DOGMA/DOGME 95: MANIFESTO FOR

CONTEMPORARY CINEMA

AND REALISM

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF

GRAPHIC DESIGN

AND THE INSTITUTE OF FINE ARTS

OF BİLKENT UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF FINE ARTS

By

Emre Yalgın

May, 2003

I certify that I have read this thesis and that in my option it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Fine Arts.

....

Asst. Prof. Dr. John Robert Groch (Principle Advisor)

I certify that I have read this thesis and that in my option it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Fine Arts.

....

Asst. Prof. Andreas Treske (Co-advisor)

I certify that I have read this thesis and that in my option it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Fine Arts.

....

Asst. Prof. Dr. Asuman Suner

Approved by the Institute of Fine Arts

....

Prof. Dr. Bülent Özgüç, Director of the Institute of Fine Arts

ABSTRACT

DOGMA/DOGME 95: MANIFESTO FOR CONTEMPORARY CINEMA AND REALISM

Emre Yalgın

M.F.A in Graphic Design

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. John Robert Groch

Co-Advisor: Asst. Prof. Andreas Treske

May, 2003

This study investigates Dogma/Dogme'95, which is the latest collectivism seen in the history of cinema. Thesis explores this newest movement's references to past and today's filmmaking in relation to the concept of realism, in order to find out the possible structure of a movement in contemporary cinema.

ÖZET

DOGMA/DOGME 95: ÇAĞDAŞ SİNEMA İÇİN BİR MANİFESTO VE GERÇEKLİK

Emre Yalgın

Grafik Tasarım Bölümü

Yüksek Lisans

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. John Groch

Yardımcı Yönetici: Yrd. Prof. Andreas Treske

Mayıs, 2003

Bu çalışma, sinema tarihinde ortaya çıkan en son kolektif oluşum olarak Dogma/Dogme 95'i incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Çalışma bu en yeni kolektif hareketin günümüze ve geçmişe dair içerdiği referansları 'gerçeklik' kavramı ile birlikte değerlendirip, günümüz sinemasında ortaya çıkması olası bir harektin yapısının keşfedilmesine çalışmaktadır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Foremost, I would like to thank three persons, who supported and helped during the whole process of this thesis. I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor my gratitude to Asst. Prof. Dr. John R.Groch. This thesis owes too much to his patience and advises. His knowledge and creative approach always helped me to figure out many things while writing the thesis.

I would to thank to my co-advisor Asst. Prof. Andreas Treske for giving me the chance of working together for two years. He spent many hours sharing his invaluable knowledge with me. And his approach not only as a collegue, but also as a friend let me succeed in many ways. As well this thesis, my private life and goals owe too much to his mentor and friendship.

I would like to express my indeptness to Asst. Prof. Dr. Asuman Suner, without her this thesis would have been a much weaker one. Her support and tutorship for two years always opened my mind in the era of film studies. And without her insistence and trust to me, it would be impossible to cope with this challenging study.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family for their endless support and understanding not only during these two years but also for my whole life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4 POSTMODERN DOGMA'S OF TODAY   **64**

5 CONCLUSION   **75**

APPENDICES   **78**

REFERENCES   **87**

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1995 a group of Danish film makers, Lars von Trier, Thomas Vinterberg, Soren Krag Jacobsen and Kristian Levring, enunciated a set of rules called as *The Vow of Chastity*. This manifesto unexpectedly exceeded the borders of Denmark and find echoes in the other countries, small and big festivals and cinema magazines all over the world. *The Vow of Chastity* was the first step of the materialisation of a new movement in cinema. The manifesto was bravely asserting to be the foundation of the upcoming future of film. Dogme'95 declared itself to be a collective of filmmakers open to everyone who wants to wear the uniform of *The Vow of Chastity*.

I swear to submit to the following set of rules drawn up and confirmed by DOGME 95:

1. Shooting must be done on location. Props and sets must not be brought in (if a prop is necessary to the story, a location must be chosen where the prop is to be found).

2. The sound must never be produced apart from the image, or vice versa (music must not be used unless it occurs where the scene is being shoot).

3. The camera must be hand-held. Any movement or immobility attainable in the hand is permitted. (The film must not take place where the camera is standing; shooting must take place where the film takes place).

4. The film must be in colour. Special lighting is not acceptable. (If there is too little light for exposure, the scene must occur, or a single lamp may be attached to the camera.)

5. Optical work and filters are forbidden

6. The film must not contain superficial action. (Murders, weapons, etc. must not occur).

7. Temporal and geographical alienation is forbidden. (That is to say the film must take place in the here and now).

8. Genre movies are not acceptable.

9. The film must be Academy 35mm.

10. The director must not be credited.

Furthermore I swear as a director to refrain from personal taste! I am no longer an artist. I swear to refrain from creating a "work", as I regard the instant as more important than the whole. My supreme goal is to force the truth out of my characters and settings. I swear to do so by all the means available and at the cost of any good taste and any aesthetic considerations.

Thus I make my VOW OF CHASTITY."

Copenhagen, Monday 13 March 1995. (App. B)

The aim of this study is to investigate this newest collectivism, Dogma'95, by comparing it with the considerable movements in the history of cinema and the conditions of today's filmmaking. Dogma'95 is not only important as being a part of the transformation of today's cinema, but it is also important because of its referential positioning against the Nouvelle Vague, Italian Neorealism, Cinéma Vérité, as well as commercial cinema and

the expanded use of technological advancement in order to create effects. These references of the Dogma'95 movement resonate with Derrida's deconstruction of Hegelian "end of history" thesis of Francis Fukuyama. Fukuyama declared the triumph of liberal democracy and the death of Marxism likewise the Dogma 95 declares the new visuality and its rules in *The Vow of Chastity* and the death of auteur in cinema and Nouvelle Vague. Derrida puts out against "Hegelian end of history thesis", that Marx is one of the specters, just like Hamlet's father, whom we can and can not exorcise in this time, which is out of joint. And through this research of Dogma 95, we will see the ghosts of not only Nouvelle Vague, but also many others such as Italian Neo-realism, Eisenstein, Vertov et cetera, haunting Dogma 95. In that sense Dogma 95 is a good topic of research because of its openness to a wide area of discussions. This openness provides an investigation of how the film theories, narrative, and the movies themselves evolve until today. Moreover it enables us to evaluate the possible properties and existence of a film movement in today's cultural and social context.

But this openness also makes harder to gather and organise the thoughts into systematic writing. So, the subject must be narrowed down. For Dogma'95 the most crucial point is the assertion about the notion of reality. According to *The Vow of Chastity*, if all the rules are followed, the Dogma certificated film will represent reality. And moreover the notion of reality is that much important for the movement that it allows us to reduce or interpret the whole manifesto as it shows a way to handle the film production and shootings to represent what is "real". But still the notion of reality itself includes not only a huge space for the debates around film theory, but also

3

occupies an important place in the history of philosophy, which is older than the foundations of cinema, from Plato to contemporary philosophers. And because of these difficulties through this research the notion of reality will be narrowed down, according to its apprehension by Dogma'95. The notion of 'reality" will be discussed by following and emphasising the important points, in which the Dogma 95 and its handling of "reality" in cinema refers to the endless discussions of film theory and philosophy. Dogma's conceptualisation of realism in cinema and its structure as a movement is itself basically dominated by the postmodern cultural and social situation of contemporary cinema. In this regard, Dogma'95 shows a clear break from the history of cinema with its postmodern discourse, this thesis aims to show this newest movement's apprehension of realism in cinema in a postmodern context.

In the first chapter Dogma'95 will be introduced to the reader in relation to the Danish film industry. After this introductory chapter, the notion of reality and its practice and theory in the history of cinema will be examined. Starting from the birth of cinema, 1920s Soviet cinema, Italian Neorealism, André Bazin, Nouvelle Vague, Direct Cinema and Cinéma Vérité will be the subject matter of the discussion. These movements and theoreticians will be discussed in respect to their apprehension of realism in cinema as well as their technical and theoretical innovations. However, it should also be indicated that these are not the only moments in the history of cinema that debates around realism come forward. Realism in cinema involves many other movements and theoretical approaches such as New German Cinema, Third World Cinema or Feminist filmmaking practices and

so forth. But there are two main reasons for excluding these from the thesis. First of all, the situation of Dogma'95 will be investigated in a specifically European context that non-European movements like Third World Cinema or not specifically European film practices just like Feminist cinema is excluded. Secondly, thesis concentrates on movements whose primary motivations were aesthetic, not political. Therefore New German Cinema, Third World Cinema or Feminist filmmaking practices will not be discussed in the thesis. And the investigation is limited to the selected movements and theoretical approaches, because Dogma'95 has clear technical and narrative references to them.

In the third chapter, Dogma'95 and *The Vow of Chastity*, which is the main declaration of the movement, will be discussed. As forming the basics of the Dogma'95, *The Vow of Chastity,* defines the borders of a Dogma certificated film. *The Vow of Chastity* will be exposed in two different parts as technical aspects and the narrative aspects. Because while some of the rules of the manifesto are directly related with the production process, the others mainly deals with the narrative aspects of a Dogma'95 film. And in both of these parts the rules of the manifesto will be discussed in relation to the second chapter. And in order to find out Dogma's attitude towards the history of cinema and the changes in the notion of 'realism' through the history of cinema until today, at the last section of this chapter the main theme will be the "space and time".

At the last chapter of the thesis, there will be the evaluation of Dogma'95 in today's social and cultural context as well as the use of technology and the countering mainstream cinema. Through the chapter

Dogma'95 will be interpreted in a postmodern context. The positioning of Dogma'95 in relation to its approach to realism in contemporary cinema will be revealed. The aim of the thesis, Dogma'95 as a postmodern movement in the history of cinema, will be grounded in this last chapter.

1.1.   Introducing Dogma 95

Before directly introducing Dogma, for understanding its motivation and approach, at first the material conditions of Danish cinema industry and auteurism should be understood. The Danish cinema, except a few names such as Carl Theodor Dreyer, who is from silent era of filmmaking and Bille August, it is hard to find a filmmaker truly recognised in the world.

> Interestingly, for a few years before the First World War, Denmark were Europe's largest producer and exporter of full-length silent movies. In the 1920's Carl Theodor Dreyer, become one of Europe's first internationally acclaimed film director His film *Jean D'arc* is still regarded as a classic by many film lovers. However the economics of the business have changed... (Fallesen, 45).

This underdevelopment in film industry of Denmark especially after the silent era can be interpreted by many factors, but the most important ones are the influence of German and American films in different periods and the continuously increasing taxes on the film making.

It is obvious for contemporary cinema for all the countries like Denmark that they suffer from the same obstacles, the influence of American commercial films, which are products of the huge companies and the American industry of film making. Against this domination of film market by commercial Hollywood films, the international corporations become important

for small country filmmakers. Because such international corporations provide filmmakers to make big budget films that can compete with Hollywood productions. The funding from two national film institutes is unavoidably come out as a bigger production and investment. And such a film funded by more then one country can find the chance of not only competing with the Hollywood films in its own countries film market, but also the chance of distribution to the world market and film festivals. For Nordic countries, Denmark, Iceland, Sweden, Norway and Finland, which inhabit the same difficulties and the developments at the same periods, it becomes common to go through such corporations with each other. For instance Bille August's *Pelle Erobreren* (1987), which is a great success for him to achieve an international status by winning several awards such as an Oscar and a Golden Palm at Cannes, is a Swedish and Danish co-production (Astrid S. 23). And Lars von Trier's *Breaking the Waves* is another interesting example of financing; producers Vibeke Windelov and Peter Aalbaek Jensen succeeded to involve many countries to support the film after many attempts. If we follow chronologically the first funding comes from Danish Film Institute and then they found support from the Norwegian and Swedish producers. But this funding was still not enough to produce the film, which was going to be shot at the Outer Hebrides in Scotland, so that they applied to Eurimages, which is the pan-European co-production fund. And then French producers La Sept Cinéma/ARTE involved into the film, and lastly Dutch television and a Dutch producers took place. So that the film was funded from five different countries Denmark, Norway, Sweden, France and The Netherlands with the participation of production companies, film institutes, Tv Channels and film

funding companies such as Eurimages, European Script Fund et cetera. (Angus Finney 223-229)

While these financing problems are effecting the European and Scandinavian cinema, Dogma'95 appears with a solution. Because Dogma'95 is an innovative movement and a rebellion against commercial way of making conventional films with its advantage of allowing low budget filmmaking and simple technical shooting principles. If the rules of the manifesto are followed the biggest expense seems to be the process of telecine, which is basically the process of transferring video to film. So that the biggest problem of small country filmmakers just like Denmark is somehow seem to be solved. At least with the advantage of low cost of production, they find the chance of telling their stories and distributing them through the world under the mark of Dogma'95.

In 1995 the introverted situation of Denmark film industry exposed to a rupture with the enunciation of Dogme 95. Lars von Trier, Thomas Vinterberg, Soren Krag Jacobsen and Kristian Levring, put their signs under a set of rules named as *The Vow of Chastity*. And Dogma'95, which is called to be a collective of filmmakers, appeared on the conditions of this manifesto. Actually the idea is started and dominated by Lars von Trier as accepted by many critiques. Lars von Trier and fellow filmmaker Thomas Vinterberg, who was the new talent of Danish cinema, came together and wrote down the ten rules of the manifesto.

> IndieWire: When you were actually sitting down coming up with the rules—the 10 principles of the Vow of Chastity—how did you go about doing that? What were those discussions like? What things didn't you include?

> Vinterberg: It was very banal. I did this with Lars von Trier, who did "Breaking the Waves", and it took half an hour and we had great fun and a lot of laughs. And you know it was very simple. We said, "What do you normally do when you make a film?" And we forbid it. That was very easy. (Lehrer, 1)

This easy and banal constitution of ten principles of *The Vow of Chastity,* which forbids what is normally done in the film making process according to Thomas Vinterberg, formed the basics of Dogma'95 with the participation of Soren Krag Jacobsen and Kristian Levring. And interestingly this manifesto, which forbids the actual process of film making, was introduced to the film world during the celebrations of the 100th anniversary of the birth of film, which was agreed to be the Lumiére brothers first public screening at December 28,1895 in the Grand Café in Paris.

