A, B and C? Perhaps the absurdity of mistaking a performed argument for people's actions in life was brought home to Hitch and Alma's 1960 censor. Hitch negotiated with the censor to keep *Psycho's* bathroom scene, in return for the censor coming to the set and personally directing a bedroom scene to *Code* standards. The censor never arrived on set to keep his side of the bargain.

Hitch and Stefano chose to get down to business and develop Bloch's novel as a movie screenplay, even as they wondered what the political censor might ban and what argument fans would support or reject. Gervasi's *Hitchcock* emphasizes Hitch's journey with the political censor – but surprisingly, Gervasi hardly explores the writing process between *Psycho's* four screenwriters. Rebello's *Hitchcock* book is much more instructive about the screenwriting cycle. This is not a criticism of Gervasi because the film had to select from Rebello's research. It tells a much-needed story about Alma Reville.

What is not in the film is that Hitch and Alma commenced development using a writer from their ongoing TV business, James P. Cavanagh. Cavanagh developed the *Psycho* screenplay from Bloch's book. Hitch, Alma and Cavanagh are all screenwriters, so Stefano was the fourth screenwriter recruited to the project. This is unclear in Gervasi but clear in Rebello. Cavanagh's first draft is "covered" in Stephen Rebello's book (2012:33-34). Cavanagh re-creates a successful idea from his TV stories: he invents Marion's nervous drive from Arizona, tailed by a suspicious police officer. Rebello argues that Hitch may have been unhappy with Cavanaugh's "emotional arc" in the first draft. Hitch contracted another writer, Stefano, whose background suggested the emotional arc that Hitch desired. Cavanagh had drafted much of what Hitch wanted in the first draft but:

"Where were the self-confidence, insouciance, and black wit of the

> writer's TV work? There seemed no percentage in commissioning a rewrite" (Rebello 2012: 34).

Besides ignoring Bloch and Cavanagh's contributions, Gervasi's *Hitchcock* doesn't clearly show Hitch and Stefano's development process. From Rebello, we know Hitch helped write the screenplay. He held regular morning "story meetings" with Stefano, where they talked over and "performed" character, sequence and scene improvisations. Then Stefano went to his typewriter, recall Hitch's discussions, add his own ongoing interpretation of Bloch's novel – plus his own thinking about the scenario. Stefano typed draft sequences, paper page by paper page, with no computer or digital backup. As Stefano began delivering *Psycho's* pages, Hitch took the pages home to Alma to analyze and give her expert opinion. Alma had greater skills than Hitch as a screenplay analyst and film editor. Where Gervasi and McLaughlin break ground is in exploring Alma's lifelong, regular contribution to her "Hitchcock" brand.

What is the great skill of a top screenplay analyst like Alma Reville? When a professional screenplay reader reads the following theoretical lines about Mel and Nat at the beach, the reader internally "watches" the sparkling surf crash on the beach:

> **EXT. BEACH – DAY**
>
> **Mel glances up at the ocean.**
>
> **Nat emerges from the waves and walks up the sandy beach towards Mel.**

The professional reader today watches the sand change color as the water runs over the beach sand. The reader internally listens to the crash of the

wave. The wave begins in the front (left or right) field of the surround sound audio environment and pans along the wave front as it crosses the middle of the screen and then arrives at the other stereo side of the surround sound audio environment. If there is a breeze, the reader will hear flapping clothes or buffeting on Mel's face because the reader has imaginatively become Mel's eyes and ears – Mel's "point of view" – for the screen interactions written above.

The sun will have a specific angle on this scene. If the diffusion and the angle of the sun are not specified in the writing (beyond the heading **DAY**) then it is the responsibility of the professional reader to instantly introduce, as it is read, the lighting qualities of a complete scene in motion, and every other scene in the screenplay. Is the sun low over the ocean behind Nat? If so, Nat is only a dark silhouette emerging from the surf. Is the sun behind Mel, so that Nat raises a dripping hand, shielding their eyes, to look at Mel? Is the reader hearing the foley sound effect of Nat's bare feet walking over wet sand and then hearing increasingly squeaking, as Nat's feet dry out and sink into the hot loose sand close to Mel? What is the expressed gesture that changes on Nat's face? Can the distributor's reader watch and listen to all of this in the real time of continuous scenes "on screen"? If not, the distributor is blind and deaf to every business opportunity and business trap that crosses their path in movie culture. Hitch and Alma succeeded over the 20th Century because Alma and Hitch could watch and listen to every line of a screenplay in this way. Screen thought is watched and listened to (makers behold scenes) in layered and dimensional real-time-base recordings. Screen thought is not read like literature or viewed like paintings, with their open sense of time in which to think at leisure. Hence an ability to listen to and watch high-speed, dimensional, real-time-base analysis is crucial for expert screen thinkers (Watson 2005).

When the screenplay was finished, *Psycho* was rewritten as a "shooting script" "breakdown" with numbered scenes for scheduling, cast and crew calls, budget allocations for shooting, postproduction and publicity materials. The argument was entering its performance and recording cycles. Every scene, sequence and insert was numbered in the final screenplay and matched to numbers in the schedule, department budgets, and storyboard shots. Rough scheduling, budget and management analysis of a screenplay occurs early in the early writing's development notes too, but the definite version of the production screenplay waits until the final draft is "fixed and completed."

The first cycle of *Psycho's* movie thought – the writing – was coming to a close. Of the writing, only Bernard Herrmann's music had to be written during the late recording phase. Distribution's publicity writing occurred later too. For Hitch and Stefano, with Alma's approval, the writing was done. As Rebello reports:

> "Once Hitchcock and Stefano had completed the breakdown, it was all over but the shooting. 'We had lunch and toasted the project with champagne,' said Stefano. 'He [Hitch] looked very sad, and said, 'The picture's over. Now I have to go and put it on film.'" (p.49)

45.

Successful Performance and Recording.

Once Hitch and Alma were happy with the whole argument in Stefano's screenplay, Hitch had *Psycho* sketched as a storyboard. In Section-49's Coverage, we glimpse both the working copy of the screenplay and its storyboards:

> "Lying in bed at home, Hitch loses control of the studio shoot. Alma drives to the studio set and enters. Peggy is reading the master copy, the shooting script, of the *Psycho* project. A worker jumps up from 'Mrs. Bates' chair – he is reading another copy of the *Psycho* script that sets out his specialized work. Alma asks for the script's current 'scene number.' She removes a prop from the director's chair, claiming the chair for herself. On Peggy's desk are the other written documents that emerge from the screenplay, such as the schedule, budget and department receipts, call sheets and phone numbers. Alma asks to see the screenplay's 'story boards' for the current scene." (Section-49 Coverage).

Working from the same agreed screenplay, the team coordinates hundreds of thousands of decisions that form the translucent layers and cascading arguments of movie thought. This is not to say that the writing ties performers and recordists in straightjackets. Interactions are not specified to the last eye-line, gesture, or sound level in an audio layer. Well-written screenplays are precision documents but the still need a director. When Alma arrived on set, she consulted her screenplay for the scene number and, looking up, she could see all the sets, devices and people who had been specified in this scene for this day in the schedule. Alma had four hats on: she knew the screenplay as one of its writers; she encouraged her performers; as a veteran editor she knew movie recording; and as *Psycho's* distributor she yearned to deliver its product so that she could get a return on her risky investment. By the time the argument is distributed, a film is much like

selling "plastic wares" – as Patti Smith sings about the music industry – *So You Want To Be*, 1979. The main difference is that consumers purchase, subscribe or hire the wares under license from the music or film distributor, whereas consumers are assumed not to copy and pirate the patented kitchenware when they purchase it. Distribution is entirely crucial to there being film culture at all: if consumers did not reimbursed Hitch and Alma (and the team and their suppliers) for the labor, materials and risk-taking, there would be no feature movie arguments or screen culture.

In Alma and Hitch's roles as directors of their performers, they both encouraged (increased the courage of) their performers by extending business-like friendship to them. In order to be sure Alma and Hitch could work with Janet Leigh, for example, they invited the star to dinner. Friendship is not just an area under inquiry on screen, friendship and its breakdown is also an aspect of lifestyle for people (including filmmakers) in the world. What friendship there was between Hitch and Vera Miles had broken down by the time the two made *Psycho*, and it was a constant tension on the set.

Alma worked on her friend Wit's screenplay as another project during the *Psycho* project. Performers may be cast for reasons of friendship and political affinity too. For example, 1960s megastar Brigitte Bardot agreed to perform in Godard and Moravia (1963) *Le Mémpris* (*Contempt*) because Bardot was a friend of director Jean-Luc Godard. They shared political and cultural views. They saw their project as resisting the revival of fascism and colonialism after 1945. Part of their resistance to such a backward cultural nadir was Bardot's use of her real name, "Camille," in the role she agreed to perform for Godard. ("Brigitte Bardot" was Camille's distribution publicity name). In the 1960s, "Bardot" had similar global tabloid media power as Diana Spencer (MacCabe 2009) or Kate Middleton. As the A-plus of the A list, Bardot was outside the budget of *Contempt* but she agreed to perform

for friend Godard – and as an expression of her own values. Strong performers contribute their mind as well as their body to the scope of their screen arguments.

Alma's performers such as Janet Leigh and Vera Miles knew their precise lines from the screenplay, but a director such as Alma or Hitch had to arrive on set to modulate the performers' performances. The screenplay is a basis for co-operation among respected specialists, not a rule. As Section-12 discusses, writers rarely specify the "spoken tone" in which any line of dialogue is intoned. When performers read and reread the screenplay, they gradually reduce their hundreds of assumptions about how to perform a gesture or inflect a tone. Each time scenes are read or performed, each performer adjusts their changing beliefs about the screen elements: nuances of timing, placement, coming and going, bodily disposition, touch, eye-lining, display, gesture, listening, intonation, and so on, among self and others in a scene. Performers entirely rebuild the argument under the director's overview of the screenplay, encouragement and guidance.

