

Alexander Kang

*Precedence of Language*

Perhaps the greatest obstacle in the production of cinema as art is that we immediately impose human conditions in the creative development of a film. This is due to the fact that the articulation of vision (whether it is written on page, entirely pictorial, symbolic, or etc.) is, and must be, done through the limited use of spoken, written, gestural and symbolic language, which are created by and caters to humans only.

Language is not simply limited to those that we utilize in our speech, writings, or gestures. It is but what Culture signifies – the ways we perceive concepts and objects. The traffic light that signifies “go” is uttered as *green light* in U.S.A whereas it is uttered as *blue light* in China despite the fact that the light that signifies “go” has the same color in both places. “Go” in this case is Language and different utterances of the color that signifies “go” are Culture. Thus, we can say that when it comes to the structure of traffic management, U.S.A and China are Culturally different<sup>1</sup>.

From the short investigation of Language and Culture above, we can hypothesize that despite Cultural differences, Culture itself exists in order to signify Language as set of concrete concepts. In other words, Culture is human perception of Language conditional to different geographical regions and respective political, social and economical conditions, and Language is an infinite abstraction of expressions that precedes humanity. We conceptualize Language and apply it to spoken, written, gestural and symbolic communications, but such conceptualization is the smallest fragment of infinity. Culture is that signifies Language, but Language does not, and cannot, signify Culture. So we come to a logical sense that everything that we cherish is ultimately meaningless, not because of the inevitable matter of death but rather due to the fact that its value diminishes in infinity, and that we are arrogant to the fullest to say that we, with our linguistic expressions, want to understand each other.

So cinema, which is articulated through language, part of Language that is spoken, written, gestural and symbolic, too is a meaningless and an arrogant medium, and that we cannot help ourselves but to impose human conditions into the creative development of a film. In short, cinema cannot escape Culture. And because cinema cannot escape Culture, it manifests the Cultural background of the filmmaker. Thus it is natural for cinema to breed auteur as its agent of Cultural expression. Auteur is then obligated to articulate fully his/her vision (Culture that naturally comes to him/her). His/her vision is never an original thought; it is only the vocabulary of Culture. Auteur only *re-cognizes* what Culture had offered to him/her. Auteurism then becomes a necessary element of the creative manifestation of cinema. Cinema, as with other arts, exists for no one, but its sole purpose is to acknowledge the precedence of Language, which has no signification to our Culture.

Alexander Kang  
05/31/2015  
Shanghai, China

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that traffic light signification of “go” is also uttered as *blue light* in Korea and Japan.