> At a public debate in the Odéon-Théatre de l'Europe on March 20,1995, Trier stepped to the front of the stage to deliver his contribution. He started by asking permission to speak on a topic outside the ambit of the debate. He then announced that he represented the Dogma 95 group, read their manifesto aloud and after he had finished, he cast red pamphlets featuring the manifesto text into the audience. He then left the theatre. (Schepelern, 1)

The declaration of Dogma'95 manifesto at the celebrations of the birth of cinema was of course not a coincidence. The history of cinema did not encounter with any new manifestos and rebellions in a collective way against the mainstream cinema, since Oberhausen manifesto in 1962 Germany.

Dogme'95 will be a rescue action announced at the birth of cinema. It is said to be the salvation of the cinema and filmmaking from the illusions created before them, especially they are lean against the 1960's and 70's cinema, for the sake of a truthful cinema. In other words Dogma'95 was

presented for the sake of a cinema, which will reflect the reality. One of the interesting points in the manifesto is that the founders swear that they can give up all the aesthetic considerations for the sake of this new coming cinema, and the reality that it will going to tell. If we simplify the arguments of the manifesto of this new movement, we can find out three main arguments. Firstly it is an objection to the studio system of film making, which is directed to the commercial cinema of Hollywood. Secondly it is against the sovereignty of an auteur cinema and thirdly it is an objection to the use of technology for creating illusions.

Thirty-one film projects are labelled as Dogma films by the directors themselves and some of them are still in the process of production depending on *The Vow of Chastity*. The production of thirty one films needs a worth paying attention, because it is a high number for not only Danish cinema, but also for a movement in the history of film making. But actually not all of these films are from Denmark, which makes Dogma'95 a more interesting subject to study. If the list of the films is evaluated, it can be seen that only eight of them is made in Denmark or directed by Danish directors; twelve of them from USA, three of them from Spain, then France, Belgium, Norway, Argentina, Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, Italy come with one each. (App. C) And the total sum of Nordic films is still less than the USA ones. These numbers are also interesting, because it shows us that Dogma'95 is easily accepted through the independent filmmakers especially in USA, where some of the objections of the manifesto are directed to, and some supporters joined the movement from many other countries outside of Denmark. When we look to the movements in the history of cinema such as

Nouvelle Vague, Italian Neo-realism or New German Cinema, we can find out that all these movements are remembered by the names of the nations, where these movements are established. On the other hand, with this fast expansion of Dogma'95 to other countries outside of Scandinavian ones, we can think that this will not easily happen to Dogma. Whether the idea spreads from this small Nordic country for evaluating it at later stages someone should have to consider the films and directors outside of Denmark, who supported this manifesto and produced films according to it. If this fast expansion is taken as evidence, it can be asserted that the manifesto seems to have a response to its call, that everyone capable of filmmaking can do his or her film wearing the same uniform with the movement for rescuing the cinema.

In June 2002 at the official Dogma'95 web page, the Dogmesecretariat announces that they are closing with a headline "back to basic anarchism". The reasons of this turning back to basic anarchisms are explained as the transformation of Dogma'95 itself as a genre, which is far from the intention of the manifesto and actually banned in the manifesto. And the original founders of the Dogma, von Trier, Vinterberg, Jacobsen and Levring are on their own ways to new experiments. Lastly the economical reasons are shown for the closing of Dogmesecretairat. But this does not mean that the basics of the movement are restricted to the thirty-one films done before this announcement. Everyone can do his or her film still obeying to *The Vow of Chastity* without paying any attention to the copyright rules. Because copyright is not existing and the whole manifesto itself is an idea nothing more. And any director, who wants to realise such a project obeying the

manifesto rules, can mark his or her film as a Dogma film. And as being one

of the leading directors of Dogma'95 Lars von Trier has already declared his

new experiments by a new manifesto with nine rules for documentary films in

2001 as "The Documentarist Code For 'Dogumentarism'". (App. D)

In the light of this brief introduction of Dogma'95, we can generally say

that not only Dogma'95 itself, but also Danish cinema attracted a curiosity in

the world.

> Denmark can claim to be the third-most important film
> making country in the EU, after the United Kingdom and
> France in terms of international market penetration. At
> the International Film Festival in Cannes earlier this
> year (1998) two out of the twenty-two films selected for
> the final competition were Dannish. As Denmark
> produces between ten and twenty films a year, and
> more than a thousand films were submitted to the
> festival, this is no little feat. (Fallesen, 45)

We can never be sure that the founders of Dogma 95 expected such

an affinity or not, but it is obvious that they managed to make the world of

cinema talk about them. And Dogma'95 put its mark on the 90's

contemporary cinema.

2. REALIST MOMENTS

If we investigate the history of cinema, it is certain that we will find out many ideas and works related to the ideal of realism. Most of the time these ideals carried to the movements and specify different ways of how to approach reality in the terms of filmmaking. Also opposite of this relation can be asserted that movements or the way of filmmaking affected or awaken the ideals of realism appeared in the theories. On the other hand this thesis not aims to define realism. Therefore the concept of realism will be considered by its basic comprehension as "a mode of representation, at a formal level, aims at verisimilitude or mimesis". (Hallam and Marshment, xii)

The debates about realism in the cinema is not an easy subject to put out with a few words. Because behind these ideas and applications not only the whole history of cinema, but also the philosophical discussions lie. We can trace back these philosophical arguments till the ancient philosophy. And the most crucial point at the beginnings of the history philosophy that can be related to cinema is the Plato's cave metaphor, which influences and effects the film theories and practice. In *Republic*, Plato makes Socrates to describe a cave to Glaukon:

> Picture men dwelling in a sort of subterranean cavern with a long entrance open to the light on its entire width. Conceive them as having their legs and necks fettered from childhood, so that they remain in the same spot, able to look forward only, and prevented by the fetters from turning their heads. Picture further the light from a fire burning higher up and at a distance behind them, and between the fire and the prisoners and above them a road along which a low wall has been built, as the exhibitors of puppet shows have partitions before the man themselves, above which they show puppets. (747)

Socrates continues his description that these prisoners in the cave will believe nothing more than that the shadows they see in the walls of the cave is the truth, these shadows are the real objects. We should not forget that Plato's cave is a metaphor to explain his philosophical system. But still we can think about a moviegoer sitting in the dark, listening to the noises coming all around the theatre and looking at the big screen and the images projected behind him or her. It is true that the case is different than Plato's cave. Normally moviegoers have a different position than the prisoners of the cave, because they are voluntarily there, they are there to believe or experience what is going on the screen. It is something obscure that how the identification with the screen and how the feelings like sadness, anxiety, fear et cetera catch us while we are watching a film. Or in other words how can watching a film approximate our experience in the world. There are lots of questions that can be raised for the case of watching a movie such like those.

But, on the other hand, there is also another important point about the images projected on the screen: do they really have to represent the real world or can we use this medium to create a new world based on our fantasies? What should be the motivation of the image; to reproduce the real world or by having the chance of this similar experience can it create dreams which are far from everyday life? These are some of the points that through the history of cinema create endless debates around the notion of realism. Actually the notion of realism is always in a flux in relation to many factors resulted from different areas: realist moments in literature, social and economical changes, philosophy. Therefore in this chapter we will look

through the history of cinema from its beginnings and try to investigate the importance of the notion of realism especially in relation to the movements. Our main concern will not be revealing the notion of realism in the history of cinema, but rather finding out the motivations behind the Dogma'95 and its apprehension of the subject matter.

2.1. The Birth of Cinema: "Realistic Documentary versus Fantasy World"

The birth of cinema itself is open to the discussions of realism. With the invention of moving picture and the camera, the tendency of capturing moving images became the most important thing. But the invention was so new that there was a question of how to evaluate and use it. Therefore the tendency of capturing the moving images varied towards different directions.

Lumière brothers, Auguste and Louis, who came from photography to the area of film made one of the first motion pictures in film history entitled *La Sortie des usines Lumiére*. This motion picture has told nothing more than the name it carries. It has not a story to tell, but only the reproduction and projection of the space and time. This is the opportunity that Lumière brothers found in this new invention: to reproduce the world and events as they are in real life. And they continue their way of producing motion pictures such as *Arriveé d'un Train en Gare* and *Le Déjeuner de Bébé*. Interestingly *Arriveé d'un Train en Gare* effected the audience so much that they were scared from the image of the train coming towards them on the screen.

This is what Lumière brothers produced: the atmosphere of the everyday event. And people went to see this projected real life on the screen.

Therefore it would not be false to say that Lumière brothers' films were the first realistic films or documentaries ever made with this new invention. On the other hand this new invention provided some other approaches. It is certain that the images projected on the screen are not the world we experience, they are only the reproductions of the world. So this screen is a kind of new universe, which is capable of including the unreal and real objects, or what is rational and irrational at the same time, on the same cotton material. In other words, it can show us or take us in a time and space, which we do not belong. This illusionary opportunity of the new medium is recognised by Georges Méliès. "Referring to the film *Le Déjeuner de Bébé,* in which Auguste Lumière and his wife are seen feeding their baby, Méliès noted that the spectators were transfixed, not by the animated figures themselves, but by the rustling foliage in the background." (Macdonald and Cousins, 4) And for Méliès, who was originally a magician, this new medium was capable of creating illusions. He started to produce films for exploring this capacity of the new medium and to screen his fantasy world and illusions to the audience. With this discovery of film's ability to change reality and create fantasies, he produced films like *L'homme à la tête de outchouc* (1901), *Le Voyage dans la Lune* (1902), *La conquête du pôle* (1912) and *Le voyage des Bourrichons* (1913). The most important one of his works is the *Le Voyage dans la Lune*, which he adopted, from the novels of Jules Verne and H.G.Wells. The film's story is about the fantastic adventures of astronauts who fall on the moon and it is evidently in opposition to Lumière brothers' realistic documentary.

Then, we can see the different tendencies behind the production of motion pictures clearly from the opposition of Lumière brothers and Méliès. Since the invention of moving pictures these, two approaches, realistic films, which seek to show the world as it is, and the films, which present an imaginary world to the audience, exist side by side. "The dichotomy represented by the contrasting approaches of the Lumières and Méliès is central to film and is repeated through the years in a variety of guises" (Monaco 216).

2.2. Soviet Cinema of the 1920s and Realism

When we come to the 1920s we can say that the cinema was transforming in different directions in different countries. In America the film sector was becoming an industry, while in Europe, despite the commercial cinema, understanding film as an art form was gaining value. These years were also very important for the development of cinema, because the Soviet's encounter many debates which are not only valuable for practice but also for the theory. In 1917s Soviet cinema industry was destroyed during the revolution, but immediately after two years in 1919 the film industry was nationalised and Lenin established the State Film School. Filmmaking before and after revolution shows a great break. Before the revolution mostly commercial and classic type of Hollywood films were produced and screened in Russia. But after the revolution most of the directors, actors and actresses took the film stocks and moved outside Russia. And the nationalised film industry dressed up with new values and the domination of politics. "Artists and film-makers were perceived as having a special role as proponents of

propaganda cinema. Lenin declared in 1922 that 'off all the arts, for us the cinema is the most important" (Nelmes 333). For carrying this duty the new filmmakers started to develop their ideas and produced films with a few equipment and film stocks left after the revolution. This period of Soviet cinema, which is evidently one of the most innovative parts of the history of film, confronted the conventions of classic Hollywood cinema with their impossibilities of equipment and the undertaken duty. As Nelmes points out the lack of equipment even film cameras resulted in the re-editing of the existing films in order to make them suitable for the values of the new socialist Soviet State. And some others created films with the negatives available. Therefore what we call Soviet montage cinema came out. (334)

These experiments led one of the most important directors of the Soviet cinema Sergei Eisenstein to develop his own theory of montage and films like *Strike* (1924), *Battleship Potemkin* (1925), *October* (1928), *Alexander Nevsky* (1938). The basics of Eisenstein's montage theory lie in its opposition to classical Hollywood style of editing, which is called invisible editing. In that type of editing the shots arranged in an order that the spectator can not realise the editing and the editing itself serves for the narrative structure of the film nothing more. Actually montage and editing are terms which refer to different kinds of understanding of this last phase of film production. While the term 'editing', which is commonly used in American cinema, means dropping useless and unwanted material, the European term 'montage' is a process of re-creation or building up the raw material. "For Eisenstein, montage has as its aim the creation of ideas, of a new reality, rather than the support of narrative, the old reality of experience." (Monaco,

323) In that sense *Battleship Potemkin*, 1925, is one of the effective examples of his montage theory. *Battleship Potemkin* is about the rebellion of the people in Odessa against the Tsar during revolution in 1905. In order to show the awakening of the people and the crew of Battleship Potemkin against the totalitarian regime, Eisenstein used three different shots of lion statutes. In the first shot we see the sleeping statute of lion. Then comes the waken up statute. And lastly the roaring statute of the lion appears. Instead of using the direct way likewise showing the rebellious people, his use of lion metaphor clearly demonstrates Eisenstein's wish to communicate with his audience rather than concentrating to his relationship with the raw materials. Therefore he prefers not to use realistic images in order to re-establish the notion of reality in his message. Because of using such a way, we can argue that he creates a new understanding of realism depending upon the images and their arrangement.