During a performance cycle, performers adopt their roles' characteristics. For example, Russell Crowe, on accepting a screenplay role, quickly dresses in a draft version of part of his character's costume (Crowe 2007). This token costume device helps Crowe rebuild the character – especially the complex character's decision-making and initiatives as an inquirer. David Lynch (2001) *Mulholland Dr.* explores this ability of an exceedingly strong performer to "take on" their role and intuitively "be" another character's thoughts, body, intimacy, friendship, family and public power when called to the stage. Naomi Watts performs "Dianne" who makes a fist of learning her lines for an audition, with her flatmate's help. Once on stage, no sense of Dianne's work-a-day attitude with her flatmate remains. She mesmerizes and convinces the other audition performer of her dramatic interactions and his too, while capturing and astonishing the watching industry people with her unforced omniscient intensity. Such performing by Crowe or

Watts or others built on strong writing but it is not in itself writing. Performance is another skill set – it is a courageous rebuild of movie interactions in the real world of the now, before the mirror or on stage, among self and others who are in the now, too. The striking performance is fuelled by leaping – unexpectedly and wide-eyed – from the team's agreed page. Earlier Livingstone and Archer said completion decisions "need not be the product of some highly lucid process of conscious deliberation. Spontaneous, intuitive thoughts or decisions can do the trick" (2010:444). What David Lynch explores with Watts is the whole argument – what happens first during the highly lucid process of conscious deliberation when Dianne practices her screenplay at home before her audition's "star turn". When the performance is completed on stage, "intuition" appears to "do the trick" but the conscious deliberation has already occurred in the writing, reading and rehearsals. What appears quick and simple – a few lines of writing and a few seconds of movie for audiences, is much more complex in the set-up and real-time performing and recording cycles of the argument. A movie performance should not be confused with theatre performance. Theatre performers use a stage. Movie performers use angles.

Unlike the movie set, the theatre stage is a very "character-friendly" place, with the appropriate settings built and furnished for all the characters to interact with each other in real-time on stage. Whether it is a "New York apartment" in Noël Coward (1932) *Designed For Living* or a public garden in Samuel Beckett (1953) *Waiting For Godot*, the theatre stage is arranged for whole actions and the performers comfortably interact in an "apartment" or a "garden." But screen performers do not perform theatre actions. Screen performers perform angles and shots for camera and microphone rather than necessarily interact with all the others on a theatre stage. Performing screen angles is very "stop-start." Performers go off to rest and then return to repeat the middle or end or beginning of an action's angle – already at full energy, speed and direction for the overall action – remembering what marks to hit, direction to look, and fresh delivery. (A

more affectionate and liberating approach to performing among young recordists is Mendes and Ball 1999. A young couple's private love-making in *American Beauty* is founded on videoing each other.)

Take the shower scene. In the writing and the movie, Mrs. Bates stabs Marion in the shower and then her son Norman Bates arrives to wrap and dispose of Marion's body. When the writing was handed over to the performance cycle, five performers performed the three roles. Victim "Marion" was performed by star Janet Leigh and also her nude body double Marli Renfro. Marion's death was performed solo for many days by each of these two performers working alone. The third performer in these nude shots was Hitch's hand, holding the safety "effects" knife in close ups of the "stabbings" and "killing" against the two women performers' bodies.

Then the recordists turned the camera and microphone around. Now they shot "Mrs. Bates" attacking with the knife – to match its trajectory to the dailies' nude victim shots. Murderous mother "Mrs. Bates" is famously revealed in the movie climax to be her son "Norman Bates," performed by Anthony Perkins – but Perkins is not dressed as mother in this shower scene. In fact, Perkins was not even on set. Many body doubles performed Mrs. Bates in her many scenes up until the climax, when Perkins (Norman Bates) is revealed in mother's clothes. For the shower scene, stuntwoman Margo Epper performed the shadowy "Mrs. Bates" role. She is barely seen. Her face is almost a black silhouette, as she is lit from behind. Epper's silhouette appears from the behind the shower curtain and stabs. Epper stabs towards the recordists' camera, rather than victim Marion, who is not on the set for these reverse shots. Epper and Hitch's stabbing would later be edited together with Leigh and Renfo's "Marion" reactions. Finally, after many days, Perkins (as Norman Bates) was called to the set to wrap Marion's dead body in the shower curtain and carry her to her car trunk. Creating this argument in the writing cycle, and rebuilding the same argument in the performance and

recording cycles unfolds as vastly different methods and complications of arguing movie thought. The recording of the performance starts earlier with camera tests; and ends later with many final layers of the audio such as stabbing a melon in postproduction for the foley sound effect (Rebello 2012: 118).

For a performer thinking about performance (Bates will attack my naked body in the shower) and an audio recordist rebuilding the "same argument" (interior acoustic challenges of Leigh's screams and running water – perhaps best recorded separately?) – these are not similar cycles of movie thought – even though the performers and recordists co-operate for weeks or months together. What unites their thinking is in the writing. Every specialist explores ways of controlling their individual – even lonely – contribution to the whole argument as it is rebuilt in its four cycles. It is lonely at the top of the studio "ziggurat" – a flat-topped pyramid with the four "above-the-line" groups holding roughly equal power in the corners. Recall performer Heath Ledger, tired and lonely and the Joker, who lost his life between calls to the *Batman* set in New York City. When performers give embodied mind to a movie argument, their mind is not in the now and they are vulnerable. Producers or other makers protect them, or the project team fails. In Section-49's *Hitchcock* coverage, Janet Leigh feels abandoned when the recordists' back-projection equipment breaks down:

> "Using back projection, Leigh 'drives' her car 'from Arizona to California' on the studio set. To encourage Leigh's facial gestures during the long drive, Hitch sneers an impromptu, scolding, guilt-ridden, sexually explicit 'thought-track' at Leigh. The projection burns out. Leigh feels abandoned in the stage car as recordists bustle around her."

Professional performers like Leigh (or the young woman performer in Sirk 1959 *Imitation of Life*) learn to manage their self on such intimidating occasions. Psychologically and physically, the drama stage is both healthy and life-affirming

much of the time, but also intoxicating, risky and potentially injurious. A performer is fortunate indeed who, from childhood to the grave, enjoys wise and friendly companions in the entertainment business. In Gervasi's next *Hitchcock* scene, Leigh's co-star Vera Miles (Jessica Biel) visits her dressing room to offer her solidarity against their work pressures. Hitchcock, too, has few people who look after him besides Alma and daughter Patricia. Lew Wasserman, his agent, helps Hitch and Alma negotiate their *Psycho* distribution deal with co-distributor Paramount. Without Lew, there would have been no *Psycho*, and Lew's share of the revenue reflects that. When filmmakers test and trust each other's maturity, competence and responsibility curves, movies succeed. *Evelyn* argues this too. In *Hitchcock's* backstory, mutual distrust has blighted Hitchcock and Vera Miles' relationship. Hitch desired to build Vera's performance career but Vera wants babies. After a clash of expectations on previous projects, it is only contract obligations that bring Hitch and Miles together on *Psycho*.

Hitchcock's main breakdown of trust is between Hitch and Alma in their private sphere at home. It is often hard for working couples to also manage relaxed lives together at the center of their private households. Movie thought – with its inquiry into both the private and the public – is one of the few complex realist inquiries that explores working couples across the whole agenda of their economic and private lives together. Gervasi's *Hitchcock* explores co-operation well. It contrasts with Godard's *Contempt* argument about failure. Frequent failure reminds makers that arguing these four cycles is not a structural flow like a how-to manual but a somewhat unpredictable agenda among real people in public workplaces and private spheres. After wrapping the *Psycho* shoot and editing a rough draft of the film for Paramount, Hitch believes he has written and recorded a dull, unattractive and annoying film – a waste of his and Alma's lifetime capital and a year of everyone's working life. Hitch's personal life hits rock bottom, too. The movie's climax approaches.

At the climax, Gervasi's *Hitchcock* is somewhat weak – in the way that *Heaven And Earth* and *Two Hands'* climaxes are weak too. At the climax, Hitch and Alma (as public makers and private individuals) clash in a furious late night kitchen argument. Eventually Alma agrees to come back to the studio and help Hitch re-edit *Psycho*. Hitch agrees to love Alma unreservedly again. In the editing suite, Alma's editing skills and Hitch's working relationship with composer Bernard Herrmann (which we do not see) – three of history's great moviemakers – rebuild an ugly duckling into a swan. But what this climax misses are two or three minutes of running time that enact key editing moments.

In the weak climax, Alma and Hitch "speak" of Herrmann's innovative score but this should have been performed as "action" and not "uttered" with the weakest element of movie thought. The climax should have enacted Alma's editing skills at the bench and Hitch's complex relationship with composer Herrmann. An improved climax would have been the opportunity to show glimpses of *Psycho's* black and white dailies rolling under the ground glass editing screen, as both the *Psycho* and *Hitchcock* arguments climax. But *Hitchcock* forgoes this stronger climax – perhaps partly for budget and ownership reasons?

With *Psycho* recorded, Hitch and Alma's distribution cycle ramped up. Distribution thinking began in 1959 with Hitch's response to *North By Northwest's* newspaper reviews. Hitch chose to resist press opinions that France's *nouvelle vague* overshadowed his autumn years. Now Alma and Hitch activate another valuable property: their "Hitchcock" brand. The partners had built their brand on Hitch's portly profile and his unique, cultivated patter to camera. Hitch's profile and patter was an amusing, familiar "trademark" that accompanied their every new movie release. With public demand, Hitch initiated incidental cameo performances of himself in their 1950s films. At the beginning of *North By Northwest* (1959) Hitch is glimpsed as a harried commuter who arrives too late to board a crowded Manhattan bus. At the beginning of *Vertigo* (1958),

pedestrian Hitch strolls past a San Francisco shipyard gate carrying a musical instrument case. At the beginning of *Psycho* (1960) he is glimpsed wearing a cowboy hat outside Marion's Arizona realtor office. Hitch shared this affectionate running gag with his fans at the beginning of his films in order to get the trademark out of the way. Audience-viewers then settled into the movie argument. This "publicity and distribution" trademark and cameo to satisfy his fans was not related to the argument's writing. Hitch did not write his cameo into the screenplay. He waited to surprise his own performers and recordists on set, on the day of shooting a scene in which he had decided to perform as well as record. Hitch's other trademark appearance – for *Psycho's* distribution publicity – is not in the film itself but in the movie's advertising trailer (now a DVD extra). Hitch takes audience-viewers on a tongue-in-cheek guided tour of the Bates Motel and Mrs. Bates' house on the hill above the motel. Hitch teases with his droll English-accented patter.

