**IDENTIFICATION**

**Instructions**: Identify the following film genres/movements. The exam is open book, so you may use your class notes, presentations, readings, and supplemental material. Do not cut and paste answers from another source. Take the time to write out your own answers, which do not need to appear in complete sentences. If you cite from an outside source, clearly identify it. (30 pts.)

1. Italian Neorealism

A film which attempts to capture the truest human experience short of a documentary by utilizing outdoor urban settings, long and often loosely narrative plots, and at times non-actors.

1. Third Cinema

A film which was popular in third world nations and among left leaning sympathizers often utilized a mixture of Neorealism and what would be considered documentary style films to spread leftist propaganda via underground screenings . Many of these films would heavily use montages and anti-American imagery.

1. French New Wave

A critique on the Hollywood movie system features more art house styles through unique cinematography and a more emphasis in the mise-en-scene varying from director to director.

1. New German Cinema

Low budget films which focused on smaller audiences utilized new camera movements and characterful acting influenced by the French New Wave.

1. Documentary Film

An educational film containing historical/ cultural significance through a narrative thesis and remain visually interesting.

1. Independent Film

A film shot outside of the major studio system, sustained on a much lower budget with lesser known actors.

**SHORT ANSWER**

**Instructions**: Writing in complete sentences, answer the following prompts in one or two paragraphs. Be as specific and concise as possible. Include quotations and in-text citations when appropriate. (40 pts.)

1. Choose one of the documentaries we have watched and argue for what “mode” of documentary is most dominant in the film and why.
2. Douglas Sirk (*All That Heaven Allows*) was a major influence on Rainer Werner Fassbinder. In what ways does *Fox and His Friends* reflect this influence?

Both these German directors were products of New German Cinema and its shows through their own unique styles. Both these directors tell a story about crossing the line of social class, the lower more charismatic and the rich more uptight, however the main difference is lies in the social trajectory of our protagonist. In all that heaven allows our protagonist falls in love with somoni below her means, both are purely motivated by affection for one another. Fassbinder tells a more scathing view of social class, choosing to aim his focuse more toward the ramifications than the motivations.

In Fox and his friends our protagonist is a poor circus thief who wins the lottery moving up into the upper echelon of society. It is here where he falls in love with a wealthy man who inherits a failing business and becomes reliant on his new lucky lover. In this movie these motivations are hidden under the guise of love to our protagonist but not to the audience or our protagonists sister. The inverse is true in all that heaven allows, where in the audience knows that our characters are only acting out of love but our protagonist is unsure and is paranoid by their family; her son and daughter.

1. How is Charles Burnett’s film *Killer of Sheep* reminiscent of Italian Neorealism?

The goal of neorealism was to capture the true human experience short of a documentary through loose narratives, outdoor urban settings, and inexperienced actors; This is a perfect description of Burnett’s film. The film itself is very reminiscent of early Italian neorealistic movies such as bicycle thieves where it shows a day in the life. The plot is not so much moved as it is followed, their doesn’t seem to be any one thing that motivates our character except for money, no hard goals. And just like a great amount of neorealistic films it comments on social class and how difficult mobility is.

1. How might Black Independent films like *Killer of Sheep* and *Sorry to Bother You* be characterized as (or at least influenced by) the movement of Third Cinema?

Third cinema arose out of socialist south America to comment on the cruel and unfair practices of capitalism, utilizing montage and distributed in underground or art house cinemas. Both Sorry to bother you and Killer of sheep fall under this third cinema rubric (aside from its country of origin) and though Sorry to Bother you is more on the established side of cinema it still makes heavy social commentary and had a limited release. The most obvious connection to third cinema in sorry to bother you was during the interpretive art scene, its here where a clear commentary on capitalism to third world countries is made. While in Killer of sheep, the montage element is used to highlight how futile and venerable these poor children are.

1. In what ways does Zhangke Jia’s *A Touch of Sin* play with generic conventions, and to what effect?

Touch of Sin gives the audience four distinct stories which decrease in violence but increase in emotional reaction. This anthology style changes our expectations about the film, from comically detached to depressingly involved. We feel a distain for our reaction of earlier mindless violence when faced with a cold sobering story. As the anthology continues our scope seems to decrease from plethora of figure to once distinct victim. As well as this the victims are less deserving of their punishments as the stories go while the earlier ones show gratuitous violence with little to no punishment for the perpetrators.

**SHORT ESSAY**

**Instructions**: In no more than 750 words, Compare and contrast Jean-Luc Godard’s approach to representing social class in *Tout Va Bien* to Agnes Varda’s approach in *Vagabond*. Defend a specific thesis that connects their class commentary to their cinematic form (generic conventions, shot composition, editing techniques, etc.). Support your argument by referring to specific scenes as best as you can recall. (If you are interested in a rewatch, *Vagabond* is still available for free on UNCA’s Kanopy page and *Tout Va Bien* can be streamed for free [here](https://www.facebook.com/watch/live/?ref=watch_permalink&v=2247507042156551).) (30 pts.)

The French New wave was able to succeed out of its desperation to compete with the Hollywood system by allowing directors to demonstrate their own artistic vision. This resulted in new chances in storytelling that were seen as more provocative to their American contemporaries with some being seen by mainstream audiences and starring some Hollywood celebrities. *Tout Va Bien* is a quintessential film from this era at its peak, not only presented in a unique style but commenting on social class through the lens of the time. A main component of the social class struggle was the discussion of gender, something that is tackled in a later French film, Vagabond. While being separated by a little over a decade they each have unique yet familiar outlooks on class while being presented in a very New Wave fashion.

A main theme of these films is identity, whether at the expense of society or even yourself, in both these movies the female led is sexualy and finicaly independent. In *Tout Va Bien*, this independence comes from the female lead’s job while in Vagabond it comes from a lack thereof. Both comment on class, in Vagabond her gender is more of a misdirect, she is more discriminated against due to her status rather than her sex. However, the subject of their sex put them under threat, in Tout Va Bien, our protagonist is very sexualized by bystanders with at times their being the threat of rape as in second scene where the group of thieves are discussing her in a gas station. In Tout Va bien one of the female strikers in her monologue states how she has tried to avoid advances from superiors.

Excluding thematic similarities, stylistically the two films share a lot, most jarring of which are the fourth wall monologues. Tout Va Bien is most guilty of this egregious practice, almost every act having at least one long direct to audience economics lesson on Unions, gender, or relationships. Thankfully in Vagabond these are limited to a woman who seems to follow our protagonist, commenting on her outlook, standing, and feelings on the situation. Another similarity, ironically is the silence, how both directors allow us to live in the scene, Vagabond does this much more tastefully than Tout Va bien allowing the main focus to be on characters and the setting. Tout Va bien uses these moments mostly to focus on the setting or at times the story. For instance, the scene during the filming of the commercial, while egregious, allows the audience to feel the maintenance of the male protagonist's situation. When used in Vagabond its used to show the protagonist's relationship to other characters as well as her feelings about her situation as demonstrated in the gas station scene. In this she is scene working and sharing glances with the boy who works their, the boy to shy to talk with her, then in the next we see the garage owner leaving her tent after intercourse letting us know our protagonist is more interested in quick fun then long term investment thus why she is a vagabond.