Additionally, Eisenstein developed the notion of "typage", which is a kind of casting non-professional actors. The casting is done according to the facial expressions and physical conditions. This means that instead of casting a professional, who is going to imitate or perform someone else, he casted ordinary people, who are most adequate to the character in the film according to his or her physical nature. That kind of casting, as we will see later in Italian Neo-realism is a step forward to the construction or verisimilitude of the realism in cinema. On the other hand, Dziga Vertov, whose ideas are in opposition to Eisenstein, argued that such kind of a casting in fiction films is nonsensical, because that kind of film making is itself unnatural. Therefore you do not need to approximate reality from which you

are already separated. And fiction film should not follow or imitate the way of documentary film. *The Eleventh Year* (1928), *Man with a Movie Camera* (1929)*, Enthusiasm* (1931) and *Three Songs of Lenin* (1934) are the series of documentaries in which Dziga Vertov puts out his ideas on montage and filming technique between the late 1920's and early 1930's. (Kevin, 50)

"For Vertov the camera is an instrument for penetrating reality, enabling people to see 'through and beyond' the mundane realities of everyday life." (Hallam and Marshment, 28) Likewise Eisenstein, Vertov's aim is the same; to develop a new form of cinema against the commercial cinema serving for capitalism, but his understanding is not destroying realism in order to approach reality. He thought that the camera is the main tool of cinema and moreover it has the power of an omnipotent eye with its ability of seeing long distances, filming in slow or fast motion et cetera. It is the mechanical eye that can capture the reality that our eyes can not see. It can reveal the truth hidden in the everyday life. Therefore Vertov argued that the first work of the filmmaker is to capture the life as it is, then comes the editing which can reveal a different reality to us. "A kino-eye film was able, Vertov believed to reveal a deeper level of truth in the world than was normally perceived by the 'imperfect human eye'"(Macdonald and Cousins, 51) (Kino-eye is a term applied by Vertov for the combination of omnipotent eye the camera and montage.) In order to achieve this, he abandoned the conventional way of narrative to a degree that narrative no longer existed. And he used a kind of documentary way of capturing daily events and real situations to edit them with using lots of techniques like flicker effects, freeze frames and even animations. But Eisenstein criticised Vertov that he captured and edited the

facts which impress himself, in other words these facts captured by the omnipotent eye is dominated through the director's own point of view. In this way Dziga Vertov's claim that cinema would remove the curtains hiding the reality behind everyday facts, was shaken by the questioning of its neutrality by Eisenstein.

Eisenstein and Vertov are two important figures at the 1920s innovative Soviet cinema, whose theories exceeded the borders of their state and effect the filmmakers and theoreticians all over the world. Their standing against the Hollywood monopoly of classical cinema led them to intensive debates around the notion of realism. The new socialist Soviet State cinema obtained new approaches to the other filmmakers who believed that the cinema has to develop in favour of realism.

2.3. Italian Neo-Realism

During the 2nd World War facing with fascism and the destruction of war, the cinema has taken deep wounds in Europe. But after the end of war European cinema organised and gained its power again. Especially in Italy, a country suffered from the heroic ideal of fascism during the years of war; a new cinematic approach was born. And this new cinematic approach called Italian Neo-realism put its mark in the history of cinema. Likewise European cinema suffering from war, also Hollywood cinema was suffering from the countering development of television against its domination in the fifties.

> If Hollywood had to battle television economically in order to survive the fifties, it had to contend aesthetically with a world-wide flowering of new talent during the late forties, fifties, and sixties [...] In Europe and Asia a new type of cinema was coming to the fore:

personal, nongeneric, related directly to the contemporary historical situation. (James, 252)

Italian Neorealist movement was the premise of this newly formed young European cinema.

For Italian Neorealism we can not find a signed manifesto. And there is not a way of film making depending on rules and aims that the directors of this period agreed on. "Rather there was [...] an array of negative convictions opposed to the formulaic depictions of commercial cinema and the belief that films should be a source of knowledge and reality" (Hallam, 41) Again likewise 1920's Soviet cinema we see that the approach or belief that cinema's main concern should be the reality, constructed by Neorealist movement in opposition to the dominance of Hollywood commercial cinema. Therefore with the Italian Neorealism the notion of realism in the cinema once more comes forward in the history of film.

In order to understand this new cinema's standpoint we should look to Cesare Zavattini's conceptualisation of the notion of realism in cinema. Zavattini was one of the important cinematic figures at this period. He was "not only a screen writer, director, and indefatigable proponent of Neorealism, but also a lucid, perspicacious theorist." (Casetti, 25) The main argument lies behind Zavettini's point of view is the ideas of liberation after the war. These ideas of liberation made people comprehend the importance of everyday life and the historical events of the current time. Therefore the screen itself should emphasise the things happening in everyday life, in other words, the simplicity of the ordinary events. And normality should be the subject matter of cinema. Zavettini's exploration of realism is again about the ordinariness of

the life; likewise the basic argument of Dziga Vertov that what has to be captured by the camera is the life itself. But this time the intensity of the argument not starts with the shooting principles, rather the basic point is the last stage of film production, the screening. What has to be screened to the audience is the life as itself. To approach this ideal Zavettini suggested that the walls constructed between the spectacle and life should be removed. These walls are the products of commercial cinema. Because the stories of commercial mainstream cinema are far from the reality that we perceive in our daily lives. In order to come over this problem in cinema, the fiction films should present the reality, which has its own story. The fiction film should not produce stories, which seem like real. Because whenever someone tries to make the things seem to be real in the story, he/she will be still far from what is real. And this kind of understanding can not destroy the space created between the spectacle and reality. According to Zavettini reality is the world we perceive and it has its own story and this should be the fiction films main theme. Therefore cinema should not try to reinvent the real; it is already there and waiting to be filmed. To reach this ideal there should be a renovation which will clear the cinema. This renovation will include the rejection of "any path except that of analytic documentary and privilege the direct reflections of things, their immediacy, relevance to present and duration." (Casetti, 26) These paths which must be rejected were the economic ties, sovereignty of the actors and actresses, existing formulas of filmmaking and studio system. Therefore the director, who will carry the biggest responsibility as an artist, will gain her freedom and able to concentrate on her work in order to produce films, which have a direct relationship with reality. Therefore as Casetti

quotes from Zavettini's *Neorealismo*: "Cinema must tell what is going on. The camera is meant to look at what lies in front of it. " And "The time is ripe for throwing away scripts and following men with the camera." (26) This declaration of Zavettini as it is discussed above again seems like Vertov's approach, but actually it has some key points in which Zavettini's comprehension differentiates. This time camera is again in the streets without a script, but it is not only capturing what is in front of it, it is also following the man in the street, who has a story. Therefore the declaration of throwing the scripts away does not mean that the films will be produced as a newsreel or without any script. The scripts, which are useless, are the ones that classic cinema uses as a closed and pre-given text. For Zavettini, in classical cinema formulas determine the story; even the shots have a hierarchy that some of them are only there to provide a bridge to the next sequence. So there will be a written script, but it will be an open one, which will serve the equality of revealing the reality in each sequence or shot. Moreover Zavettini himself wrote the screenplays of some fundamental films of Neorealism like *Shoeshine*, *Umberto D* and *Ladri di biciclette*. Therefore we cannot evaluate that the script was useless in Neorealist movement. Also we can find some likeness to Eisenstein's notion of "typage" in the Neorealist movement, in the context that the movement rejects professional actors in favour of real people. But while Eisenstein used this notion his main idea was the appropriateness of the physical and facial expressions, Neorealist movement on the other hand was in pursuit of real stories of the ordinary man. The aim was not just approximate the reality of the character in the story but to find out the real character and his/her own story.

Between 1945 and 1948 Italian Neorealism has its golden time. Roberto Rosellini's *Roma città aperta* (1945), *Paisà* (1946), Luchino Visconti's, *Obsessione* (1942) *La terra trema* (1948), Vittorio De Sica's *Shoeshine* (1946), *Ladri di biciclette* (1948), *Umberto D* (1951), Giuseppe De Santis's *Riso Amoro* (1948) are the most important films which formulate the basics of the Neorealist movement. Though there was not an agreed manifesto or principles of filmmaking, but this does not mean that films of this period have not common points or applications, which allow us to recognise them as examples of Neorealism.

> The central characteristics consist of a method of filmmaking practice (location shooting and the use of non-professional actors), the attitude of the filmmakers (who aim to get close to their subject), their choice of subject matter (the lives of ordinary people), and the ideological/political slunt of the films (broadly left wing/liberal humanist). (Hallam and Marshment, 40)

If we go further and examine the technical aspects of the Neorealist films, it is obvious that we can find that their apprehension of realism in cinema was resulted also by similar choices of practice. First of all, the rejection of the studio system of filmmaking has two important reasons; one is to free the director from the complexity of the system, the crowd and preparations. Secondly and probably the more importantly not only the film itself gets closer to reality, but also the actors and the director has the opportunity to work in a situation that fits to reality by that way. It is obvious that shooting on location provides a realistic view of the subject matter and the concentration to the story as being in the real places not in a constructed one. Because if you construct a place for instance a jail in the film it might seem like real, but it has two main disadvantages. Firstly it will not carry the

impressiveness of the real jail view. Secondly during the shootings the feeling

of being in a jail and being in a fake one will clearly effect the performance of

the actors, director and crew. And the consequence of these two situations

can not be comparable. Another important technical point appears as the

long takes, for which later André Bazin will argue that these shots create a

more realistic vision. These long takes rather than lots of edited pieces,

create a more observatory space for the spectator. Because the spectator is

free to observe the space on the screen, rather than guided by the directors

point of view constituted of edited pieces. Also "...smooth camera work

privileges character as the primary point of camera focus and there is a

careful regard for balanced composition in the frame." (Hallam and

Marshment, 42) These are the technical aspects, which have to be believed

to carry the Italian Neorealism to realism in cinema as well as the theoretical

debates.

Therefore the struggle between Lumière's realistic documentary and

Méliès' fairy-tale which we carried to the 1920s Soviet cinema is questioned

again with the Italian Neorealism. It is clear that Italian Neorealism influenced

the world of cinema by its technical and theoretical properties.

> This artisanal mode of production, politically and
> philosophically committed to freedom of political
> expression and personal vision, stood in
> contradistinction to the globalising tendencies of the
> Hollywood dream factory and the nationalised
> propagandist cinemas of communist and Fascist states.
> (Hallam and Marshment, 45)

And especially Italian Neorealism's resistance and cinematographical

characteristics are important for the examination of Dogma 95 that in later

chapters we will discuss the similarities and differences between these two movements.

2.4. André Bazin and Nouvelle Vogue

André Bazin was one of the key theoreticians, who put his mark on the cinema. This French theoretician's importance not only lies in his theories, but also his role in the education of young French critics. André Bazin never expressed his ideas in a systematised framework. Rather he wrote essays for the monthly journal *Cahiers du Cinéma*, which he founded with Jacques-Doniol Valcroze and Lo Duca in 1951. (*Cahiers du Cinema* is accepted to be the most important French film critic journal in the history of cinema.) And most of these essays are collected under the name of *What is Cinema? Volume I and II*. Therefore it is difficult to expose his theoretical work.

André Bazin fought for a realistic cinema, which will free the spectator from the dictatorship of directors, screenwriters, producers of entertainment commercial cinema. And he grounded his ideas on an ontological level that he insisted on an existential relationship between cinema and reality. At first look his theory can be understood in Aristotelian terms of conceptualising art as a mirror for reflecting reality. But whenever the certain relation he draws between cinema and reality can be recognised deeply, it can be seen that cinema is not only a mirror to reflect reality. Moreover it is a part of the reality and participates in its existence. "Hence a close bond established between cinema and reality: the former completely overlaps the latter and becomes its 'finger-print', more than its copy." (Cassetti, 31) Therefore as soon as we assert that cinema participates in the existence of reality, then as being a part

of reality it has the power to reveal the essence of reality. Moreover "by tracing reality in all its aspects, it continues it." (Cassetti, 31) This ontological relation of cinema and reality lies in the origins of cinema, which is claimed to be the photography by Bazin. Photography, which has the power of reproducing the material reality surrounding us by means of space, is perfected with the cinema. In the sense that cinema carries this realistic image to a narrative and time, in other words to the moving world. And the notion of space becomes a fundamental term for cinema, for which we can not deny its reality. Having its basics from the photographic image therefore cinema is ready to be expanded with the possibilities of techniques and narrative aspects to the realm of reality where Bazin already indicated its existence. And this notion of space refers to mise-en-scène in cinematography for Bazin. Therefore mise-en-scène becomes a key study for realist films and realism in cinema. The elements of mise-en-scène are the deep focus and sequence shot or long shots, which we discussed, in Italian Neorealism. He believes that these two; deep focus and long shots create the realistic film image.

The evolutionary side of deep focus comes from not only being a new cinematography device, but also for Bazin it provides such a space that the spectator has freely move in the scene. Orson Welles' *Citizen Kane*, 1941 is one of the most important films for the history of cinema specifically with the use of deep focus. And André Bazin says that:

> Whereas the camera lens, classically, had focused successively on different parts of the scene, the camera of Orson Welles takes in with equal sharpness the whole field of vision contained simultaneously within the dramatic field. (*What is Cinema?* V.2, 28)

In that sense the spectator is freed from the choice of the director, and left to a mood that he/she can make the focusing according to his/her choice. This provides an active mental condition, which brings the spectator and film closer to each other. Being closer to the film also means being closer to the reality in a realistic film. "It is no longer the editing that selects what we see, thus giving it an a priori significance, it is the mind of the spectator which is forced to discern..." (What is Cinema V.2, 28). As soon as such a medium is used, then it becomes a contradictory move against the editing theory of classical Hollywood system. Because deep focus or sequence shot is not used with the invisible editing which we discussed above. *Découpage classique*, which is a name given to Hollywood construction of film grammar by French's, depends on the editing of several shots instead of a sequence or long shot. In this style first a major shot covering the whole scene and then several close-ups and different shots are filmed. And at the editing process these variety of shots come together to form a sequence. Whenever Bazin argues in favour of deep focus and sequence shot, he is actually rejecting this classic style called *découpage classique*. And this rejection brings forward the importance of mise-en-scéne in which the whole of the sequence established.