Distribution and its publicity is a complex cycle that in many ways is like selling and servicing any mass consumer product or political campaign. Filmmakers Alma and Hitch carefully build their publicity brand over three decades from the 1930s until their 48th *Psycho* film. As distributors, part of their publicity involved Hitch's media appearances at various city premieres of their movies. The Internet has revolutionized distribution but until the 1970s, a few hard-copy prints of movies were usually released in a few major cities, sometimes running for years of screenings in a flagship cinema; and gradually an exhibition campaign spread to regional places around the globe, over months – or blockbuster distribution campaigns over years.

Gervasi's *Hitchcock* opens mid-1959 at Hitch and Alma's heavily publicized premiere of *North By Northwest*. It ends mid-1960, with Hitch and Alma attending *Psycho's* heavily publicized New York City premiere. *Hitchcock* is a one-year biography of Hitch and Alma's lives, from the distribution of one movie to the

next. Given Hitch and Alma's tight budget and co-distributor Paramount's relative disinterest in the film, Hitch and Alma reverted to many low-cost publicity tricks learned during more than 40 years in the film industry. They involved cinema owners. They created an atmosphere of public anxiety and fear – much in the way political campaigns unfold in Curtis (2004) *The Power of Nightmares.* Uniformed security guards were suggested for cinema lobbies, and no patron was to be admitted after the movie commenced – cinema owners signed contracts to this scare-raising process. Hitch put all these efforts into *Psycho's* initial distribution because Hitch *did not believe* he had a hit on his hands. According to Rebello, Hitch was bewildered and surprised when *Psycho* was an immediate success with audiences. Hitch did not expect windfall profits from the argument at all. It is with this cautious, prudent, doubtful mindset that we should interpret Alma and Hitch's efforts to make their creative gamble pay off. Filmmakers are well aware that, even after writing, performing and recording a superb movie, problems in the forth distribution cycle can stymie a film like *Psycho*. For example, director John Duigan turned down a higher budget film to make writer Naomi Wallace's (1997) *Lawn Dogs*. The project team delivered this brave and beautiful gem to distributors just as the studio was in corporate takeover anguish – and *Lawn Dogs* fell between the cracks. Another movie hampered in its distribution cycle is the black comedy Hilditch and McCall (2002) *The Actress*. This in-your-face, heartfelt, contemptuous low budget youth movie was pushed aside by a tired, limp soap opera that garnered distribution funds but failed. Without distribution, *The Actress* faded out. Legitimate copies of it are rare.

Hitch and Alma did have another business venture that would have somewhat saved them if *Psycho's* distribution failed. Around the time of making *Psycho*, agent Lew Wasserman branded the "Hitchcock" name and ownership to a long-running television series, *Alfred Hitchcock Presents*. Unlike a movie, the series was licensed ahead of its production costs to national consumer brands. Other business brands (Ford vehicles, etc.) paid for the *Hitchcock Presents* TV series' writing, performing, recording and distribution. On the TV series, the budget and above-

the-line income was paid up front. Hitch and Alma carried little risk by the time each episode was made. By contrast, the risks carried by *Psycho* (and similar risks carried by moviemaking generally) are enormous. Specialists at the top of the ziggurat defeat these risks and are paid accordingly.

Hitch and Alma had to balance the forecast demand for each story with political pressures on the story, for example. They had been scared off serious stories that explored (Orwell's) Cold War after their visit from the F.B.I. regarding *Notorious*. As successful businesspeople but anxious new citizens, they took few political risks but some financial risks. By their back yard pool, Alma and Hitch discuss "risk and movie thought" in an insightful *Hitchcock* scene. Hitch pleads with his senior partner to mortgage their mansion and fund *Psycho*:

> "Do you remember the fun we had, when we started out, all those years ago? We didn't have any money then, did we? We didn't have any time either, but we took risks, do you remember? We experimented. We invented new ways of making pictures because we had to. I just want to feel that kind of freedom again. Like we used to, you know?"

Gambling on maturity, competence and responsibility, they risk their life savings in an uncertain world. Hitch and Alma honed the screenplay. They cast superb, appropriate performers (although Hitch was frustrated with wooden "Sam"). They recruited maestro Herrmann. They recorded luminously on a perilous shoestring. They distributed carefully, preparing to build on day-to-day changes in their markets. They paid their project team. Partly through luck, but mainly via their skillful team, *Psycho's* gamble paid off. They felt that kind of freedom again.

*****

CONCLUSIONS

Pages 414-421 removed
for copyright or
proprietary reasons.

It is Conclusions, part 46. Screen thoughts: developing interactions as arguments.

*****

Appended
COVERAGE, SCREEN and TEXT SOURCES.

Pages 423-444 removed
for copyright or
proprietary reasons.

It is Appended: Coverage, screen and text sources, part 47. A cry in the dark coverage, and, Heaven and Earth coverage, and, Hitchcock coverage

50.

Timeline – 170 Movies Plus:

Directors and Writers.

Louis Le Prince et al. (1888) *Roundhay Garden Scene (short).*
The first extant screen drama, about four dancers in Yorkshire.

Arrernte Nation, Gillen and Spencer (1901) *Chitchingulla (short).*
An ancient dance gifted along Australia's international song-line network.

Edwin S. Porter et al. (1903) *The Life of an American Fireman (short).*
First plot that intercuts: between fire victim scene and rescuer scene.

Tait, Tait et al. (1906) *The Story Of The Kelly Gang.*
First feature length movie: an oppressed family in a police state fights back.

Charlie Chaplin (1916) *Behind The Screen: The Bewildered Stage Hand (short).*
A new filmmaker resists a studio bully boss and befriends the studio's star.

Whale, Sherriff and Wells (1933) *The Invisible Man.*
A scientist's self-experiment disables him; he is badgered, and so runs amok.

Whale et al. (1935) *Bride Of Frankenstein.*
The mutated creations of an organ transplant doctor turn against him.

Ford and Steinbeck (1940) *The Grapes Of Wrath.*
Indebted American farmers struggle against inherited capital and are defeated.

Shumlin and Greene (1940) *The Confidential Agent.*
Spanish republican and British heiress fight U.K. right wing assassins.

Welles, Mankiewicz et al. (1941) *Citizen Kane.*
Feared news media mogul and warmonger dies wealthy, despised and friendless.

Curtiz et al. (1942) *Casablanca.*
Jaded entrepreneur chooses between his war refugee lover and fighting fascism.

Lang and Greene (1944) *The Ministry of Fear.*
Ex-psychiatric prisoner and a war refugee fight spies in a nightly bombed city.

Wilder, Cain and Chandler (1944) *Double Indemnity.*
Two life insurance cheats murder a husband and turn on each other.

Hitchcock, MacPhail and Beeding (1945) *Spellbound.*
Two lovers, both psychiatrists, investigate paranoia, corruption and murder.

Goulding, Trotti and Maugham (1946) *The Razor's Edge.*
War hero renounces wealth, gains meditative enlightenment to help others.

Hitchcock and Hetch (1946) *Notorious.*
Spies fall in and out of love as they risk death marrying into a nuclear gang.

Hawks and Chandler (1946) *The Big Sleep.*
Private eye investigates two sisters embroiled in organised crime.

Reed and Greene (1949) *The Third Man.*
A naïve pulp novelist desires a Czech war refugee who loves a drug

smuggler.

Boulting and Greene (1950) *Brighton Rock.*
Young gang boss murderer deceives a poor waitress in order to evade justice.

Mankowitz et al. (1950) *All About Eve.*
Broadway star betrayed by starlet assistant and starlet's press critic champion.

Wilder, Brackett and Marshman (1950) *Sunset Blvd.*
Poor screenwriter lives, loves and dies at the whim of a mad ex-star.

Donen, Kelly, Comden and Green (1952) *Singin' In The Rain.*
Performers discover how 1920s synchronized dialogue reinvents their careers.

O'Ferrall, Dalrymple, Storm and Greene (1953) *The Heart Of The Matter.*
Colonial police chief chooses between his wife, a refugee lover and suicide.

Lee and Shute (1956) *A Town Like Alice.*
Soldiers and expatriate women POWs survive Japan's South East Asian invasion.

Lang, Marchant, Ephron and Ephron (1957) *Desk Set.*
Computer expert falls in love with firm's librarian he plans to retrench.

Bernds et al. (1957) *Reform School Girl.*
Reform school girl seeks love with a young fugitive hood on the outside.

Corman, Waters et al. (1957) *Sorority Girl.*
Women's jealousies and cruelty in a sorority house lead to killing.

Dymtryk, Anhalt and Shaw (1958) *The Young Lions.*
Chivalrous German, US Italian hustler and US Jewish young father at war.

Hitchcock and Taylor (1958) *Vertigo.*
Ex-cop desires a beautiful prostitute entangled in a murder plot.

Mankiewicz and Greene (1958) *The Quiet American.*
British journalist defends his love for Vietnamese girl from a US spy.

Kubrick, Trumbo and Fast (1959) *Sparticus.*
Roman slave leads a revolt against fascist imperialism.

Hitchcock and Lehman (1959) *North By Northwest.*
Suave advertiser is set up as a patsy in a female spy's national security op.

Reed and Greene (1959) *Our Man In Havana.*
A shopkeeper's daughter's expensive tastes lead to his espionage rort.

Sirk, Hurst, Griffin and Scott (1959) *Imitation of Life.*
Multiracial friendships lead to entertainment wealth, tragedy and heroic struggle.

Wilder, Diamond et al. (1959) *Some Like It Hot.*
Fugitives from the mafia hide as transvestites, and fight over a girl musician.

Hitchcock, Stefano and Bloch (1960) *Psycho.*
Sexually repressed motel owner murders a girl thief, is captured by her family.

Edwards and Capote (1961) *Breakfast At Tiffany's.*
A stormy friendship blossoms between two troubled New York prostitutes.

de Sica and Moravia (1961) *Two Women.*
Mother and daughter war refugees run from invasion, rape and betrayal.

