

The Intrinsic Nature of Cinema

Cinema is the actualization of our dreams, for it delivers sequential images that are related regardless of the logical doings of time and space. Each cut, each transition from one shot to another, breaks the continuity of time and space. [A woman looks at an oncoming car – we then cut to the close up of her eyes.] Here in this simple sequence, the film demonstrates how cinema is absolutely unrealistic yet is composed with images from and of the real. Dream is the intrinsic nature of cinema. Cinema is not dream-like; cinema is, again, actualization of our dreams. No other form of art is able to *be* dreams. And it is because cinema *is* dreams that cinema is absolutely different from theatre. Thus it is a worthless effort to make cinema-esque theatre or theatre-esque cinema, for theatre can never *be*, it can only portray, dreams due to its intrinsic temporal and spatial singularity. However, one can combine two forms of art in one exhibition format, but resulting, in my opinion, in a postmodern soup that is inferior both to theatre and cinema.

Another thing that springs out of the cinema's intrinsic nature is a statement on Hollywood's method of filmmaking so-called "continuity filmmaking" that has spread to film industries all over the world. We can pretty much say that Hollywood is the only film industry in the world. Other film industries are merely tributaries of Hollywood. But let's go back to our point here. Hollywood employs continuity filmmaking, which is a filmmaking method that relies on visual logics of temporality and spatiality in order to give the audience that the sequences in the film that they are watching occur in continuous manner. That is, continuity filmmaking hypnotizes the audience in to thinking that cinema should reflect reality. Such method, as a result, goes against the intrinsic nature of cinema. Cinema, as mentioned above, is dreams. Dreams are, by nature, illogical sequences of images that derive from our memories of life. So in order for a filmmaker to be true to the medium, he/she must 1) base the film upon his/her own memories of life and 2) not try to fit the film to the temporal and spatial logic of reality (i.e. should not rely on modes of filmmaking such as continuity filmmaking).

The question of fear amongst filmmakers is always the same: "what if the audiences don't understand my film?" Let me put it this way. The purpose of any art is to present life as honest as possible because that honest presentation of life is *truth*. So, whether the audience understands the film or not the only significant factor in true cinema is the *honesty of life*. The honesty of life in a single term is *belief*, which is synonymous to *love*. And when the honesty of life is presented, it is *art*. But how does an artist achieve honest presentation of his/her own life through the work? Simply, the artist should not compromise his/her vision; should be persistence with it; should drive it.

There is no need to understand, nor can we actually understand anything, for everything, from blue to orange, from a dick to a cunt, from everything to anything, is always already is.

Alexander Kang
2016/08/06
California, USA