According to André Bazin, sequence shot, which he perfectly sees in Italian Neorealism, is the finalising point of reaching reality. Therefore Bazin excludes the montage style, which is favoured by especially 1920's Soviet cinema, from the realism in cinema. Whether the montage cinema refers to progressive style of Eisenstein or invisible editing of Hollywood cinema, they are all far from reality in cinema. Realism can not be reached by montage or

editing. In that sense Bazin exalted the films and style of Italian Neorealism. Because film has to recreate the experience of the real world. And this goal can be achieved by a sequence shot. When the film is formed of sequence shots, the editing looses its importance. It is enough for sequence shots, which are representing the reality, to come together in order to form a realistic film. In other words just linking the parts, which are in relation to reality, will be ended as a realistic whole. So that André Bazin devoted himself to advocate the realism in cinema and believed it will be reached by some specific techniques sequence shot and deep focus.

It is certain that Bazin's works influenced the Nouvelle Vague. And moreover *Cahiers du Cinéma*, became an intellectual place where the leading figures such as François Truffaut, Jean-Luc Godard, Claude Chabrol and Eric Rohmer, were able to meet. Actually Nouvelle Vague becomes one of the most important and influential movements in the history. The most efficient times of this movement are during the fifties and early sixties. The Nouvelle Vogue is also a reaction against the mainstream cinema and its conventions, but this reaction is not based on the notion of 'realism'. But what makes it important for the study of Dogma 95 is the Dogma 95's reference to its comprehension of the idea of author. Whether André Bazin is a key theoretician for Nouvelle Vague, it is certain that the tendencies of Bazin and the founders of Nouvelle Vague are separate.

François Truffaut's famous essay *Une certaine tendance du cinéma français* published at *Cahiers du Cinéma* in 1954 was accepted to be the manifesto of this new movement. In this essay Truffaut rebelled against the tendencies of French cinema and favoured the director as an auteur, who is

responsible for his/her films, against the good cinema. The notion of good cinema, in question, was referring to the films of screenwriters, which are lacking the possibilities of the cinematography and nothing more than being a commercial literary cover. But before Truffaut, Alexandre Astruc was published an essay *La Caméra Stylo* in 1948, which had the greatest influence on the Nouvelle Vague. Astruc's assertion that the camera as similar to pen, was formed a theoretical stance against Bazin's ontological researches and thesis. Thinking camera as a pen allowed the French directors to free from sticking to realism. And provided them the freedom of expressing themselves with the cinematic devises just like writing with words. Therefore mise-en-scéne became more important for the directors as a way to express and differentiate themselves from the others. In other words mise-en-scéne was the place that the director puts his/her signature. And this understanding resulted as the replacing of mise-en-scéne with metteur-en-scéne. Rather than the importance of what is in the frame, what is told to audience is replaced by how it is told. So that the director's communication with his/her audience became valuable. With the development of the notion of metteur-en-scéne the films were highly personalised. And the movie going activity gone under a change. Because with the development of the ideas of metteur-en-scéne and autheur, audience did not go to a movie to watch what it tells or its story, rather went for the reason that the film is an autheur's creation. And "Once it is understood that a film was the product of an author, once that author's 'voice' was clear, then spectators could approach the film not as if it were reality, or the dream of reality; but as a statement by another individual." (Monaco, 332) Therefore the comprehension of the notion of

realism is also changed; the realism searched in the image until Nouvelle Vague left its place to the realistic voices of the author's, who are trying to communicate with the audience. This approach sublimating the author is actually in contrast to André Bazin's ideas of realism in cinema. And it is resulted in a way that to investigate this movement becomes very difficult. Because every author followed different ways in order to create their own unique expression to communicate with the audience. For instance, if we examine Jean Luc-Godard, we can differentiate two periods, in which his attitude of film making theoretically and practically shows variations. The ideas in the early period of Godard, mainly expressed in his essay *Montage, mon beau souci*, published at *Cahiers du Cinéma* (65 December 1956). In this essay Godard asserted against André Bazin that the montage itself is a part of the mise-en-scéne. And we cannot differentiate them such as they are existing in opposition to each other. In découpage classic there is an important notion, which eliminates the unwanted long periods of time during the sequence called jump cut. For example, we have a character at the one side of a huge room and a ringing telephone at the other side of the same room. In such a situation rather than showing the whole action of this character, to open the ringing phone, at first the character looking to the phone and maybe first one or two steps then cut to close-up of the ringing phone and the character opens the phone. Instead of using real time and a long shot, with the cut to close-up of ringing phone, which is called jump cut, découpage classic creates a time laps, which is impossible to recognised by the viewer. And Godard carried this notion of jump cut to the whole of the mise-en-scéne and created time laps, which broke the perception of

continuity through the film. Godard also derives this idea from the experience of watching television, because while we are watching film we are not fully concentrated on the television in contrast to the dark theatres of movie. While watching television we are open to any kind of disturbance. The act of watching a film in television lacks the concentration. This means that when a film is on television then the space and time continium is changed beyond our power. For Godard this shows us that Hollywood model of classic way of narration depending on linear flux can be changed. And this broken space and time continuum can be achieved by jump cut method. For instance in *A Bout de Souffle* (1959), when Jean Paul Belmondo makes a move to reach his gun there is a jump to another scene that he holds his gun. Therefore the spectator can not able to see the complete action or movement, which is clearly contradictory to André Bazin's realistic film. Moreover later Godard goes further and announces that film can not be able represent reality at all, it can only be a wrong representation of it. And it can only find the truthfulness and honesty in itself, in the voice of the autheur. So its real subject matter is itself not the out side world surrounding us.

When we consider that early and late Godard's attitude to cinema is a reflection of Nouvelle Vague, this new movement appears as a self-reflexive meta-cinema. This new cinema declared that its subject mater is its own process of filmmaking and its own language. Therefore the audience should know that the experience of watching films has nothing to the with reality. And this was provided by technical defects likewise 'jump cut'. In that sense Dogma's clear aggression to the Nouvelle Vague as being a call to realism, can be understood. Because Dogma'95 insists on achieving a certain kind of

realism in cinema, whereas Nouvelle Vague never defined it self on either parts of the dilemma. For Nouvelle Vague neither the cinema of Méliès nor the cinema of Lumiére's is the right approach that the directors of this movement tried to establish a new cinema by undermining both of them. And this new cinema is the self-reflexive meta-cinema of Nouvelle Vague.

2.5.   Direct Cinema and Cinéma Vérité

Until the fifties the cameras were very heavy and hard to set up. Therefore they were mostly used inside the studios. "Cameras could be made lighter by removing their noise insulation and synch systems. This was what the Italian Neorealists did; they shoot film without sound and post-synchronised." (Douchet, 204) As it is discussed above with Italian Neorealism and the location shooting, because of the need for lightweight cameras it is not surprising that Neorealist's followed such a way. And this need also give the idea to produce lightweight 35 mm cameras. But there was one more need, which was the portability of the camera, attained by 16 mm cameras perfectly for location shooting. During the World War II 8 mm and especially 16 mm cameras were developed and practised by the armies. The 16 mm cameras used by the armies not only for shooting the war, but also for training. Because 16 mm cameras and projectors were much more portable equipment than any others were. With the expansion of these, 16 mm cameras and the projectors, libraries and scholars used them for educational purposes and also consumers used this equipment for home recordings. As becoming popular and showing a great progress in a few years 16 mm also

attracted the filmmakers. And this attraction revealed a new approach to realism in cinema, which might be the dream of Andrè Bazin.

The idea of using 16mm equipment in the late fifties and early sixties provided the filmmakers the possibility of working like print journalists. This means that they were free to move easily everywhere they want to shoot and prepare newsreels for television. And this development in USA created "a new style of documentary, so different from the highly worked and often semifictional style to deserve a name: Direct Cinema." (Monaco 268) These films were produced for television screening, because the theatres were using 35 mm projectors not 16 mm ones. The leading figure of Direct Cinema was Robert Drew, who established the Drew Associates with Richard Leacock, Don Pennebaker, Mayseles Brothers. And Drew Associates produced the first examples of this new documentary style such as *Primary* (1960), *The Chair* (1962), *and Crisis* (1962). One more advantage of the 16 mm equipment was being cheap, which gives the chance of recording as much as the directors or cameraman want. Because these documentaries were not well prepared, rather they depend on a spontaneously shooting principle. Where the action took place the camera was there, so that they required more film stock than ever used for capturing every piece of reality.

On the other hand in France during the same years likewise Direct Cinema a type of new documentary filmmaking called Cinéma Vérité, was introduced to the world of cinema. Whether these two seem similar at first sight according to their wish to capture reality with the same equipment, actually they have a different point of view. Direct Cinema was established on the bases that they could record reality without any influence. Therefore they

35

were totally against the interviews and rejected that the presence of the camera will effect the recorded person on the conditions that its property of mobility can be used in a correct way. Contrary to this understanding Cinéma Vérité followed the way of Dziga Vertov and believed in the power of the camera eye's potential of revealing the hidden truth. Therefore; "They interviewed their subjects and intervened constantly in the filming, using the camera as their tool and the film making process as a means in itself to explore their subjects' preoccupations." (Macdonald and Cousins, 250) These two contradictory approaches also created films, which have different subjects; while Direct Cinema preferred to be in the place where something was happening, Cinéma Vérité, as having a more sociologist and anthropologist manner, tried to deal with ordinary habits of societies.

Anthropologist Jean Rouch and sociologist Edgar Morin signed *Chronique d'un ete* (1961) was the first example of Cinéma Vérité as well as Chris Marker's *Le Joli Mali* (1962). The work of Jean Rouch and Edgar Morin were on the events in Algeria based on interviews and impressions from Paris' conditions. The technical qualities of the film, such as use of 16 mm, natural sound and lightning, avoiding the construction of mise-en-scéne determined the latter ethnographic films and Cinéma Vérité. Jean Rouch had chosen to leave the classical methods and equipment of the cinema industry to capture the 'natural conditions' without any kind of 'aesthetization'. He insisted on that the reality could only be got in 'real' conditions without any effects or technological means of creating any conditions. He refused aesthetical works, because he suggested that such a gaze could not capture the reality as it is. And he believed that his camera and sound recorder has

36

the potential of recording hidden reality in interviews and routines of everyday life. As well as the 16 mm cameras, the development of sound recorders was also important for Cinéma Vérité. "The key was to record sound that was synchronous with the picture, without having a cumbersome umbilical link between the camera and the recorder. "(Macdonald and Cousins, 249) With the solution of this problem in 60's the freedom of moving and capturing both the sound and the image at the same time created the style of Cinéma Vérité. The style of Cinéma Vérité based on portable equipment resulted to be a portable filming technique as itself. The hand-held camera moving in the routines of daily life in order to reveal the rites and customs became the distinctive property of this new documentary. In a short time hand-held camera technique became common and used widely by filmmakers. The result was grainy and shaky realism in cinema.

It is clear that Cinéma Vérité has an important place in the history of cinema with its grainy truths. It was effected many filmmakers especially Nouvelle Vague as being pre-and post of it. For instance, Godard's use of hand-held camera technique in *A Bout de Souffle* (1959). If we look to the use of the term 'Cinéma Vérité' today, it commonly refers to "...a vague blanket term which is used to describe the look of feature or documentary films –grainy, hand-held camera, real locations- rather than any genuine aspirations the filmmakers may have." (Macdonald and Cousins, 251) And this grainy, shaking 16 mm recordings left their place to low resolution, shaking digital cameras, as we will see in the evaluation of the Dogma 95 manifesto *The Vow of Chastity*.

2.6. Conclusion

In the history of cinema we can see that the debates around realism started with the beginning of the birth of cinema and continued in particular moments. Through this evolution there always appeared two distinct poles. One side is favouring the fantasy world of cinema and the other favouring the realism in cinema. And whenever a movement or theory advocating realism took place, it chooses its target of critique as the main stream popular cinema of Hollywood. And most of the time these responses to mainstream cinema appeared with a social as well as an esthetical context. For instance Dziga Vertov's ideas were clearly depended upon the constructivist theories and the revolution in 1917. Also it is clear that Eisenstein's montage theory was a result of the notion 'dialectics' and the revolution. And the humanist ideas of liberation after the World War II clearly defined the Zavettini's wish to reach realism in cinema. Therefore these poles are always full filled and supported with social context in the history of cinema. Another common point, which we can define, is that whether these moments of realism were always appeared as a rebellion against the mainstream commercial cinema, unavoidably they fed their enemy. And because of their innovative approach they always came up with some esthetical judgements against commercial cinema, likewise the jump-cut or long take.

3. The Vow of Chastity

In this chapter the ten rules of *The Vow of Chastity,* which is the foundation of Dogma'95, will be put under a critical examination. And these rules will be comprehended under the conditions, in which they come out, and their references to the other movements in the history of film in relation to the notion of realism.

First of all these ten rules of the manifesto can be divided into two groups, which will make the study more systematic and convenient to the reader. The separation of the rules depends on their initial aim and effects on the filmmaking practice. Therefore it is plausible to discuss them in two parts. The ones related to the film making practice, the ones, which stand more related to the narrative aspects of film underproduction. In that sense the first five rules and the ninth rule of *The Vow of Chastity* can be classified under the heading of technical aspects. Because these rules are briefly putting the main preferences of what to do and not to do during the production of a Dogma'95 certificated film. And the rules number six and eight can be examined together as they are related to the pre-production process, specifically the main idea or script writing of a Dogma'95 film. These rules, which will be classified, as narrative aspects of the manifesto, are there to prepare the narrative of the film. On the other hand the sixth rule of the manifesto, which also deals with the narrative aspect of a Dogma certificated film, provides a ground to evaluate the narrative and technical aspects of *The Vow of Chastity* together. Therefore the seventh rule will be discussed in a third part as a conclusion of this chapter. And one last rule of the manifesto, which is left behind in this distinction, is the rule number tenth. The tenth rule

will not be discussed in this chapter, because it does not fit each of these separated parts adequately. However it is one of the most important rules, which clearly identifies itself as a reaction to past and today, so it will be the subject matter of the last chapter about the postmodernism and Dogma'95.

