

The Thing of the Past

A film, inevitably, is a thing of the past – it is an artifact. As such a filmmaker who believes in cinema cannot stop him/herself but to make the same film over and over again in order to make his/her *vision*, life, relevant to the present. On the other hand, a filmmaker who constantly searches for new *ideas* for a film makes films that are only relevant for a certain time gap, just like advertisements. Thus, filmmakers who rely on *vision* and those who rely on *ideas* are respectively auteurs and the producers of gimmick, visionaries and idealists.

Notice that vision and ideas are respectively singular and plural. A visionary concentrates on the essence of his/her life whereas an idealist chases for things to say about life. Other way of saying it is that a visionary understands that the truth is always already within him/herself whereas an idealist is in search for the truth; a visionary manifests whereas an idealist learns; a visionary is a master whereas an idealist is a pupil – respectively a player and a worker; respectively an artist and an assistant.

But nonetheless both a visionary and an idealist are engaged in the act of creating artifacts – the things of the past. The difference is that a visionary, by repeating his/her vision throughout his/her filmography, fully opens his/her life to the public whereas an idealist, by ceaselessly looking for new ideas to film, makes the public unsure of his/her life. It ultimately is the matter of honesty. If a filmmaker has only one essential thing to manifest, then he/she must be an honest artist. But if a filmmaker has so many messages and things to talk about, then he/she must be quite dishonest in the sense that he/she is not sure what he/she believes in life.

The films by visionaries may seem to be logically incomprehensible (e.g. *The Mirror*, 1975, and *Persona*, 1966) because they are fully but metaphorically autobiographical, for they are honest manifestations of the filmmakers' lives, but they allow the audiences to experience the life of the film that reflects the audiences' lives, which are by nature incomprehensible. Life is spontaneous and illogical, so why should a film logically make sense? It is very strange to me that although people agree that a work of art should honestly reflect life but yet they turn around and say that storytelling is the most important aspect of cinema because they want to see something *of* real life that they can understand and feel emotional. There are but two things I can say to them: Escapists! Hypocrites!

The world is saturated with films made by filmmakers who just have so much to say about life but never concentrate on life itself. Thus, as the commercial film industry grows bigger people's spirituality of life around the world grows weaker. Think of a situation, a real life situation: there is a guy at a gathering who talks and talks, but no one listens to him, but everyone looks at him because he is a clown, he is entertaining. A true filmmaker only needs one thing to say, and when he/she speaks it is shown through honest and uncompromised images, and when a true filmmaker is asked, he/she will reply with the same (but adjusted through maturity) honest images – making presently relevant the thing of the past that defines his/her life in this world called disaster.

Alexander Kang
2016/07/17
Shanghai, China