Truffaut et al. (1962) *Jules And Jim.*
A young woman chooses to love two young men through war and peace.

Young and Fleming (1962) *Dr. No.*
UKUSA spy beds a colonial orphan, defeats a Chinese-German mercenary.

Godard and Moravia (1963) *Le Mémpris* or *Contempt.*
A despised and hapless screenwriter loses his lover to a macho producer.

Hitchcock, Hunter and du Maurier (1963) *The Birds.*
An environmental catastrophe ruins small town lives and loves.

Grenville, Anouilh and Anhalt (1964) *Beckett.*
A king and bishop fight to the death over sex, politics and religion.

Kubrick, Southern and George (1964) *Dr. Strangelove.*
Psychotic US general and foolish officials start the nuclear apocalypse.

Watkins et al. (1964) *Culloden.*
Military analysts report the English genocide of the Celts in Scotland.

Watkins et al. (1965) *The War Game.*
The last nuclear war victims follow official procedures until dying.

Ingmar Bergman et al. (1966) *Persona.*
Nurse unfolds her fears, violence, love and dreams to a mute actress patient.

Pontecorvo et al. (1966) *The Battle Of Algiers.*
French colonialists impose a national security state on Algerian resisters.

Antonioni and Cortazar (1966) *Blow Up.*
Photographer discovers a murder while filming and bedding his models.

Jewison, Ashby and Silliphant (1967) *The Heat Of the Night.*
Black detective is shanghaied into solving a murder in a racist backwater.

Aldrich and Marcus (1968) *The Killing Of Sister George.*
A struggle for love, sex, friendship and job security among UK lesbians.

Anderson and Sherwin (1968) *If.*
Two students and their café waitress lover lead an armed insurrection.

Kubrick and Clarke (1968) *2001: A Space Odyssey.*
Primates fight against those that use bones and computers as weapons.

Watkins and Gosling (1968) *The Gladiators.*
UK and Chinese soldier lovers prefer sex over TV brand-sponsored war.

Zeffirelli and Shakespeare (1968) *Romeo And Juliet.*
Two lovers, ethnically profiled by warring parents, choose death over piety.

Powell, Lindsay and Yeldham (1969) *The Age Of Consent.*
Famous artist retreats to tropical island, takes a local girl as his model.

Antonioni, Gardner et al. (1970) *Zabrinski Point.*
American resisters to the invasion of Vietnam make love and anarchy.

Kotcheff, Jones and Cook (1971) *Wake In Fright.*
A teacher en route to freedom, is trapped in killing, gambling, sex and alcohol.

Kubrick and Burgess (1971) *A Clockwork Orange.*
Murderous hood enters a labyrinth of parole, prison, psychiatry and PR

politics.

Makavejev and Reich (1971) *W.R. Mysteries Of The Organism.*
Freudian fugitives from Soviet Europe find similar violent oppression in US.

Polanski and Shakespeare (1971) *Macbeth.*
Ambitious couple murder for power, go mad and face overthrow.

Coppola and Puzo (1972, 1974, 1990) *The Godfather (1,2,3).*
Sicilian family leverages US and papal corruption to gain business empire.

Buñuel and Carriere (1972) *The Discrete Charm of the Bourgeoisie.*
Wry violence, ennui, façade and dreams of corrupt snobs wasting their lives.

Herzog and Fricke (1972) *Aguirre, Wrath of God.*
Mercenaries and missionaries invade a haunting paradise that fights back.

Gorrie, Magnus et al. (1973) *Edward VII* (Series)
Edward Saxe-Coburg-Gotha's responsibility curve from 1841 to 1910.

Ingmar Bergman et al. (1972) *Cries And Whispers.*
Maid befriends dying sister as her suppressed sisters' neuroses flare.

Francis Ford Coppola et al. (1974) *The Conversation.*
Sound recordist goes crazy protecting security and investigating murder.

Nichols, Webb et al. (1975) *The Graduate.*
Student couple escape her seductress mother.

George Lucas et al. (1977) *Star Wars.*
Lucas' 'fantasy war' response after prevented from making *Apocalypse Now.*

Allen and Brickman (1977) *Annie Hall.*
Allen satirizes Allen and California as he chases Annie from NYC to LA.

Cimino et al. (1978) *The Deer Hunter.*
Young white conscripts endure the makers' fake bamboo and roulette.

Schepisi and Kenneally (1978) *The Chant Of Jimmie Blacksmith.*
Educated indigenous youth is unjustly treated until he mounts a rebellion.

Chaplin, Cleese, Gilliam, Idle, Jones and Palin (1979) *The Life Of Brian.*
Bastard of Roman invasion joins a Marxist committee and they martyr him.

Scott, O'Bannon and Shusett (1979) *Alien.*
Space freighter answers planet's distress call and is attacked by alien parasites.

Forman, Ragni, Rado and Weller (1979) *Hair.*
Dance musical: Vietnam recruit and heiress join hippies, a friend takes recruit's place.

Ashby and Kosinski (1979) *Being There.*
A gentle fool, born and raised in a garden, wanders in the realm of superpower politics.

Kubrick and King (1980) *The Shining.*
Incompetent alcoholic writer unleashes violence on his trapped wife and child.

Reisz, Pinter and Fowles (1981) *The French Lieutenant's Woman.*
Evolution scientist and liberated women fight Victorian seaside prudes.

Szabó, Dobai and Mann (1981) *Mephisto.*

A frightened performer chooses officious power under Nazis over his friends.

Spielberg and Matheson (1982) *E.T.*
Kids' bicycle gang rescues a stranded alien creature from space.

Attenborough and Briley (1982) *Gandhi.*
Indian lawyer overthrows British imperialism by denying war, trade or servitude.

Scott, Dick, Fancher and Peoples (1982) *Blade Runner.*
Bounty hunter stalks fugitive robots, saves one and questions his identity.

Chaplin, Cleese, Gilliam, Idle, Jones and Palin (1983) *The Meaning Of Life.*
Musical about sex, overpopulation, religion, officials, class, obsession and death.

Gilbert and Russell (1983) *Educating Rita.*
Mature age external liberal arts student discovers academia and personal freedom.

Kazdan and Benedek (1983) *The Big Chill.*
Middle class student friends reunite at a beloved suicide's funeral.

Anderson and Sherwin (1984) *O Lucky Man.*
Sex object survives nuclear disaster, medical experiments and global predation.

Joffe, Schanberg, Robinson and Pran (1984) *The Killing Fields.*
An educated photo-journalist survives Pol Pot's anti-modernity fascism.

Radford and Orwell (1984) *1984.*
Fascist public relations state sabotages lovers' feelings and historical

thought.

Lean, Rau and Forster (1984) *A Passage To India.*
Naïve colonist ingénue falsely charges doctor with assault and destroys his life.

Weir, Williamson and Koch (1985) *The Year Of Living Dangerously.*
Local photographer warns foreign journalist of 1965 Indonesian genocide.

Weir, Wallace and Kelly (1985) *Witness.*
Cop escapes crime boss police chief, hiding with low-tech organic Christians.

Geoff Murphy et al. (1985) *The Quiet Earth.*
Conjecture about a today's world suddenly inhabited by only three people.

John Duigan et al. (1986) *The Year My Voice Broke.*
Youth observes love between childhood friend and young hoodlum.

David Lynch et al. (1986) *Blue Velvet.*
Friends investigate a small town crime gang, a victim and corrupt police.

Stone and Weiser (1986) *Wall Street.*
Share trader availed of an escort, paid a fortune to commit insider crimes.

Berri and Pagnol (1986) *Jeanne de Florette* and *Manon des Sources.*
Covetous farmers deceive, murder and sexually stalk their neighbours.

Beineix and Djian (1986) *27° Betty Blue.*
Odd jobs writer attempts to share life with a bipolar girlfriend and fails.

Gilles Mimouni et al. (1986) *L'Appartement.*
Youth pursues love in two dangerous triangles before returning to his

fiancée.

Duigan, Noonan et al. (1987) *Vietnam* (Series)
Teens frolic and date each other as their bureaucrat fathers invade Vietnam.

Dexter et al. (1987-2000) *Inspector Morse* (Series)
Cultured homicide detective and sidekick solve murders in Oxfordshire.

Kubrick, Herr and Hasford (1987) *Full Metal Jacket.*
Marine recruits endure obedience training, invade Vietnam, die or retreat.

Schepisi, Caswell and Bryson (1988) *A Cry in the Dark.*
A nation's gossips, media and bureaucrats wage war on bereaved young mother.

Allen (1989) *Crimes And Misdemeanours.*
Wealthy, respected doctor gets away with murdering his affair.

Schepisi, Stoppard and Le Carre (1990) *The Russia House.*
Scientist's wife reaches out to a publisher, and they evade two spy services.

Coen, Coen et al. (1991) *Barton Fink.*
Theatre writer struggles to write movies as his illusions are undermined in LA.

Demme and Tally (1991) *Silence Of The Lambs.*
Female FBI agent befriends a jailed serial killer hoping to capture or kill another.

Altman and Tolkien (1992) *The Player.*
A script development executive kills a writer and beds the writer's girlfriend.

Fricke, Magidson and Stearns (1992) *Baraka.*
Surreal patterns of nature and people's actions world wide, set to music.

George and Watson (1992) *Kewen And Blue.*
Science and sports students teach each other their languages and skills.

Newell, Barnes and Von Arnim (1992) *Enchanted April.*
Four 1919 women holiday in Italy and rethink their relationships.

de Heer et al. (1993) *Bad Boy Bubby.*
A child escapes house arrest after 20 years and discovers the real world.

Seed, Dobbs and Davies (1990) *House Of Cards* (Series)
A politician connives with cronies, climbing to ultimate power over Britain.

Stone and Hayslip (1993) *Heaven And Earth.*
Girl soldier defends her home then raises children with an enemy abuser.

Reitman and Ross (1993) *Dave.*
President's body double takes power and reforms neoconservative America.

P.J. Hogan et al. (1994) *Muriel's Wedding.*
Dreamer thieves from her corrupt family, seeks love and happiness.

Andrew Payne et al. (1994-1997) *Pie In The Sky* (Series)
Semi-retired detective-come-chef entrepreneur solves village crimes.