3.1.   Technical Aspects of the Manifesto

As it is indicated above at this part, the first five and the ninth rules of the Dogma'95 manifesto will be discussed. These rules will be evaluated in relation to the development of technology, which has a clear effect on the movements in the history of cinema. And this new movement's apprehension of realism in cinema according to its technical properties will be defined through the chapter. The rules are:

1. Shooting must be done on location. Props and sets must not be brought in (if a prop is necessary to the story, a location must be chosen where the prop is to be found).

2. The sound must never be produced apart from the image, or vice versa (music must not be used unless it occurs where the scene is being shoot).

3. The camera must be hand-held. Any movement or immobility attainable in the hand is permitted. (The film must not take place where the camera is standing; shooting must take place where the film takes place).

4. The film must be in colour. Special lighting is not acceptable. (If there is too little light for exposure, the scene must be occur, or a single lamp may be attached to the camera.)

5. Optical work and filters are forbidden

9. The film must be Academy 35mm. (App.B)

At first look these rules simply force the director, who is going to shot a Dogma'95 movie, to make a film rescued from lots of production burdens. But moreover it is a reaction to the fascinating artificial opportunities of new technologies that most of the directors are using today for creating magnificent scenes in order to impress the audience. In that sense these rules can be labelled as being nonsensical for many people, who believe that the use of new improvements will make everything better. Why to use a typewriter if we have a computer? Why not taking a photo with a digital cam and see the result at the same moment rather than using film and waiting it to be developed? But the basic idea of these rules are not only a renewal, also a going backwards. A kind of nostalgia is the aspiration, which we can easily deduct. The purified cinema, which is rescued from all the professional complexity and the dominance of the industry, is the main aim. And there is also an important promise given in the case of following these rules when shooting a film, this is the realism, which is in question all through the history of cinema. With the Dogma'95 the yearning of realism in cinema strongly appears one more time against the mainstream entertainment cinema of Hollywood, which is accused of ignoring this deep concern. Also the Nouvelle Vague is taken as a target to attack with these five technical rules as well as the other rules we'll discuss later.

> The cameratics of the French New Wave, the anti-dramatic films of Bresson and Antonioni, the non-linear experiments of American avant-garde...each of these was a revolutionary call to arms. Dogma is a call to disarm, to strip away the veneer, to walk without

crutches supplied by Industrial Light and Magic.
(Corliss, 84)

Disarming the filmmaking from all of its possibilities provided by high-technology aims to re-invent the essentials of it, to re-invent the story and realism in cinema.

If we look at the first rule about location shooting and restriction of any kind of props or set construction, we can see that the history of cinema is familiar with this rule from Italian Neorealism, Direct Cinema and Cinema Vérité. But here Dogma's attitude is clearly closer to Italian Neorealism in the sense that it runs after a story not a kind of documentation. In other words, the realism provided by location shooting is a tool for giving the story a feel of realism. It is a way of carrying the aimed narrative to the realm of reality. On the other hand Dogma'95 also differentiates from the comprehension of location shooting in Italian Neorealism with a thin line. Because in the case of Neorealism, what is chased is the real stories passing in real locations, not only giving the story a realistic base. Therefore both use the same tool for approaching realism in cinema, but with different understandings. Whether in that way or not, the effectivity of location shootings as I discussed at the second chapter with Italian Neorealism is a key point for the seek of realism in cinema. And Dogma'95 discovers this fact again. It is obvious that location shooting provides a great atmosphere for the director and the crew as well as the actors and actresses. Moreover it gives the advantage of spontaneity and relaxes the production budget with preventing the expenses of luxury studio and design process of props. Also Dogma'95 adds one more limitation to the location shooting, which is the prohibition of props and set brought to the

location. Actually this prohibition seems to be already included whenever we talk about location shooting. But the things not work that much easy in the sets, whether the shooting takes place in real location or not, suddenly there can appear many reasons to require changes in the location. For instance if the shooting location is a small room and there is no place to move with the camera, then the big table in the room can be changed with a smaller one. Or just in the case of Thomas Vinterberg's *Dogma#1: Festen*, in which the story is passing in a huge house used as a hotel. This huge house has not a reception desk to provide the necessary information and sequences, which will show that the house is a hotel. Therefore Thomas Vinterberg confesses that he constructed a reception desk in the house. Also in *Dogma #2: Idioterne*, von Trier violated this rule by telling his actors and actresses to bring their goods to the shooting place. So location shooting when limited with such a rule becomes more and more difficult to apply. Behind this difficulty if it is truly applied, unavoidably it will result with a perfect sense of realism.

The second rule that sound not be produced apart of the scene is a part of the continuity of this perfect sense of realism gained by the location shooting. The function of music till from the silent era seems always to construct a bridge between the emotions of the scene and the perception of this emotion by the audience. Noel Carroll argues that: "the music tells us something, of an emotive significance, about what the scene is about; the music supplies with to say, a description (or, better, a presentation) of the emotive properties the film attaches to the referent of the scene." (221) In that sense most of the time functioning in that way, music or the sounds

external to the scene appear as an artificial tool for a realistic cinema. It is obvious that most of the time in real life we do not experience situations supported by musical melodies. And carrying the cinema to realism also needs such an application of not using external sound effects or music when filming real life situations. If we think that the location shooting provides a realistic sense to the two-dimensional picture, the sound as the third dimension of this space has to continue this sense too. For this reason, it is plausible for Dogma'95 to include this rule in the manifesto.

The reasons behind the third rule, which limits the use of camera to the hand-held, are related with the technological improvement. In today's cinema the possibilities of automated camera movements or motion controls become very popular and chosen by many directors and director of photographs. Because that kind of motion control provides to shoot in many different ways that with hand control impossible. And the motion control devices such as steadicam, camrail, robotic-controlled steady cams, jib arms, motorised cranes has the possibility of moving in the space very fluid, which is also not possible with a hand held cam. There are many examples of the use of these devices in the history of cinema, such as the long opening sequence of Orson Welles' *Touch of Evil*, but with the improvement of these devices especially in the era of television; they became more popular in cinema. For instance the stedicam is "popularized in excessively styled feature films by Coen brothers (Blood Simple, Raising Arizona) and Kubric (Full-Metal Jacket)" (Caldwell, 132). The steady cam has such an effect that it removes the all unwanted camera shakes caused by the steps of camera operator and

just moves in the space without any sense of humanity. Therefore the scene shoot with the steady cam has totally non-human.

> If anything reflects the ontological death of photographic realism in television, it is surely this gang of new and automated motion-control devices...The televisual image no longer seems to anchored by the comforting, human eye-level view of the pedestal-mounted camera, but floats like the eye of a cyborg. (Caldwell, 133)

As Cadwell argues the advantage of these motion control devices take the point of view to a level, which is far from human view. Therefore Dogma's insists on the hand-held camera, aims the resurrection of the human point of view in cinema. And moreover by giving a documentary or Cinéma Vérité type of mood to the film Dogma'95 tends to create a realistic sense and naturalness. If we look to *Breaking the Waves,* Lars von Trier gives the clues of this rule with the shaking hand-held camera, which creates an atmosphere similar to the name of the film. Also the TV series of *The Kingdom* is another earlier application of this rule. And in both of these films, this hand-held camera technique comes forward, as well as the other filmic properties, as a successful and unique element. "Perhaps future film texts will cite the *Breaking the Waves* as a film that redefines the potential of the hand-held camera." (Lucia, 72) The potential of this hand-held camera, which defines it as such an important phenomenon, lies in some interrelated facts. First of all while its bringing the camera to the operators hands and constructing the bodily experience between them, the consequence of this unification is forming a distance with the characters on the screen. The vision is again the vision of a human eye, but not a stabilised one on the mounted tripod. Rather it is a shaky disturbing alliance between the cameraman and the camera. It is

just like a vision searching the hidden reality with shaky and confused movements that nearly forget about to make balanced frames, which is a property of Italian Neorealism to construct a realistic point of view. And these disturbing unfinished frames create a space between the characters and the events. It makes the process of identification harder for the spectator. Even there are out of focus scenes resulted from this strange relation, for instance in *Dogma #2: Idioterne* the first night of Karen with the group of young people, who are imitating the behaviours of idiots, at the house. And this freedom of mobility used for chasing the characters in every condition and everywhere. Sometimes it goes further and even penetrate the characters intimacy as well as the spectator, like we experience in the zooms made to the sexual organs in *Dogma #2: Idioterne*. Secondly during the shootings the use of hand-held camera most of the time destroys the basic conventional language of cinema, the continuity of the screen direction. The continuity of the screen direction is attained by a simple method called action axis. Action axis is the imaginary line, which defines the travel of the subject in the scene. "If all camera set-ups are positioned on one side of this line, screen direction will remain the same throughout a series of shots, regardless of camera angle." And "The relationship between camera and subject movement remains the same, providing the camera never crosses the action axis." (Mascelli, 93) Whenever the immobility, which is very difficult with a hand-held camera, is totally out of context with this rule, then the basic premise of filmmaking, the action of axis, no more exists. Because this rule forces the camera to chase the story and hang around the scene and the characters without stopping for a rest. And this travelling shaky camera breaks the

action of axis sometimes intentionally and some times unintentionally. This unsettling of the camera, moving without any defined borders also effects the play of actors and actresses. Because they can not know what the camera is shooting during they play. Anthony Dodd Mantle, who is the director of photography of *Dogma #1: Festen*, *Dogma #3: Mifune* and *Dogma #6: Julien Donkey-Boy*, tells that; The camerawork was improvised. I was never in the same place, and I told the actors before we shot they would never see me in the same place twice and they should stop asking me where I was going to be." (Quotation Geuens, 199) Therefore an improvised mise-en-scéne appears. A natural and sometimes an accidental choreography is happening through the shootings. And the freely floating camera in this improvised mise-en-scéne, creates an intensity of a realistic visuality or a gaze inhabiting a living vision in its deepness, rather than a mechanised and a constructed visuality. And this freedom given to the camera and the director of photography displays an important fact that the director's hegemony on the picture is also broken. The director is no more the ruler of the camera; the choice of the frame is mainly left to the director of photograph's creativity. And the director has only one thing to concentrate on; it is the story, which he wants to tell. Therefore Dogma'95 positions as a counter attack to the notion of metteur-en-scéne and auteur developed with the Nouvelle Vogue, which will be discussed entirely in the third chapter. The last consequence of this rule appears in the editing process; as soon as this freed camera's shaky and unbalanced frames break through the continuity of axis of action, the editing starts to show an adaptation to it. In the editing process this naturalness and sense of realism provided by such kind of framing is not under gone a

47

correction. Rather the editing continues the process of breaking the continuity. And the chaotic result of this new technique is hard to follow by the audience, who used to watch the classical style of mainstream film language specially balanced and settled framing. But on the other hand we should confess that it reaches its claim of a realistic cinema successfully.

Lars von Trier says in an interview with Peter Rundle that in his early films such as *Europa* and TV series of *The Kingdom* he thought too much on the optical filters and colours. (1) For instance, in the television series of *The Kingdom* we can see the greenish colours and effects provided with computer. Also in the *Breaking the Waves*, during the post-production he played with the film too much. As John Orr points out;

> While Robbie Müller shoot the film on hand-held Cinemascope with no artificial lightning, in editing von Trier transferred from film to video to manipulate the image and especially the colour, before transferring back for theatrical projection. (Contemporary Cinema, 16)

Whether these two films with their shooting style of hand-held camera seems like they are Dogma'95 films, the main technical reason that they can not deserve the Dogma certificate lies in the fact that they are manipulated. And with the fourth and fifth rules of *The Vow of Chastity,* von Trier continues that he is not to think about that kind of possibilities, which he can interfere the image, anymore. These restrictions provide him the opportunity of concentrating more on the film and the story rather than the esthetical anxieties. (Rundle, 1) Another important point about these two rules is the decrease in the working crew. In the Hollywood productions, while the film is going to be shoot lots of people work in the studios. And the preparation of

light for a very short scene takes hours. Then Dogma'95 rules prepare a quiet and simple set, which is cleared from all of the crowd and anxieties, to director. The only option left to the director is just concentrating on the story. Therefore "a Dogma production needs only the basics; a camera, a cast, and a script. But it has its risks. To succeed at all, a Dogma film has to be exquisitely crafted." (The Economist, 86) Because whether the filmmaking is purified from all the complexities of contemporary cinema with the rules of the manifesto the most important thing, which is the skeleton of a film, the story telling remains. In this way, story telling necessarily requires the talent of the director. Also in the official webside of Dogma'95, it is advised to the filmmakers that not to shoot a Dogma'95 movie as their first film. Usually in contemporary filmmaking, the technical aspects exceeded and shaded the story telling in order to fascinate the audience. Even some computer programs are used for helping to create the characters and stories in Hollywood productions. In fact Dogma'95 brings back the importance of story telling and also the story itself to the contemporary cinema by insisting on these limitations against the technical possibilities. And this is why shooting a Dogma'95 film is hard, because there is no possibility of hiding the story behind the technological magic. Therefore the main subject matter of the cinematic tradition, the story telling again becomes important with the restrictions of *The Vow of Chastity* in the history of cinema.

Other than these aspects of the two rules, the fourth rule seems to be open to discussions because of its insistence on the 'colour film'. While 'black and white' is mostly accepted as more realistic conventionally in photography, why do Dogma rules exclude 'black and white' in a Dogma film,

for instance? If we take the human perception to the account, usage of 'black and white' in cinema would be interpreted as alternating reality or manipulating it with some esthetical aims. In the traditional cinematic narration 'black and white' is used with some determined esthetical aims and changed the normally perceived reality. So colour becomes another key point of the pure realistic narration of Dogma films and the manifesto.

According to the last technical rule, the Dogma'95 certificated film should be Academy 35 mm. The reason of including this rule in the manifesto is also similar to other technical restrictions. With this rule the director is rescued from thinking about any esthetical possibilities, which can be gained by the preference of the film stock used in the film. Whenever we think about the variety of film stocks and their various properties including the amount of grain, contrast, tone, gauge, colour and the aspect ratio or frame size, then we can see that it is a very hard job for the director to decide, which fits best to his/her film.

