Intended to argue for films being historical, just a different way of doing it

He’s well aware of the faults of movies and uses these to analyse other’s reviews and analyse the movies. One is that they’re entertainment and false, actors, too much detail

He is also aware of mistakes historians make while analyzing films like historical accuracy, evoked emotions, etc. The fault that historians think movies=books and should therefore be right is changing

Rather than focusing on the inacurasies and theories of film, focus on how history is portrayed in film and the way film-makers have actually been working

‘seriously attempting to make meaning of the past’ page 42. Written criteria can’t be applied as films can’t be told like a book can

Films must show specifics, not generics, and therefore must invent things that historical documents cannot prove

Films are more personal, combining things like race, class, and gender into one rather than splitting them apart like a book. History is a process

Book is aimed to slice the head off our stereotypes of what constitutes historical thought

Film is more emotional than analytical like books

You can never mirror a moment that has vanished, no matter how accurate you strive to be

We speak for facts, facts cannot speak for themselves

A filmmaker doesn’t have the same luxury as a researcher, to sit down, to think, then to write for years

Author knows exactly why he wrote the book and for what purpose

We already have books, Film is a different way of seeing

Books are referential, film is metaphorical and symbolical

The book’s writing is jumbled and the author doesn’t point back to his thesis that much, expecting the reader to keep up and do it themselves. But it’s an academic book, so the readers are expected to keep up and reflect on the points made themselves.

We always violate the past when we attempt to preserve it’s memory. It is inevitable and part of the price of our attempts at understanding the vanished word of our forebears.