Heckerling and Austen (1995) *Clueless.*
Snobbish students groom a rookie to be someone she is not, and fail.

Campbell, Fleming, France et al. (1995) *GoldenEye.*
UKUSA spy and Russian programmer hunt dissident ex-Soviet crime cartel.

Oshii, Itō and Shirow (1995) *Ghost In The Machine.*
Cyborgs and people fight international corruption, street crime and cybercrime.

de Palma, Koepp et al. (1996) *Mission Impossible (One).*
Spy agency adopts disguises, ruses and spectacle to defeat other spies.

Hytner, Miller et al. (1996) *The Crucible.*
Hysterical, sexually repressed girls accuse seniors of witchcraft, so hang them.

Luhrmann, Pearce and Shakespeare (1996) *Romeo And Juliet.*
Young lovers are discriminated against by both families, so commit suicide.

Hanson and Elroy (1997) *L.A. Confidential.*
Two enemy detectives unite to solve and end police corruption.

Duigan and Wallace (1997) *Lawn Dogs.*
Girl with sense of justice befriends young man and helps him escape posse.

Morahan, Whitemore and Powell (1997) *Dance To The Music Of Time.* (Series)
20th Century saga of novelist's life with U.K. 'in generation' intellectuals.

Gregor Jordan et al. (1998) *Two Hands.*
Foolish endearing hoodlum and his girlfriend run from Sydney crime boss.

Malick and Jones (1998) *The Thin Red Line.*
Soldier reflects on life among the folly of a WW2 battle on an island paradise.

Gary Ross et al. (1998) *Pleasantville.*
Contemporary teens become the children of 1950s white small town

parents.

Mendes and Ball (1999) *American Beauty.*
Families unravel: mid-life crisis, adultery, fascism, drugs, fear, lies. Two escape.

Hallström and Irving (1999) *The Cider House Rules.*
Young doctor abandons abortion clinic, sees tragedy without it, and returns.

Weitz, Weitz and Herz (1999) *American Pie.*
Boys pledge to end their virginity, renounce machismo to regain their girlfriends.

Mann, Roth and Brenner (1999) *The Insider.*
Scientist looses his family, fighting U.S. tobacco companies' cancer epidemic.

Soderburg , Grant and Brockovich (2000) *Erin Brockovich.*
Unemployed secretary becomes millionaire lawyer fighting cancerous factories.

Lee and Wang (2000) *Crouching Tiger Hidden Dragon.*
A Han princess martial arts fighter falls in love with a young Mongol warlord.

Polanski, Harwood and Szpilman (2000) *The Pianist.*
Celebrated Polish pianist is hidden by the resistance during Nazi invasion.

Roach, Glienna et al. (2000) *Meet The Parents.*
Male nurse struggles with his father-in-law's national security paranoia.

Howard and Goldsman (2001) *A Beautiful Mind.*
Genius mathematician suffers bipolar cold war delusions that threaten his

family.

Jeunet and Laurant (2001) *Amelie.*
Young waitress celebrates love, sex, family, community, aging, hopes and death.

David Lynch et al. (2001) *Mulholland Dr.*
Actresses and director struggle with desires, drugs, mafia, and each other.

Miyazaki et al. (2001) *Spirited Away.*
Child forced into a spirit-world bathhouse to save her pig parents.

Richard Kelly et al. (2001) *Donnie Darko.*
Time distorts as teen contemplates existence, fear, family, intimacy and death.

Jonz and Kaufman (2002) *Adaptation.*
Writer learns how to research flowers and participate in real drama.

Hilditch and McCall (2002) *The Actress.*
Actress femme fatale piques the boys and girls in a share house.

McDonough, McDermid and Leonard (2003) *Wire In The Blood: Sharp Compassion.* (Series)
Autistic psychiatrist and female detective solve fake terror plot.

Campbell and Tredwell-Owen (2003) *Beyond Borders.*
Aid-worker lovers save humanity, braving death in three wars.

Waters, Fey and Wiseman (2004) *Mean Girls.*
Snob girl gang befriends a newbie who outdoes their venom.

George and Pearson (2004) *Hotel Rwanda.*

Hotel manager and his family fight extreme racism in 1994 Rwanda and the North Atlantic.

Gaghan and Baer (2005) *Syriana.*
Oil sheik snubs U.S. oil and modernizes his people, so he is assassinated.

Mann and Yerkovich (2006) *Miami Vice.*
Cops infiltrate South America's biggest crime empire and its female banker.

De Niro and Roth (2006) *The Good Shepherd.*
Secretive ivy-league father sets up C.I.A. but his son betrays Cuba mission.

Forster and Helm (2006) *Stranger Than Fiction.*
Up tight clerk has life controlled by author yet he mellows for a cookie baker.

Scott, Jacobson and Zaillian (2006) *American Gangster.*
New Jersey cop brings down NYC Harlem's drug lord during the Vietnam era.

Von Donnersmarck et al. (2006) *The Lives Of Others.*
National security eavesdropper switches loyalty from tyrant state to his victims.

Djigirr, de Heer et al. (2006) *Ten Canoes.*
Youth envies senior's wives, defends dying senior in battle and assumes seniority.

Ishihara, Ito and Tanigawa (2006) *The Melancholy of Haruhi Suzumiya* (Series)
Five school friends explore desire, gumption, altered reality, monsters and time.

Campbell, Fleming et al. (2006) *Casino Royale.*
Poker-playing spy and official treasury sidekick fleece war bankers.

Coen, Coen et al. (2008) *Burn After Reading.*
Washington DC farce: officials, bodybuilders, limp spies, greed and ennui.

Takahashi, Arakawa and Hasekura (2008) *Spice and Wolf.* (Series)
Medieval she-wolf negotiates love and liberty with spice and currency trader.

Daldry, Hare and Schlink (2008) *The Reader.*
Illiterate public official beds boy who later witnesses her war crimes trial.

Van Sant and Black (2008) *Milk.*
Pioneer San Francisco gay politician lives and dies for American democracy.

Bernth, Foss and Sveistrup (2008, 2010, 2012) *The Killing (1,2,3).* (Series)
Danish detective solves family murder, military terrorism and child kidnapping.

MacDonald, Abbott et al. (2009) *State Of Play.*
Journalist investigates covert assassination connected with his political friends.

Burton and Carroll (2010) *Alice In Wonderland.*
Strong-willed girl tumbles into a logician's 'eccentrics and animals' fable.

Feig, Mumolo and Wiig (2010) *Bridesmaids.*
Friends and boyfriend shun prickly bridesmaid but all is well at the wedding.

Granaz Moussavi et al. (2010) *My Tehran For Sale.*

Men and State abuse an actress, she escapes and ends up in Australian detention.

Tran Anh Hung and Haruki Murakami (2010) *Norwegian Wood.*
Friends cope with each other's mind-body disconnects, love, sex and suicide.

Polanski and Harris (2010) *The Ghost Writer.*
Prime Minister's writer discovers a secret service murder, so he is next.

Clooney, Heslov and Willimon (2011) *Ides Of March.*
Presidential candidate impregnates aide; boyfriend leaves her, she suicides.

Asghar Farhadi et al. (2011) *Nader And Simin: A Separation.*
Disability carer's divorce case is jeopardized by maid's assault case.

Fincher, Sorkin and Mezrich (2011) *The Social Network.*
Software inventor and young entrepreneur fight for their ownership shares.

Malick et al. (2011) *The Tree Of Life.*
Family's journey to maturity via a brother's bullying and death.

Alfredson, Le Carre et al. (2012) *Tinker, Tailor, Soldier, Spy.*
Sacked spy investigates the traitor inside U.K. secret service.

Ross, Ray and Collins (2012) *The Hunger Games.*
Fashionistas in TV brand-sponsored war (*The Gladiators* 1968 clone).

Gervasi, McLaughlin and Rebello (2012) *Hitchcock.*
Hitchcock's senior partner and lover, Alma, directs "his" movie *Psycho.*

Kirk, Phelps and Dickens (2012) *Great Expectations.*
Wealthy boy mistakes his nemesis for his benefactor – an illegal immigrant.

Connolly, Ayres, Davis and Dreyfus (2012) *Underground.*
Computer genius youth discovers US plans to bomb civilians and is arrested.

Affleck and Terrio (2012) *Argo.*
C.I.A. uses a movie ruse to extract American personnel from post-Shah Iran.

Adamson and Jones (2012) *Mr. Pip.*
Australian-trained PNG soldiers murder teacher in Bougainville mining war.

Blair et al. (2013) *Redfern Now (2-5).* (Series)
Veteran "suffering" from bamboo disturbs suburb. (See *Deer Hunter*).

Hallström, Knight and Morais (2014) *The Hundred-Foot Journey.*
Young refugee chef is attacked by nationists who then champion his skills.

Miller, Frye and Futterman (2014) *Foxcatcher.*
Weapons heir, grandly deluded about Olympic wrestling brothers, murders one.

Alex Garland et al. (2015) *Ex Machina.*
Robot maker and apprentice buried by their devised ambitions and desires.

51.

Documentary Sources.

Batty and Portello (2009) "Rome" in *A History Of Christianity.*

Bronowski, J. (1973) *The Ascent Of Man.* See also book version.

Connolly, Keane et al. (2011) *The Story of Ireland.*

Crowe, Russell I. (2007) *Inside the Actors Studio.*

Cox, Brian et al. (2011) *Wonders Of The Universe.*

Curtis, Adam (2004) *The Power of Nightmares.*

Dawkins, Dyson, Hawking, Judson et al. (2010) *Genius of Britain.*

Ehrlich and Goldsmith (2009) *The Most Dangerous Man In America.*

Ferguson, Charles et al. (2010) *Inside Job.*

Ferguson, Niall et al. (2006) *The War of the World.*

Feuerherd, Edward (2008) *World In Conflict.*

Gardner Films, PBS and SBS (2000) *Islam: Empire Of Faith.*

von Hagens, Gunther (2005) *Anatomy For Beginner*s.