> Early in the history of film, an arbitrary aspect ratio of four to three (width to height) became popular and eventually standardised by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. This ratio more often expressed as 1:1.33 or simply as the 1.33 ratio, while it was undeniably the most common ratio, was never the sole ratio in use. (Monaco, 86)

And this standardised aspect ratio or frame size is the Academy 35 mm. But through the progress of film technology directors tried some other frame sizes. As James Monaco argues because of the popular use of 1.33 ratio in television during the early fifties, the wide screen systems became common among the filmmakers. (88) And today the same distinction between television and cinema depending on their frame sizes continues. Interestingly

Dogma'95 one more time intends to go back to the early years of filmmaking by insisting on the Academy 35 mm.

As soon as there is less decision to give about the film stock, the possibility of manipulating the image with the chosen film is restricted. So that there is only one choice of screening aspect ratio or frame size and the story should be told without any auxiliary advantages, which can be provided by the film stock chosen. On the other hand this rule is immediately broken down with the start of the production process of Dogma films. Lars von Trier explains this situation that his director of photography Robbie Müller, while shooting *Dogma #2: Idioterne*, said that he could not able to work with a hand-held 35 mm camera through all the scenes. Because 35 mm camera is a very heavy equipment to carry and travel around all the time during the shootings. And Robbie Müller suggested that they could make the movie with digital cameras and transfer it to Academy 35 mm at the post-production stage. And this will not be a violation of the rules. (Rundle, 1) Lars von Trier and also the other founders of *The Vow of Chastity* accepted this idea. And later they announced that actually a Dogma'95 film can be shoot with digital cameras and the ninth rule is from now on only indicates the distribution format of the film, which should be still Academy 35 mm.

The use of digital cameras also supported the third rule, which is binding the camera to the hands of the director of photography. Lightweight digital cameras can move easily and carried. In this sense if we remember how the improvement of 16 mm and 8 mm cameras during the World War II give the idea of expanding the filmmaking process outside of the studios to Cinéma

Vérité and Direct Cinema, then we can see the importance of technological improvement on the movements and their film grammar.

The improvements in video technology started in the 80's and easily became a cheap and easy alternative way for television productions. One of the most important developments was the video-assist that the image was no more a mystery with the use of it. Before the video-assist existed the only ones who had an idea about the image during the shootings were the directors of photography and the camera operator. Because they were the only ones who had the access to see the things captured from the visor of the camera. The director and the crew could only see the captured image, after it was back from the lab.

> No one else at the same time, including the director of photography, had any certainty about whether the shot worked, that is, whether it was exposed or framed correctly. The image was always in some ways a mystery, one that revealed its secrets only after a journey from the lab's dark, chemical soup. (Caldwell, 131)

And as well as the mystery of the image, the distance between the image and the director was also broken with the development of video-assist. This break down indicates the instant experience of the image, which is captured. Another important progress in this era was the replacement of vacuum tubes with rectangular chips called CCD (Charge Coupled Device) in the cameras. This technology was improved the smaller and professional as well as non-professional cameras that we call digital camera today. To shoot with this new technology products coasted cheaper and required less professionalism that they spread out easily. For Dogma'95 the use of digital cams also brings the opportunity of using more than one camera during the shootings. And this

increases the tension caused from the break down of continuity through the scenes, which is already discussed above.

Dogma'95 purified the process of filmmaking from lots of technical properties, which requires mastery and professionalism. And Dogma'95 by providing the advantage of low budget production attracted many independent film makers whole over the world. This technical purification premising to catch the realism in cinema as we discussed above created a new kind of cinematic language similar to a sense of documentary filmmaking.

3.2. Narrative Aspects of the Manifesto

The rules of the manifesto are classified as technical and narrative aspects; so at this part the rules sixth and eight will be discussed. These rules, which has narrative implications on a Dogma certificated film, are:

6. The film must not contain superficial action. (Murders, weapons, etc. must not occur).

8. Genre movies are not acceptable.

These rules are aiming the same goal, realism in cinema, likewise the rules, discussed under the heading of technical aspects of *The Vow of Chastity*. But these ones are more problematic in their handling of the subject matter narration. Because there can be no exact evaluation of realism in narrative structure. It is obvious that we can say same thing for the rules, which we investigate as technical, but the technical implications are mostly depend on the relation between the image screened and the audience. And the success of this relation is connected to its strength and fluidity. On the

other hand, whenever we start to talk about the notion of 'realism' for the narrative or dramatic structure of the film, things start to change. Especially the notion of 'realism' is searched in the elements of the narrative. What are the elements of a realistic story? This is the tricky question, which should be answered. A journey to moon might be a fantasy in the years that Méliès did his masterpiece, *Le Voyage dans la Lune,* but it is no more a fantasy. And these rules of the manifesto try to give answers to this tricky question.

If we consider the restriction of any kind of superficial action, at first look it seems plausible for a film insisting on realism and the purification of cinema for the sake of story. If the notion of superficiality thought as a mechanism, which will fill the blanks inside the story, then a strong story will not need any kind of superficiality. But as it is indicated that the problem is determining the superficial action, which detains the film to be realistic. In other words what are the superficial actions existing in reality? *The Vow of Chastity* defines these superficial actions as murders and weapons. Is this mean that weapons and murders are not belonging to the world we are leaving or are they superficialities of reality? The answer is simple; anyone, who asserts such a thing, should be blind. Because such actions, which will result as the death in real life, can never be thought as superficialities of real life rather they indicate some of the most crucial feelings, such as fear and sadness, of humanity. So excluding murders and weapons from the story can have only two meanings for the manifesto; first of all giving the film a taste of a documentary, which is shoot spontaneously at the same time with the event, and a clear reaction against the commercial action cinema. But the first reason is questionable, in the sense that as I introduced the progress of

16 mm cameras refers to their use in the World War II. Therefore the documentary in nature can not exclude murders or weapons, as they are superficialities of reality. If we want to advocate this rule, the second reason stating a response to the commercial action cinema is the most powerful one. In commercial action cinema most of the time the audience is attracted with extreme actions. It is evident that stories of that kind of film are far from the daily life. Moreover these extreme stories exaggerated by technological advantages such as big explosions, heroes flying while they are fighting, et cetera. And such kind of exaggeration scenes mostly fills the emptiness of the stories, as soon as there appears a need for an escape when the story comes to a dead end. If we think that the conditions of Hollywood entertainment cinema, in which the scripts are written with the help of computer programmes loaded to create stereotype characters and their possible combinations of progress through the film, then the special effects and exaggerations become to be the most important thing. The aim is entertainment and it is provided by the magical illusion, this is the foundation of commercial cinema. *The Matrix* (1999), directed by Wachovsky Brothers, might be the counter argument of the evaluation of special effects as superficial actions, which help the dead ends of the story to survive. This film's subject matter is the notion of reality and confusion of human mind with the uprising technology and machines. And it becomes a legend in a short time not only because it introduces new filming techniques but also a narrative provided by technological improvements in a well-grounded story with philosophical context. All the artificial actions of the characters from flying to stopping the bullets with a hand move is explained on the confusing

layers of reality through the story. *The Matrix* can be a good example of combining the special effects and story by not making any concessions from the both sides. But this is not a case, which can be extended to the whole of the commercial action cinema. It is common that most of the time contented is dominated by the illusions created with special effects. And Dogma'95 exposing itself as a movement against all kind of illusions in order to survive the story in cinema might see the right to put such a rule for avoiding that kind of film making. On the other hand this rule can never be a medium to determine the borders of realism in the cinema. Lastly if we consider *Dogma #12: Italiensk for Begyndere*, directed by Lone Scherfig, we could find a condition, which is superficial as much as acts provided by murdering or weapons. Lone Scherfing, who is the first woman director of Dogma'95, tells a story established around different characters and their voyage to change their lives by helping each other. And during the film the characters, who meet accidentally, involve in each other's lives. The surprising condition through the story happens in a way that two of the accidentally meet woman characters finds out that they are sisters. And this condition brings a new layer to the story, which provides a stronger relation between the characters. This stronger relation between the characters bounds and impedes them from breaking through their own stories. Therefore the dead end, which will be caused by the separation of different characters, is avoided by such a superficial condition created in the story. In that sense this condition inevitably refers to superficiality inside the story. Another example might be the Thomas Vinterberg's, *Dogma #1: Festen*. The film is about a scandalous birth day party. For the birthday celebration of the father the family members

and some other friends come together in a hotel, which belongs to the family, far from the city. There are two bothers and one sister, except them there was another sister, who was the twin of one brother and she committed suicide, so there are some problems among the family members. The characters are crucial because the son, who is the twin of the dead sister, celebrates his father's birthday with a confession about his and his sister's incest experience with their father. This confession causes a real breakdown in their family relations, guests get shocked, and the staff of the hotel rebel, but nobody can leave this chaotic place because the keys of the cars are lost. Thomas Vinterberg in an interview says that one of his friends heard such story in a radio programme that a son blames his father because of incest relation in a dinner and the guests left the place immediately. (Macnab, 4) But in order to preserve the tension and bounding the characters in one place, there should be something to avoid them from leaving the place. Therefore the keys of the cars are stolen through the story. And as well as the story also the characters are imprisoned in the hotel. So the act of 'stealing the keys' is a direct intervention to the natural flux of the story. And this act rescues the original flux of the story from a dead end. This is completely an artificial and superficial solution created in side the story. Therefore labelling the extreme acts such as murders and weapons to be the superficial properties of the narration is not a proper solution. Because there can be many other acts which might add superficiality to the narration.

And lastly the rule number eight restricts any kind of genre movie without discussing the notion of 'genre'. Here the aim is simple and naive

again; it is a reaction against the commercial cinema and its illusionary world created through the defined and formulated structures.

> Genres are formal systems for transforming the world in which we actually live into self contained, coherent and controllable structures of meaning. Genres can thus be considered to function in the way that a language system does-offering a vocabulary and a set of rules which allow us to 'shape' reality, thus making it appear less random and disordered. (Nelmes, 127)

Consequently genre functions to construct a common and agreeable kind of film making by defining its borders and narrative elements. Dogma'95 might try to destroy these defined borders and common style of narration, but the problem is the apprehension of Dogma as itself forming a genre or not. Because Dogma'95 itself defines and limits the filmmaking process into some borders by putting rules. Moreover it is shaping a reality to capture. It is obvious that at first Dogma'95 films created a tension and curiosity, because they have awaken the 60's popular shaky camera style by combining it with new digital medium. But after watching two or more Dogma films, the audience is capable of knowing the basics of a Dogma film and able to predict what would come next. Hence the experience of watching a Dogma'95 film loosed its originality and started to become a genre in which the vocabulary of images readily defined. This is another paradoxical situation for Dogma'95, created by the rule number eight, because whenever Dogma defines a particular kind of filmmaking, it should predict the danger of becoming a genre in itself.

3.3. Time and Space

One of the most interesting rules in The Vow of Chastity is the seventh rule. This rule, which forbids any kind of temporal and geographical alienation, has its roots in documentary filmmaking of Lumiére brothers in the history of cinema. The audience has to be awaken from the fantastic dreams of Méliès. And this ideal is obtained by limiting the story of the film to 'here and now' with the seventh rule of *The Vow of Chastity*. It simply aims to construct a unity of space and time, which means the reality to be captured is 'here and now'. But this goal of unity of space and time is not a simple assertion about realism, because the consequence of this ideal is contradictory with the notion of time-image, which Deleuze finds in the modernist cinema.

According to Deleuze, there are two different periods in the history cinema: before and after the World War II. The cinema before World War II is determined by movement-image and it is separated in two directions after the World War II. One is the action-image cinema, in which the time depends on the movement. In other words time is subordinated in this cinema, because it is understood as the organising element of the movement and nothing more than this. This is what we call the Hollywood or commercial entertainment cinema. On the other hand there appears the cinema of time-image, which Deleuze mainly attributed to the directors such as Rosellini, De Sica from Italian Neo-Realism, Godard, Truffaut and Resnais from Nouvelle Vague. After the World War II, two things were broken. One is the hodological space, the space of movement, and the other is the unity of the subject and movement. These two things are subordinating the time in action-image. And their breaking down results as the crystal-image. In other words time-image

opens the pathway to the pure cinema of the crystal-image. The hodological space and unity of movement and subject are the basis of action-image and organic-image. In organic-image opposed to crystal-image the sensory motor schema, which can be thought as the unity of subject and movement, is preserved. In that sense time is always dependent on the movement. And the classic style of narration, which is linear and chronological, uses this hierarchical relation between time and movement. Whenever time is freed from the movement, the time-image, which is non-rational and non-linear, becomes possible.

In time-image, characters are isolated. If we examine the early films of Antonioni and Rosellini, we can witness such kind of isolation. "In the situation at the end of the war, Rosellini discovered a dispersive and lacunary reality- already in *Rome, Open City*, but above all in *Paisa*- a series of fragmentary, chopped up encounters, which call into question the SAS form of the action-image." (*Cinema I: The Movement Image*, 212) These isolated characters are put into such situations that the action becomes impossible for them. This impossibility of action causes the break down of the classical style of form as situation, action and situation (SAS). In classical narration the characters are developed around a condition of struggle, which provides mobility to the character and the story. But with the time-image the characters are placed in an immobilised situation that action is replaced with something that we wonder to find out this something likewise the characters themselves. These new characters, for Deleuze, "saw rather than acted, they were seers." (*Cinema II: The Time-Image*, XI) And the action is divorced from the movement that we mentally achieve the relations between the images;

there are no more rational cuts and continuity. This is the disconnection of space and time. In time-image there appears a system of relations inside the image and a single image belongs to several layers of time which exist together. The time appears as being not chronological or linear but formed of many layers. Therefore while the time-image is captured by the mental processes, the movement image is captured by the body. And the screen becomes a data of multiplicity of images, which are received by mentally with the time-image. Therefore "The optical and sound situations of neo-realism contrast with the strong sensory-motor situations of traditional realism."(*What is Cinema II: Time Image*, 5) These pure optical and sound situations have always two different edges, which are always in contact with each other. Real and imaginary, physical and mental, objective and subjective, they all exist through the pure optical and sound situations in relation to each other. And we loose our sense of defining what is real or imaginary, objective or subjective through the experience of these pure optical and sound situations. According to Deleuze, this is the reality obtained by the time-image, a whole set of possibilities opening to the totality.