Hanks and Goetzman (2013) *The Sixties.*

Hindmarch (2008) "The Rosetta Stone" in *Days That Shook The World.*

History Channel (1999) *Empire: The Greeks.*

Howard, John and ABC Australian Broadcasting Corporation, (2008) *The Howard Years.*

Lay and Thompson (2006) *The Battle of Long Tan.*

Chris Masters et al. (2012) *The Years That Made Us.*

Nurmohamed, Wood, Heather et al. (2006) *Ancient Rome: The Fall Of Rome.*

Oppenheimer, Anonymous and Cynn (2012) *The Act Of Killing.*

Perkins, Nowra et al. (2008) *First Australians.*

Pilger and Lowery (2010) *The War You Don't See.*

Pilger and Martin (2007) *The War On Democracy.*

Pilger and Lowery (2001) *New Rulers Of The World.*

Pilger and James (1996) *Burma Land Of Fear.*

Pilger and Munro (1995) *Vietnam: The Last Battle.*

Pilger and Munro (1994) *Death of a Nation: The Timor Conspiracy.*

Pilger and Munro (1994b) *Flying The Flag, Arming The World.*

Pilger and Munro (1979) *Year Zero: The Silent Death Of Cambodia.*

Pilger and Monro (1978) *Do You Remember Vietnam?*

Pilger and Monro (1970) *The Quiet Mutiny.*

Pilger and Devenish (1982) *Frontline: The Search For Truth in Wartime.*

Mortimer and Starkey (2014) *Time Traveler's Guide to Elizabethan England.*

Murphy and Beard (2006) *Ancient Rome: Nero.*

Muybridge, Eadweard et al. (1878) *Galloping Horse.*

Rees and Dallek (2008) *Behind Closed Doors.*

Roberts, Alice et al. (2012) *Origins of Us.*

Roberts, Alice et al. (2010) *The Incredible Journey.* See also book version.

Starkey and Granitch (2005) *Monarchy.*

Stewart, Iain (2011a) *How Earth Made Us: Fire.*

Stewart, Iain (2011b) *How Earth Made Us: Water.*

Talbot, Marianne (2010) *The Nature of Arguments* (U.K.: Oxford U/ itunes U).

Talbot and Lindsay (1998) *1968: The Year That Shaped A Generation.*

Vertov, Dziga et al. (1929) *The Man With a Movie Camera.*

Woods, Jeff et al. (2009) *The Story of India.*

Young, Nic et al. (2008) "The Christmas Truce" in *Days That Shook The World.*

52.

Historiographic Sources.

Bernays, Edward quoted in Pilger and Lowery (2010) *The War You Don't See* (U.K.: Network).

Bradley, James (2009) *The Imperial Cruise* (U.S.: Little Brown and Co).

Brewer, Susan A. (2009) *Why America Fights* (U.S.: Oxford University Press).

Bronowski, J. (1973b) *The Ascent Of Man* (U.S., Canada: Little Brown & Co).

Bryson, John (1985, 2000, 2012) *Evil Angels* (Sydney: Hachett, Penguin).

Bushkovitch, Paul (2012) *A Concise History Of Russia* (U.K.: Cambridge University Press).

Cain, Frank (1994) *The Australian Security Intelligence Organization* (U.K.: Frank Cass).

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2015) *Shigellosis* and *Amebiasis* (U.S.: www. cdc. gov).

Chamberlain-Creighton, Lindy (2012) *The Dingo's Got My Baby* (Momentum).

Chamberlain-Creighton, Lindy (2010) *A letter to Open-Minded Australians* at http:// www. lindychamberlain .com/ content/ 30th_ anniversary_letter

Chang, Jung and Jon Halliday (2005) *Mao The Unknown Story* (UK:

Jonathan Cape/Ted Smart).

Child, Morrison, Rowley et al. (1966) *Vietnam And Australia* (Australia: University of New South Wales Study Group on Vietnam).

Clements, Nicholas (2014) *The Black War* (Australia: Queensland University Press).

Dallek, Robert (2010) *The Lost Peace: Leadership in a Time of Horror and Hope, 1945-1953* (NYC: Harper Collins).

Dikötter, Frank (2010) *Mao's Great Famine* (U.K.: Bloomsbury).

Dobbs, Michael (1998) "Ford and GM Scrutinized for Alleged Nazi Collaboration" in *The Washington Post* (November 30, U.S.) p. A01.

Ehrman, Bart D. (2003) *Lost Christianities* (U.K.: Oxford University Press).

Elder, Bruce (1988) *Blood on the Wattle* (Australia: National).

Evans, Richard J. (2003) *The Coming of the Third Reich* (U.S.: Penguin Allen Lane).

Evans, Richard J. (2005) *The Third Reich in Power* (U.S.: Penguin Allen Lane).

Ferguson, Charles (2012) *Predator Nation* (U.S.: Crown).

Galbraith, Peter W. (2006) *The End of Iraq* (U.S.: Simon & Schuster).

Goldberg, Beverly (2002) "Pastor's Potter book fire inflames N.Mex town" in *American Libraries*, February (U.S.: Proquest).

Goldman, Steven L. (2013, 2004) *Science in the Twentieth Century* (U.S.: Audible).

Gollmar, Robert H. (1981) *Edward Gein* (U.S.: C. Hallberg).

Graeber, David (2012) *Debt: The First 5,000 Years* (U.S.: Melville House).

Graham, Chris and Wendy Bacon (2014) "Curriculum-reviewer-barry-spurr-mocks-abos-mussies-women-chinky-poos" in *New Matilda,* October 16 (Australia: New Matilda online).

Greenwald, Glenn (2015) "Cowardly Firing of Australian State-Funded TV Journalist Highlights the West's Real Religion" April 30 in *The Intercept* (US: FirstLook . org).

High Court Kings Bench (1765, 2013) *Entick v Carrington and Ors, EWHC KB J98, November 2* at http:// www. bailii.org /ew/cases/EWHC/KB/1765/J98.html (England and Wales: High Court Kings Bench).

Hill, Dave (2003) "The kids aren't alright" in *The Guardian* November 11 (U.K.: Guardian).

Hitchcock, William I. (2008) *The Bitter Road to Freedom* (U.S., Australia: Free Press).

Horner, David (2014) *The Spy Catchers. The Official History of ASIO* (Australia: Allen and Unwin).

Jud, Denis (1973) *George V* (U.K.: Weidenfeld and Nicolson).

Kull, Ramsay, Subias et al. (2003) "Misperceptions, the Media and the Iraq War" at worldpublicopinion .org /pipa/ (U.S.: University of Maryland and

Knowledge Networks) 21-page report.

Lake, Marilyn and Henry Reynolds (2008) *Drawing The Colour Line* (Australia: Melbourne University Press).

Lester, Yami (2008) interview in "A Fair Deal For A Black Race" in *First Australians* Episode 6, (Australia: Special Broadcasting Service SBS).

MacMillan, Margaret (2003) *Six Months That Changed the World: The Paris Peace Conference of 1919* (U.S.: Recorded Books/Random House).

McGee, Ralph (1982) interview in Pilger and Devenish (1982) *Frontline: The Search For Truth in Wartime.* (UK: Network).

Mikkelson, Barbara and David P. (2014) "The Deer Hunter Suicides" in *Snopes* (U.S.: snopes com).

The Milwaukee Journal staff reporters (1957) "Obsessive Love for His Mother Drove Gein to Slay, Rob Graves" and "Mother Love Complex Told" in *The Milwaukee Journal,* Thursday 21 November (US: The Journal Company).

Mantienne, Frédéric (2012) *Pierre Pigneaux: Evêque d'Adran et mandarin de Cochinchine* (France: Les Indes savantes).

Murphy, John (1993) *Harvest of Fear* (Australia: Allen and Unwin).

Neate, Rupert (2011) "Levi's pull 'riot' ad after UK violence" in *Guardian* 11 August.

Nguyen, Ai Quoc (1945) *Declaration of Independence* in Walden Bello (2007) *Ho Chi Min: Down With Colonialism* (U.K.: Verso).

Nguyen, Ai Qoc (1969) "Testament" in Walden Bello (2007) *Ho Chi Min: Down With Colonialism* (U.K.: Verso).

Nguyen, Lien-Hang T. (2012) *Hanoi's War* (U.S.: University of North Carolina Press).

Nuland, Sherwin B. (2008) *Doctors: The Biography of Medicine* (U.S: Vintage).

Orwell, George (1945) "You and the Atomic Bomb" *Tribune* 19 October, p.1. (U.K. now published at www wagingpeace org).

Ostrander, Kathleen (2000) "Teen re-enacting movie shot himself, police say" in *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel* (U.S.: Newsbank archive).

Pankhurst, Sylvia (1977, 1931) *The Suffragette Movement* (U.K.: Virago).

Paxton, Robert O. (2004) *The Anatomy of Fascism* (U.K.: Penguin).

Pinto, Constancio (1995) 11 August New York City meeting with Henry Kissenger in: Christopher Hitchens (2012) *The Trial Of Henry Kissinger* (U.S.: Twelve).

Pisani, Elizabeth (2014) *Indonesia, Etc.: Exploring the Improbable Nation* (U.S.: W.W. Norton).

Regeringskansliet, Cabinet (2012, 2004, 1766) *The Principle of Public Access* at http:// www government .se/sb/d/2184/a/15521 (Sweden: Regeringskansliet).

Rhodes, Richard (2007) *Arsenals of Folly* (U.S.:Knopf).

Rhodes, Richard (2010) *The Twilight Of The Bombs* (U.S.:Knopf).

Ritter, W. Scott (2010) *Dangerous Ground* (U.S.: Nation).

Roberts, Alice (2009) *The Incredible Journey* (U.K.: Bloomsbury).

Roberts, J.M. (1999a) *The Penguin History of the Twentieth Century* (UK, US: Penguin).

Schechter, Harold (1989) *Deviant* (U.S: Pocket Books).

Sebag Montefiore, Simon (2007) *Young Stalin* (U.K.: Weidenfeld and Nicolson).

Seven News (2012) *Teen dies playing Russian roulette* July 2 (https:// au.news.yahoo com /world /a/ 14105693/ teen- dies- playing- russian-roulette/

Shepherd, Geoff (2014) interviewed by Chris Uhlmann 27 August on the *7.30 Report* (Australia: A.B.C. Television) and in A.B.C. transcripts.

Schultheiss, O. C., M. M. Wirth and S. J. Stanton (2004) "Effects of affiliation and power motivation arousal on salivary progesterone and testosterone." *Hormones and Behavior,* 46/5 December (U.S.: Academic Press).

Sun Zi (2014, c.500 BCE) *Art Of War* (U.S.; http:// ctext .org /art-of-war/).

Tone, Andrea (2001) *Devices and Desires: A History of Contraception in America* (U.S.: Hill and Wang).

Tuchman, Barbara (1984) *The March of Folly* (U.S.: Ballantine).

Tully, John A. (2011) *The Devil's Milk* (U.S.: Monthly Review Press).

United Nations Population Fund (2011) *The State of World Population 2011* (U.S.: www unfpa org).

United Nations (1948) *International Bill of Human Rights* (U.N.: 183rd Plenary Meeting, 10 December). pp. 71-77.

Vickers, Adrian (2013) *A History Of Modern Indonesia* (U.K.: Cambridge U.P.)

Weiner, Tim (2007) *Legacy of Ashes: The History of the C.I.A.* (U.S.: Doubleday).
Weiner is compiled from official declassified U.S. government executive orders and minutes.

Williams, Anne and Vivian Head (2011) "Ed Gein" in *Fiendish Killers* (U.S.: Canary).

Yergin, Daniel (2008) *The Prize* (U.S.: Free Press).

Zinn, Howard (1980) *A People's History of the United States* (New York: Harper and Row).

53.

Novels and Tales.

Austen, Jane (1813) *Pride and Prejudice.* (U.S.: Amazon Kindle).

Beckett, Samuel (2011) *Waiting For Godot* (U.S.: Grove).

Carol, Lewis (2014, 1865) *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* Illustrated by John Tenniel (Australia: ebooks Adelaide edu au).

Coward, Noël (1932) *Designed For Living* (U.S. audible com)

Cousins, Matthews and Greene (1938) *To Beg I Am Ashamed* (U.K.: Routledge).

Durrell, Lawrence (1938) *The Black Book* (Paris: Obelisk).

Durrell, Lawrence (1957) *Justine* (U.K.: Faber).

Durrell, Lawrence (1958) *Balthazar* (U.K.: Faber).

Durrell, Lawrence (1958) *Mountolive* (U.K.: Faber).

Durrell, Lawrence (1960) *Clea* (U.K.: Faber).

Homer (1898) *Odysseus,* trans. S. Butler (wikisource.org)

Greene, Graham (1932) *Stamboul Train* (U.K.: Heinemann).

Greene, Graham (1955) *The Quiet American* (U.K.: Heinemann).

Greene, Graham (1966) *The Comedians* (U.K.: Bodley Head).

Greene, Graham (1978) *The Human Factor* (U.K.: Bodley Head).

Jones, James (1962) *The Thin Red Line* (US: Dell Doubleday).

Murasaki, Shikibu (2006, 1900, c.1025) "Genji Monogatari" (Tale of Genji) in Suyematz Kenchio translator, E. Wilson editor, *Japanese Literature* (Project Gutenberg and pgdp.net).

Orwell, George (1949) *1984* (U.K., U.S., Canada: Secker and Wallberg, Penguin).

Sartre, Jean-Paul (1965, 1949, 1938) *Nausea* (U.K.: Penguin).

Traditional. *Ramayana.* (Indonesia)
(The author has written a chapter on the *Ramayana* and Australian dance in *Visions* 1994 op. cit.).

Traditional. *Three Kingdoms.* (China)

54.
Screen Makers' Sources.

Aranda Nation (c.3,000-57,000 BCE) *Corroboree Dance Network Map.* Stone manuscript No.4610 in Shøyen Collection (2012) at http:// www. schoyencollection com.

Arrernte Nation (1901) *Chitchingulla* screened in Rachel Perkins and Louis Nowra (2008) *First Australians* Ep.4, "No Other Law" (Australia: SBS Television). DVD series.

ASPERA (2014) *Register of Examiners and Supervisors,* June 28 (Australia: The Australian Screen Production Education and Research Association).

Bertrand, Ina and William D. Routt (2007) *The Story of the Kelly Gang.* (Australia: ATOM Australian Teachers of Media/Madman).

Box Office Mojo (2013) [various movie titles in text] (U.S.: IMDB com).

Bryan, Ann Marie Jade (2013) *First Black Deaf Filmmaker* (U.S: http:// reviews. filmsnobbery .com/ guest-post/ first-black-deaf-filmmaker-breaks-new-ground/)

Burlingame, Jon (2012) *The Music Of James Bond* (U.K.: Oxford University Press).

CEO of Czech-Out on Amazon com (2014).

Carlos, Walter (later Wendy) (1968) *Switched On Bach* features Robert Moog's synthesizer.

The Moog3 later used by Popol Vuh's Forian Fricke, then abandoned, before Fricke returned to acoustic East-West fusion compositions by 1973, often with Korean soprano Djong Yun.

Copeland, Aaron (2009, 1985, 1939) *What To Listen For In Music* (U.S.: Penguin).

Crowe, Russell (2007) in *Sean Penn, Russell Crowe: Inside The Actors Studio* (Australia: Eagle Entertainment)

Deeley, Michael (2009) *Bladerunners, Deer Hunters and Blowing The Bloody Doors Off: My Life In Cult Movies* (U.S.: Pegasus Books).

Djigirr, Peter (2006) "Interview" in Djigirr, de Heer et al. movie *Ten Canoes.*

Edwards, Ron and Monika Skerbelis (2005) *I Liked It, I Didn't Love It: Screenplay Development* (U.S.: Lone Eagle).

Eno Brian, et al. (2010) *Brian Eno: The Man Who Fell To Earth* (U.K./Australia: Prism Films/Madman).

Gengaro, Christine Lee (2013) *Listening To Stanley Kubrick* (U.S.: Rowman and Littlefield).

de Heer, Rolf (2006) "Interview" in Djigirr, de Heer et al. movie *Ten Canoes.*

Klein, Marty (2013, 1995) *Movies, Anyone?* (http:// vashti. net: 44131/ blind/ movies .htm)

Kotcheff, Ted (2009) "Interview" in (2009, 1971) *Wake In Fright* (Australia: Madman).

LoBrutto, Vincent (1997) *Stanley Kubrick: a Biography* (U.S.: Donald I. Fine/Penguin).

Lucas, George (c. 1999) speaking to the author and SPAA Conference delegates. (Sydney: Screen Producers Of Australia).

Levine, Ted (2001) interview in Jeffrey Schwarz (2001) *Inside The Labyrinth: The Making Of Silence Of The Lambs*. (U.S.: MGM).

Lynch, David interview in DVD extras, David Lynch et al. (1986) *Blue Velvet.*

Martin, Adrian (Conference convenor) et al. (2011) *World Cinema Now* (Australia: Monash University).

MacCabe, Colin (2009) "Introduction" to Godard and Moravia (2009, 1963) *Contempt* (U.K., France: Optimum, Canal Plus).

McKee, Robert (1997) *Story: Substance, Structure, Style and The Principles of Screenwriting* (U.S.: Regan Books).

McKee, Robert (1996) 'Story' three day lecture on motion picture authorship, (Australia: University of Technology).

MPAA, Motion Picture Association of America (1930-1955) *A Code to Govern the Making of Motion Pictures* (U.S.: MPAA). [The *Production Code*.]

Murch, Walter and Michael Ondaatje (2002) *The Conversations* (UK: Bloomsbury).

Powell, John (2010) *How Music Works* (U.K.: Penguin) and audible com.

Rebello, Stephen (2012, 1990) *Alfred Hitchcock and the Making of Psycho* (US: Open Road); new September 2012 Preface edition.

Robinson Ian (1993 to 1997) Various research papers, including "Comic Devices: A Preliminary Taxonomy", "'Heroic Myth Structure For Writers and Its Relation To Classical Models Of Narrative Film'" and "The Heroine's Journey" given to the author in writers circle meetings and Australian Writers Guild conferences.

Smith, Patti (1979) *So You Want To Be* (U.S.: Arista).

Strick, Philip (2003) *Film Notes: Persona* (U.K.: Persona Tartan Video DVD release).

Stubbs, David (2014) " 'Too Much The Darkness' The Werner Herzog Soundtracks Of Popol Vuh", August 29th in *The Quietus* (U.K.: thequietus com).

Tonks, Paul (2011, 2003) *Film Music* (U.K.: Oldcastle; also audible com).

Traverso, Antonio (2011) "Acting-Out and Working-Through Trauma: Chilean Documentary and the Memory of the Dictatorship" presentation at Adrian Martin (Conference convenor) *World Cinema Now* September (Australia: Monash University).

Vogler, Christopher (1992) *The Writer's Journey: Mythic Structure for Storytellers and Screenwriters* (U.S.: Michael Wiese Productions).

Watson, Robert S. (2013) "Wikileaks on Film? The 'Movie Thought' Approach" in *The London Film and Media Reader 1,* Ed.: Phillip Drummond (U.K.: Academic Conferences London) [Overwritten document].

Watson, Robert S. (2009) Chapter 3 "Dynamic Communities" in Ed: Sarwal and Sarwal, *Creative Nation: Australian Cinema* Volume 1 (India: SSS Press).

Watson, Robert S. (2005) *Coding* (U.S.: Library of Congress).

Watson, Rob (1994a) *Movie Writer* (Australia: Macmillan) Hardback second edition entitled *Writing Movies*.

Watson, Rob (1994b) *Visions* (Australia: Curriculum Corporation).

Weinstein, Arnold (2013, 1995) *Understanding Literature and Life: Drama, Poetry and Narrative*. (U.S.: Brown University/ audible com).

Willimon, Beau (2011) "Developing the Campaign: The Origins of the *Ides of March*" in Clooney, Heslov & Willimon *Ides of March* (US: Exclusive, Cross Creek, Roadshow).

55.

Philosophy Sources.

Aristotle (1932) *Poetics* [Ποιητικῆς – Aristotle in 23 Volumes, Vol. 23] translated by W.H. Fyfe (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd.).
This translation, with line numbers and its Greek version interleaved, is also reissued digitally at Tufts' Perseus project at www perseus tufts edu.