If we examine the Dogma 95's position in relation to Deleuze's conceptualisation and periodization of the cinema according to the type of image, we can see that Dogma 95's assertion of the goal of unity of space and time in order to reach 'reality', is contradictory to the time-image of modernist cinema of Italian Neorealism and Nouvelle Vague. A Dogme'95 film never seems to have a chance of breaking the logical structure of time or creating a variety of layers in time. Because first of all the characters are not the seers of Nouvelle Vague or Italian Neorealism, on the contrary they are

acting through a process of development. To see this, it is enough to just look at the first two films of Dogma: *Festen* and *Idioterne.* In these two films we can see that the formal structure of commercial cinema situation action and situation is strictly followed through the script. In *Dogma #1:Festen,* at first the situation is clearly defined: a birth day party of a father who engaged in incest relations with their children, including his suffering and self-tortured son Christian. Then comes the expected action of Christian, he reveals family secrets in front of the guests during the party. And this act of Christian creates a struggle, which is going to find an end through the film. Therefore Christian is a character, who stops playing the seer; he is no more a seer. And if we consider the young group showing their aggression and dilemma against the middle class values and life style by imitating the behaviours of idiots in *Dogma #2: Idioterne,* we can see that these characters are also not seers. Therefore the hodological space and unity of movement and subject, which is broken down with technical aspects of the manifesto as we discussed above, are re-preserved with the handling of the narrative structure. The reform of technical aspects turned upside down with a narration bound to the closed formal structures of classical cinema. The search for the unity of space and time, the connections between the images, the spaces and the time, which is freed from any chain by modernist cinema of Italian Neorealism and Nouvelle Vague, is exorcised. This means that you can not shoot a time-image film with the rules of Dogma 95. When the seventh rule is asserting the notion of 'here and now' to the narration, it forces the structure of film to one dimension, the linear dimension of time. This linearity of time forecloses possibilities and variations. Deleuze's pure

cinema of crystal-image is therefore very different than Dogma's pure cinema. Dogma's pure cinema is just looking straight forward with a belief that there is a reality existing outside of us and waiting to be captured without any deeper examinations. Actually this is a naive apprehension of the notion of "realism" in cinema. Because Dogma'95 is based upon fiction filmmaking and as Dziga Vertov points out, fiction film is itself a construction and hence unnatural. This is the paradox of realism in cinema, and Dogma's attitude of compressing this construction's structure and closing the possibilities of time and space makes it difficult to reach its aim. In that sense, the pure cinema of Dogma'95 is far from being innovative with the established structure of narrative through the rules of *The Vow of Chastity*.

As a conclusion, while Dogma manifesto formulates an innovative technique of filmmaking, it fails to carry this enthusiasm into the narrative. The pure cinema of Dogma becomes a purity of restrictions and limitations.

4. Post-modern Dogma's of Today

Dogma'95 is the latest movement or the latest collective rebel against the mainstream commercial cinema. And it came out in today's conditions with references to past and now. Especially while there is a transitional moment occurs in cinema, Dogma's conditions and properties should be evaluated once more in relation to today's cultural and political context. Through this chapter the main concern is to understand this rebellion in the context of transforming cinema from modern to postmodern.

There are endless debates turning around the terms 'modernism' and 'postmodernism' in the field of cultural studies, contemporary sociology and philosophy. And, if Dogma'95 is going to be fully comprehended, it is impossible to deny these debates. On the other hand such a discussion is a little bit problematic, because that kind of naming is still confusing and does not appear as an agreement. But this does not mean that we should wait such agreements. The most crucial point of humanities is this openness which differentiates it from the analytic sciences.

According to Frederic Jameson, who is a leading figure in contemporary debates on postmodernism, there appears a catastrophe and progress in the development of capitalism. And postmodernism is one the phases of this progress. Marxist political economy plays an important role in his understanding of postmodernism and he is influenced by Ernest Mandel. For Ernest Mandel, a Marxist economist, there are three major stages, market capitalism, monopoly capitalism and multinational capitalism. In the history of capitalism multinational capitalism is the capitalism in its purest form.

> Jameson also tells us that Mandel inspired him to put forward his own 'tripartite scheme', his own 'cultural periodization'. There are aesthetic forms that clearly correspond to Mandel's economic periods: realism, modernism, postmodernism. (Docker, 116)

But such a fragmentation of historical periods does not mean that for Jameson, these periods are completely separated from each other. We can not distinguish a sharp division or rupture between the stages of modernism and postmodernism. Jameson defines his use of the term postmodernism as "a periodizing concept whose function is to correlate the emergence of new formal features in culture with the emergence of a new type of social life and a new economical order..." (Jameson, 15). Between these two terms, the two types of social life and economical order, there exist continuities and discontinuities, according to which we can separate them. This means that postmodernism is only an appearance or version of modernism and the difference comes from the shift between the dominant and the repressed. The repressed things become dominant, dominant things change to be repressed in this new social and economical order. Likewise Jameson's rejection of a rupture, which cancels any kind of interaction and similarity between modernism and postmodernism, if we refer to Foucault's methodology of archaeology, which allows us to see not only the multiplicity of discourses but also their relations, we will see that his approach to historical breaks does not refer to an absolute change. Rupture is meant to be "a redistribution of the episteme', a reconfiguration of its elements, where, although there are new rules of a discursive formation redefining the boundaries and nature of knowledge and truth, there are significant continuities as well." (Steven and Kellner, 44) Therefore we can talk about

continuities as well as discontinuities in the historical breaks, and such continuities will allow us to see the interactions, similarities and overlappings coming from the old one to the newer. In that sense strictly identifying a certain period in the history as modern and the other as post-modern is not an easy and plausible work. As well as there exists not certain rules or sharp borders to define each of them; it is not easy to label something as postmodern or modern. But still there exist some differences and discontinuities in the discourse that allows us to have positions.

We should be aware of the change in the history of film either as we deal with its technology or narrative. For instance in Darren Aronofsky's film *Requiem for A Dream* (2000), which is a film about all kinds of drug addiction, he uses two main close-up shots for showing the usage of a drug. First one is the colourful small pills or injector and then comes the growing iris of the eye. Every time there is an action of using a drug in the film, we see these close-up sets which are supported by sound effects. With these highly aesthiticized close-up sets Aranofsky provides a rhythm to the film and also avoid the film from long shootings of preparation and the usage of any kind of drug. Also if we also look to the Guy Ritchie's gangster movie *Snatch* (2000), we can find such kind of a narration in a different way. The Jewish Mafia character living in New York hires some people to steal a very valuable diamond in London. But because of the hired gangster's weakness to gambling, everything becomes more complicated then he expected. And he decides to go London and do his business by his own. This trip from New York to London is shown likewise Aranofsky's close-up sets, we see the stamping of the passport, we see our character taking some pills, and the departure of a plane from the

airport as very fast and short shootings coming one after another. After this narrative style, audience knows that the gangster is not in New York anymore. That kind of fast narration composed of basic moments chosen from the whole trip provides a fluidency and rhythm to the Ritchie's gang story. Moreover if we consider *Snatch* as an example of gangster genre, we can see that not only that kind of fast narration style, but also its narrative structure is very different than important films of this genre like Coppola's *Godfather* movies (1972, 1974, 1990), Brian De Palma's *Scarface* (1983) et cetera. Generally while that kind of films focus on one character and his rise or fall in an epic way, in Ritchie's film he introduces us lots of characters independent from each other. And through the film their ways intersect and disperse again coincidentally. It is obvious that Darren Aronofsky's *Requiem For a Dream* and Guy Ritchie's *Snatch* can not be compared because of their different intentions and handling their subjects. Aronofky's close-up sets repeated during the entire of the film to create a tension and they also function as metaphoric scenes providing openness to the narration. On the other hand Ritchie's use of that kind of fast narrative dispersed into the film in order to give fast informations to the audience and catch a dynamic rhythm. This kind of narrative style can be explained by many ways; we can drive it back till to the Eisenstein's montage theory, which is introduced at the second chapter. We can talk about the changes in the audience that today the images settle to the viewers such as a habit, therefore they only need to see the basic images to understand what is going on the screen and nothing more. Whether it is explained in that way or another, the important thing is that we are witnessing a change or transformation in the cinematic language.

And this change is not only restricted with these two examples, there are lots of comparisons we can make such as the differences between the films of new authors like Won Kar-Wai, Tom Tykwer, Michael Haneke and French New Wave or Italian Neorealism.

If we look at John Orr's handling of this transformation, we can see that he prefers to name this transformation, which he dates it from 1960's and 70's, in a different way. "...There were two directions film took as it moved towards the end of century. In the East it assumed a meta-modern form, governed by a new aesthetic for illuminating the clash between tradition and modernity. In the West it intensified into hyper-modern form, governed by the problematic of technology and spectacle in the computer-driven information." (*The Art and Politics of Film,* 1) Whether we accept such a definition or something else, the crucial point is that there appears a transformation. But not as a complete separation or rupture in the field of cinema. If we turn our interest to Dogma 95 movement, the problem is that where we can place this movement in this transformation of cinema or how we can interpret this movement while there is a transformation to different directions?

Dogma 95 declared itself as a countering movement against certain tendencies of today's cinema. But what are these tendencies that make the founders of Dogma 95 to act against them? If we look to their text introducing *The Vow of Chastity*, we can find out their discomfort with today's cinema and what they mean by certain tendencies. There are three main arguments in this text forming the basics of Dogma's resistance. First one is the illusions created by the use of high technology. It is very easy to see what they mean

68

with these illusions. It is clear that in today's cinema we have digital mediums, which can create lots of effects and many other facilities supporting these effects. For instance you can shot a scene passing somewhere far from your home in a simple studio, in which you have a blue or green screen and a good postcard of the place. The only thing you have to do is shooting your mise-en-scéne in front of the blue or green screen and then composing it with your postcard in an editing system. Or likewise we see in the Peter Jackson's *Lord of Rings: Two Towers* (2002), you can create millions of fully armed orc warriors marching to the battlefield with 3D-computer animation. And each of these warriors can show different behaviours. (Orc is a kind of creature takes place in the J.R.Tolkien's fantastic world from which the film is adapted.)

The second argument of the rebellion is against the Hollywood studio system of filmmaking. According to Dogma manifesto this system is the enemy of the story. Actually cinema itself is a story telling and the directors are storytellers of cinema. If we remember the location shootings advantages and disadvantages from the discussions beginning with the Italian Neorealism and re-appearing with Dogma'95, we can see the Dogma's resistance stands in favour of the purification from the complexities and professionalism governing today's cinema. This purification is expected to the reveal the story telling. The tradition of story telling beginning from oral to written shaped in today's culture with the images. Especially with the development of media technologies, satellite systems, computer driven information systems cover the whole world with an image-based system. Televisions and Internet become the vital needs. In that sense cinema as

being one of the image based mediums of our age, continues the tradition of story telling in the dark atmosphere of theatres. But Dogma's anxiety is the filthiness of the screen with technological storm, which is taking away the grains of truth. Story telling depends on the sharing of experience of the teller and the audience. As soon as the story is subordinated by the technological magic excluding any kind of experience in the cinema, the essential mission of cinema leaves its place to something else. So Dogma is a reaction against this filthiness in order to exorcise the story telling in cinema.

The third argument, which can be driven from the text introducing the manifesto, is the rebellion against author or individualism in the cinema. This reaction also finds a place in the rules of manifesto as the tenth rule, which we did not examined in the third chapter. Rule number ten is asserting that the director must not credited. It is a clear reaction to the Nouvelle Vogue and the notion of 'author' developed with this movement. Dogma is blaming the Nouvelle Vague because of subordinating the cinema and its essentials by the names. As Jean-Pierre argues in his article that the choice of the words of this introductory text of Dogma'95 has a clear reference to the François Truffaut's famous article "*Une certaine tendance du cinéma français*". (2) The certain tendencies meant by Truffaut is different than Dogma's, even Nouvelle Vague and authorship against the certain tendencies of 50s and 60s, itself becomes tendencies of today's cinema which has to be rejected according to Dogma. In practice this tenth rule is not worked. Harmony Korine the director of *Dogma #6: Julien Donkey-Boy* credited himself and broke the rule. And also most of the time the names of the founders of Dogma'95 especially Lars von Trier and Thomas Vinterberg become stronger

then the Dogma itself. Dogma is always called with these two directors although they did not credited themselves. This reaction always remained as symbolic and also Thomas Vinterberg himself interprets the rule as purely symbolic. On the other hand this rule carries some hidden connections behind it. Because the assertion of this rule clearly related to the political and cultural status of Dogma as well as our time. In postmodernist discourse the subject becomes decentered and fragmented that the notion of 'autheur' looses its importance. Dogma's insistence on rejecting the individualism in cinema in favour of plurality for the sake of cinema results as an invitation for everyone to shoot Dogma films. And because Dogma'95 offers a low budget code of filmmaking and draws attention in film festivals, it attracted many independent directors. And not the films but the structure of this movement becomes decentered and fragmented with the young directors who joined to Dogma movement and carried it to their home countries. For a wider understanding of this structure, we should one more time investigate the 90s politics and culture with the goal of Dogma.

The rules of *The Vow of Chastity* are readily discussed with their applications and evaluated through their innovation for the history of the cinema in the third chapter. Their success and failure depends on their interpretations and applications. They are formal restrictions by Dogma'95 to reach a pure cinema. For achieving this aim, Dogma'95 claimed that they would give up any aesthetic considerations for the sake of cinema. Disarming the cinema and refocusing to the forgotten essence 'story telling' in the name of purity is the Dogma's main discourse. A cinema freed from aesthetical judgements or any kind of aesthetical evaluations. For Benjamin the

mechanical reproduction while costs the lost of aura, it also frees the art from any aesthetical judgements in favour of being political. In that sense Dogme'95 is a movement which is political. But this does not mean that the narration of the Dogma certificated films include political discourses, rather the structure of this movement itself includes an immanent form of late 90's politics and cultural situations.