Bala, Arun (2008, 2006) *The Dialogue Of Civilizations In The Birth Of Modern Science* (U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan).

de Beauvoir, Simone (2009, 1949) *The Second Sex* trans. C. Borde and S. Malovany-Chevallier (U.S.: Knopf).

Bell, Millicent (2002) *Shakespeare's Tragic Skepticism* (U.S.: Yale University Press).

de Botton, Alain (2000) *The Consolations of Philosophy* (U.S. Vintage) and its audiobook. A concise compendium of key quotes by Plato (Socrates), Epicurus, Seneca, Montaigne, Schopenhauer and Nietsche with de Botton's interpretations.

Campbell, Joseph (1972, 1949) *Hero With a Thousand Faces* (U.S.: Princeton University Press).

Casey, Ed (n.d.) *20th Century European Philosophy* (audible com).

Cavell, Stanley (1979) *The World Viewed: Reflections on the Ontology of Film* (US: Harvard UP).

Chase, Coady, Rush and Corry (2010) *Introduction To Logic* (Australia: University Of Tasmania Press).

Chödrön, Pema (c.2005) *The Pema Chödrön Audio Collection* (U.S.: audible com).

Chödrön, Pema (2003) *From Fear to Fearlessness* (U.S.: audible com).

Chödrön, Pema (1999) *Good Medicine* (U.S.: audible com).

Chödrön, Pema (2000) *Pure Meditation* (U.S.: audible com).

Critchley, Simon (2002) "Calm – On Terrence Malick's *The Thin Red Line*" in Film-Philosophy 6/48 (www film-philosophy com).

Cox, Damien and Michael Levine (2012) *Thinking Through Film* (U.K.: Wiley).

Craig, Edward (2002) *Philosophy: A Very Short Introduction* (U.K.: Oxford University Press).

Dao De Jing 道 德 attributed to Lao Zi, 老子 (2013, BCE 500) – of which there are dozens of translations and some audiobooks.

Davidson, Donald (2004) *Problems of Rationality* (U.K.: Oxford University Press). Introduced by Marcia Cavell.

Davidson, Donald (1998) "Responses to Barry Stroud, John McDowell, and Tyler Burge" in *Crítica: Revista Hispanoamericana de Filosofía*, Vol. 30, No. 90 (Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma).

Davidson, Donald (1991) *Inquiries Into Truth and Interpretation* (U.K.:

Oxford University Press).

Davies, David (2009) "Terrence Malick" in Paisley Livingston and Carl Plantinga (2009) editors, *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy and Film* (UK: Routledge).

Descartes, René (1637) *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting the Reason, and Seeking Truth in the Sciences* (U.S: www classicallibrary .org/descartes/index.htm).

Descartes, René (1641) *Meditations on First Philosophy* Trans: J. Veitch (U.S: www classicallibrary .org/descartes/index.htm).

Dewey, John (2013, 1916) *Democracy and Education* (U.S.: gutenberg org).

Dias, André (2011) "Autopsy 'in Vivo': Biopolitical Features Regarding Wiseman's *Primate*" at David Sorfa coordinator *Film-Philosophy Conference 2011* (U.K. Liverpool John Moores University).

Epicurus (2014) English translations of 341–270 BCE text fragments at Epicurus net.

Falzon, Chris (2009) "Why Be Moral?" in Paisley Livingston and Carl Plantinga (2009) editors, *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy and Film* (UK: Routledge).

Freud, Sigmund (1920) trans. G.S. Hall, *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis* (U.S.: Liveright)

Gedney, Mark (2009) *Ricoeur: A Dialogue on Neuroscience* Gordon Faculty Forums (Dec. 24, iTunesU) [Summarizing Ricoeur (2000) *What Makes Us Think? A Neuroscientist and a Philosopher Argue About Ethics, Human Nature and the Brain*, with Jean-Pierre Changeux, trans. M. B.

DeBevoise].

Geuss, Raymond (2008) *Philosophy and Real Politics* (U.S.: Princeton University Press).

Gibran, Kahlil (1984, 1926) *The Prophet* (U.K.: Heinmann).

Gleeson, Andrew (2011) "The Secrets and Lies of Film" in Ward E. Jones and Samantha Vice editors *Ethics At The Cinema* (U.K.: Oxford University Press).

Grayling, A.C. (2010) *Thinking Of Answers* (U.K.: Bloomsbury).

Greene, Graham (2007) *The Spoken Word* (U.K.: British Library Board/ BBC).

Hanh, Thich Nhat (1992) *Peace Is Every Step: The Path of Mindfulness* (U.S.: Bantam).

Kant, Immanuel (1784) *What is Enlightenment?* (*Was ist Aufklärung?* www english.upenn .edu/~mgamer/Etexts/ and other Internet translations).

Kaye, Sharon M. (2009) *Critical Thinking* (U.K.: One World; and audible com).

Kornfield Jack (c.2000) *Buddhism For Beginners* (U.S.: audible com).

Kosso, Peter "Philosophy of Historiography" (2009) Ch.2 in A. Tucker (ed.) *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography* (U.K.: Blackwell).

Livingstone, Paisley (2006) "The Very Idea of Film as Philosophy: Theses on Cinema as Philosophy" in Smith and Wartenberg editors, *The Journal of*

Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Vol. 64, No. 1, *Special Issue: Thinking through Cinema: Film as Philosophy* (U.S.: Wiley/The American Society for Aesthetics).

Livingston, Paisley and Carol Archer (2010) "Artistic Collaboration and the Completion of Works of Art" *British Journal of Aesthetics* Vol. 50-4 October, pp. 439–455 (U.K.: Oxford UP / British Society of Aesthetics.)

Livingston, Paisley and Carl Plantinga (editors) (2009) *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy and Film* (UK: Routledge).

Lorenz, Chris (2009) "Scientific Historiography" Ch.35 in A. Tucker (ed.) *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography* (U.K.: Blackwell).

Malpas, Jeff (2006) "Philosophising Place in *The Joshua Tree*" in Mark A. Wrathall editor (2006) *U2 And Philosophy* (U.S.: Open Court).

McGinn, Colin (2006) *Shakespeare's Philosophy* (U.S.: Harper Collins).

McGinn, Colin (2003) *Discovering The Philosopher In You* (Modern Scholar audible com).

Midwest Studies in Philosophy (2010) Volume XXXIV (U.S. Wiley). Film special edition.

Mulhall, Stephen (2006) "The Impersonation of Personality: Film as Philosophy in *Mission: Impossible*" in Smith and Wartenberg editors (2006) op. cit.

Nussbaum, Martha (1999) "Virtue Ethics: A Misleading Category?" in *The Journal of Ethics*, vol. 3. (Netherlands: Springer).

Plantinga, Carl (2009) "Documentary" in Paisley Livingston and Carl Plantinga (2009) editors, *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy and Film* (UK: Routledge).

Plantinga, Carl (2006) "Characterization and Ethics in the Documentary" (U.S.: Amazon Kindle).

Plato (2010, 1892) "Apology" in *Dialogues Of Plato*, Trans. Benjamin Jowett (U.S.: Liberty Fund/Oxford UP).

Plato (1999, 1892) *Crito by Plato*, Trans. Benjamin Jowett (U.S.: gutenberg org).

Quine, Willard Van Orman (1961) "Two Dogmas of Empiricism" second, revised edition in *From a Logical Point of View* (U.S.: Harvard University Press/ ditext. com/quine/quine).

Ricoeur, Paul (1992, 1990) *Oneself as Another* Trans: Kathleen Blamey, *Soi-meme comme un autre* (US: The University of Chicago Press).

Rorty, Richard (2011) "Davidson Versus Descartes" in Ed: Jeff Malpas *Dialogues With Davidson* (U.S.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press).

Rorty, Richard and Eduardo Mendieta (2006) *Take Care of Freedom and Truth Will Take Care of Itself* (U.S.: Stanford University Press).

Rorty, Richard (2000) "Responses" in Robert B. Brandom, editor *Rorty and his Critics* (U.K.: Blackwell).

Rorty, Richard (1991) *Objectivity Relativism and Truth* (UK: Cambridge UP).

Rorty, Richard (1989) *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity* (UK: Cambridge UP).

Strathern, Paul (2013) *Heidegger* (U.S.: audible com).

Sartre, Jean Paul (1948) *Existentialism And Humanism* (U.K.: Methuen).

Shaw, Dan (2012) "Submission to God's Will in *A Man For All Seasons*" in Dan Shaw (ed.) 2012 *Morality and the Movies* (U.S.: Continuum).

Sinnerbrink, Robert (2006) "A Heideggerian Cinema? On Terence Malick's The Thin Red Line" in *Film-Philosophy* 10/3. (www film-philosophy com).

Stuhr, John J. (2012) *John Dewey* (audible com).

Smith, Murray and Thomas E. Wartenberg, editors (2006) *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 64, No. 1, *Special Issue: Thinking through Cinema: Film as Philosophy* (U.S.: Wiley/The American Society for Aesthetics).

Thwaites, Trevor (2010) "Affect and the Collaborative Jazz Performance" *Conference of the Australasian Society for Continental Philosophy* (unpublished draft used with permission. N.Z: University of Auckland) Thwaites quotes Berliner, P. (1994). *Thinking in jazz: The infinite art of improvisation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. p.414.

Turing, Alan (1950) in Donald Davidson 2004: 77ff. op. cit.

Vasicek, Zdenek (2009) "Philosophy of History" Ch.3 in A. Tucker (ed.) *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography* (U.K.: Blackwell).

Wartenberg, Thomas E. (2011) "Moral Intelligence and the Limits to

Loyalty: *The Third Man* as Philosophy" in W.E. Jones and S. Vice (Ed.s) *Ethics At The Cinema* (U.K. Oxford University Press).

Wartenberg, Thomas E. (2008) *Existentialism: A Beginner's Guide* (U.K.: One World).

Wartenberg, Thomas E. (2007) *Thinking On Screen* (U.K. Routledge).

Wittgenstein, Ludwig (2009, 1953) *Philosophical Investigations.* (U.K: Wiley-Blackwell).

Woolf, Virginia (1929) *A Room Of One's Own* (U.S.: Harcourt Brace and Co.).

Zegarelli, Mark (2007) *Logic* (U.S.: Wiley).