According to Douglas Kellner and Steven Best postmodernism rejects the modern assumptions of social coherence and notions of causality in favour of multiplicity, plurality, fragmentation and indeterminacy. And moreover a socially and linguistically decentered and fragmented subject challenges the rational and unified subject of modern theory. (4) When we examine the political events of 90's specially in the protests of globalisation such as the one in Seattle and the anti-war protests against the USA and England, we can see the characteristic of postmodernism described by Best and Kellner. Especially in the protests of globalisation and IMF a variety of people from different perspectives; anarchists, greenpeace supporters, different socialist fractions, gay and lesbians, et cetera, come together for one reason. And this coming together is not organised from a centre or does not include a hierarchical order. And this is also what we can find in the Dogma's call that everyone can make Dogma films in order to rescue the cinema from the individual hegemonies of autheurs. Dogma is open to anyone who wants to wear the same uniform, the uniform of the rules serving for the pure cinema against the illusions. Therefore its fast expansion to other countries outside of Denmark and its political structure can be understood in these terms specially when we think about it as a reaction against the

Hollywood monopoly of film industry. This monopoly of Hollywood feeds from the technological developments as well as the disarmed Dogma movement. In that sense Dogma tries to hunt commercial cinema with its own equipment. Everyone can make a Dogma film using digital cameras. In other words who has a digital camera can rebel against the Hollywood film industry if he/she believes that the pure cinema of Dogma. Collectivism is predicted by the Dogma. And this collectivism is presupposing a socially and linguistically decentered and fragmented movement, the Dogma'95.

When the rules of *The Vow of Chastity* are under investigation, we argued that the purification of cinema is a kind of nostalgia for Dogma'95. But this nostalgia indicates not a fully comprehended movement, technique or narrative. It is joining the well-known techniques such as location shooting of Italian Neorealism, or the 60s popular shaky camera style ceased with Cinéma Vérité. In that sense Dogma's attitude is not a clear nostalgia, but rather their way of achieving the desired pure cinema indicates a kind of postmodern quotation. The postmodernist context as generally accepted offers such quotations in a value-free, decorative and de-historicized way. But Dogma's position is different than this. Because when they are quoting from the history of cinema, they have a two sided approach. One side of Dogma is very strict and has a strong faith that they are doing the right thing in the name of cinema. On the other side Thomas Vinterberg saying that they wrote the manifesto with laughter's. And the confessions about how the manifesto rules are violated during the shootings, becomes a part of Dogma'95. Such confessions were made after each film even they are presented to the audience with the film in the official webside. These

73

confessions show that Dogma'95 founders and filmmakers are aware that their rebellion is purely symbolic just like the purified cinema they offer. According to Linda Hutcheon's "Postmodern film does not deny that it is implicated in capitalist modes of production." (*The Politics of Postmodernism*, 114) In that sense Dogma'95 appears of a mode of postmodern way of filmmaking, because the founders always knew that they could not win the war against the commercial mainstream cinema. So, this is the strange position of Dogma: while claming that *The Vow of Chastity* is the correct way of purified cinema and its a rebellion against the past and today's illusions in the cinema, they are also showing a disbelief to the manifesto and its premise of realism. Therefore Dogma'95 does not indicate a nostalgia in its relation to past. Linda Hutcheon's argue that "postmodern art uses parody and irony to engage the history of art and the memory of the viewer in a re-evaluation of aesthetic forms and contents through a reconsideration of their usually unacknowledged politics of representation" (*The Politics of Postmodernism*, 100). And Dogma's relation to past appear as a postmodern irony with what is said on one side and the unsaid on the other side.

5. Conclusion

> A hundred years after its birth the cinema appears more strongly divided than ever between the two choices present since its inception: Méliès or Lumière. From a commercial and financial point of view, spectacles, special effects, and diversions have won the day. (Douchet, 314)

It is obvious that today's cinema is fascinated by the technological storm as Dogma'95 argues. And most of the time these technological advancements able to attract the audience, even the people go to theatres to see what is the latest computer and digital effect technology offers. And Dogma'95 appeared as an innovative film movement with its promise of low budget filmmaking style against this illusionary cinema. Moreover it offered the materialisation of the one hundred years biggest dream, the realism in cinema. And it attracted many filmmakers as well as the audience, because it is the denial of the commercial cinema, it is the rejection of illusions, plus Dogma is a new movement in the history of cinema. Today's cinema industry and the audience totally forget the notion of 'movement'. "There is no longer a French New Wave, a New German cinema or a maverick alliance of Easy Riders and Raging Bulls which enables us to nail a label to a collectivity. The nearest is Danish Dogme'95..." (*The Art and Politics of Film*, 21) It is clear that for a short time Dogma'95 filled this emptiness of contemporary cinema. It could not stand for a long time and consumed rapidly, likewise the every product of our age. It is not only consumed by media, but also by its founders and its own enemy, the commercial cinema. Commercial cinema industry recognised its innovation and make use of its style in films like *Blair Witch Project* (1999). Actually *Blair Witch Project* is nearly done with Dogma rules:

location shooting, shaky camera style, no props or sets, no artificial lightning and the unity of time and space. It's about a legend that some film school students trying to make a documentary called *Blair Witch Project* and while they are making the shootings in a forest, they lost and hunted by the mysterious witch. The film is done by putting the supposedly film school students in the forest with a camera and left them there for about a week. *Blair Witch Project* is so successful and realistic that itself become a legend. And for a long time the film is discussed to be real, not a fictional construction. In that sense it is such a successful application of Dogma rules that created a sense of reality more then Dogma films. But why Dogma itself not becomes that much successful? The reason lies behind the attitude of Dogma, as it is argued to be a postmodern irony in the fourth chapter. The notion of "realism" for Dogma'95 always viewed as a flux. In other words the realism of Dogma is very different then it is normal conception in the history of cinema, because with Dogma realism is not understood as a coherent and unified notion. Realism can not be reachable by universal assumptions for Dogma. *The Vow of Chastity* is only one of the possible faces of realism. The Dogmasecretariat declared that the founders of Dogma'95 are now searching for new experiments. In other words searching for new appearances of realism in cinema. And this is the basic evidence of how the notion of 'realism' in cinema conceptualised not only by the founders of Dogma, but also for contemporary cinema.

As a conclusion, Dogma'95 is an important example of the materialisation of a collectivism in contemporary cinema. It offered the new generation of filmmakers and critiques, who never had the chance of

witnessing a movement, a re-evaluation of past and a critique of contemporary cinema. On the other hand their approaches seriousness and their status of success will remain as question mark which will be answered through the evolution of cinema.

APPENDIX

A.   Text of Dogma'95

.. is a collective of film directors founded in Copenhagen in spring 1995.

DOGME 95 has the expressed goal of countering "certain tendencies" in the cinematoday.

DOGME 95 is a rescue action!

In 1960 enough was enough! The movie was dead and called for resurrection. The goal was correct but the means were not! The new wave proved to be a ripple that washed ashore and turned to muck.

Slogans of individualism and freedom created works for a while, but no changes. The wave was up for grabs, like the directors themselves. The wave was never stronger than the men behind it. The anti-bourgeois cinema itself became bourgeois, because the foundations upon which its theories were based was the bourgeois perception of art. The auteur concept was bourgeois romanticism from the very start and thereby ... false!

To DOGME 95 cinema is not individual!

Today a technological storm is raging, the result of which will be the ultimate democratisation of the cinema. For the first time, anyone can make movies. But the more accessible the media becomes, the more important the avant-garde, It is no accident that the phrase "avant-garde" has military connotations. Discipline is the answer ... we must put our films into uniform, because the individual film will be decadent by definition!

DOGME 95 counters the individual film by the principle of presenting an indisputable set of rules known as THE VOW OF CHASTITY.

In 1960 enough was enough! The movie had been cosmeticised to death, they said; yet since then the use of cosmetics has exploded.

The "supreme" task of the decadent film-makers is to fool the audience. Is that what we are so proud of? Is that what the "100 years" have brought us? Illusions via which emotions can be communicated? ... By the individual artist's free choice of trickery?

Predictability (dramaturgy) has become the golden calf around which we dance. Having the characters' inner lives justify the plot is too complicated, and not "high art". As never before, the superficial action and the superficial movie are receiving all the praise.

The result is barren. An illusion of pathos and an illusion of love.

To DOGME 95 the movie is not illusion!

Today a technological storm is raging of which the result is the elevation of cosmetics to God. By using new technology anyone at any time can wash the last grains of truth away in the deadly embrace of sensation. The illusions are everything the movie can hide behind.

DOGME 95 counters the film of illusion by the presentation of an indisputable set of rules known as THE VOW OF CHASTITY.

B.   The Vow of Chastity

"I swear to submit to the following set of rules drawn up and confirmed

by DOGME 95:

1. Shooting must be done on location. Props and sets must not be brought in (if a prop is necessary to the story, a location must be chosen where the prop is to be found).

2. The sound must never be produced apart from the image, or vice versa (music must not be used unless it occurs where the scene is being shoot).

3. The camera must be hand-held. Any movement or immobility attainable in the hand is permitted. (The film must not take place where the camera is standing, shooting must take place where the film takes place).

4. The film must be in colour. Special lighting is not acceptable. (If there is too little light for exposure, the scene must be occur, or a single lamp may be attached to the camera.)

5. Optical work and filters are forbidden

6. The film must not contain superficial action. (Murders, weapons, etc. must not occur).

7. Temporal and geographical alienation is forbidden. (That is to say the film must take place in the here and now).

8. Genre movies are not acceptable.

9. The film must be Academy 35mm.

10. The director must not be credited.

Furthermore I swear as a director to refrain from personal taste! I am no

longer an artist. I swear to refrain from creating a "work", as I regard the

instant as more important than the whole. My supreme goal is to force the

truth out of my characters and settings. I swear to do so by all the means

available and at the cost of any good taste and any aesthetic

considerations.

Thus I make my VOW OF CHASTITY."

Copenhagen, Monday 13 March 1995

C.   List of Dogma'95 films

Dogme # 1: Festen (Denmark)
Directed by Thomas Vinterberg
Produced by Nimbus Film Productions

Dogme # 2: Idioterne (Denmark)
Directed by Lars von Trier
Produced by Zentropa Entertainments

Dogme # 3: Mifunes Sidste Sang (Denmark)
Directed by Søren Kragh-Jacobsen
Produced by Nimbus Film Productions

Dogme # 4: The King Is Alive (Denmark)
Directed by Kristian Levring
Produced by Zentropa Entertainments

Dogme # 5: Lovers (France)
Directed by Jean-Marc Barr
Produced by TF1 International

Dogme # 6: Julien Donkey-Boy (USA)
Directed by Harmony Korine
Produced by Independent Pictures

Dogme # 7: Interview (Korea)
Directed by Daniel H. Byun
Produced by CINE 2000 Production

Dogme # 8: Fuckland (Argentina)
Directed by Jose Luis Marques
Produced by ATOMIC FILMS S.A.

Dogme # 9: Babylon (Sweden)
Directed by Vladan Zdravkovic
Produced by AF&P, MH Company

Dogme # 10: Chetzemoka's Curse (USA)
Directed by Rick Schmidt, Maya Berthoud,
Morgan Schmidt-Feng, Dave Nold,
Lawrence E. Pado, Marlon Schmidt
and Chris Tow.
Produced by FW Productions

Dogme # 11: Diapason (Italy)
Directed by Antonio Domenici
Produced by FLYING MOVIES s.r.l.

*Dogme # 12: Italiensk For Begyndere (*Denmark)
Directed by Lone Scherfig
Produced by Ib Tardini Zentropa Entertainments

Dogme # 13: Amerikana (USA)
Directed by James Merendino
Produced by Gerhard Schmidt and Sisse Graum Olsen
Cologne Gemini Filmproduktion and Zentropa Productions 2

Dogme # 14: Joy Ride (Switzerland)
Directed by Martin Rengel
Produced by ABRAKADABRA Films AG

Dogme # 15: Camera (USA)
Directed by Rich Martini
Produced by Rich Martini

Dogme # 16: Bad Actors (USA)
Directed by Shaun Monson
Produced by Nicole Visram
Immortal Pictures

Dogme # 17: Reunion (USA)
Directed by Leif Tilden
Produced by Kimberly Shane O'Hara and Eric M. Klein

Dogme # 18: Et Rigtigt Menneske (Denmark)
Script and Director: Åke Sandgren
Produced by Ib Tardini
Zentropa Productions

Dogme # 19: Når Nettene Blir Lange (Norway)
Directed by Mona J. Hoel
Produced by Malte Forssell

Dogme # 20: Strass (Belgium)
Directed by Vincent Lannoo
Produced by Dadowsky Film

Dogme # 21: En Kærlighedshistorie (Denmark)
Directed by Ole Christian Madsen
Produced by Bo Ehrhardt, Birgitte Hald and Morten Kaufmann
Nimbus Film Produktion ApS

Dogme # 22: Era Outra Vez (Spain)
Directed by Juan Pinzás
Produced by Pilar Sueiro
ATLÁNTICO FILMS, S.L.

Dogme #23: Resin (USA)
Directed by Vladimir Gyorski
Produced by Steve Sobel
Organic Film

Dogme #24: Security, Colorado (USA)
Directed by Andrew Gillis
Produced by Andrew Gillis
Grammar Rodeo LTD

Dogme #25: Converging With Angels
Directed by Michael Sorenson
Produced by Thomas Jamroz and Michael Sorenson
Artistry & Rhythm Filmworks

Dogme #26: The Sparkle Room (USA)
Directed by Alex McAulay
Producer: Voltage USA

Dogme #27: Come Now (USA)

Dogme #28: Elsker Dig For Evigt (DENMARK)
Director: Susanne Bier
Producer: Vibeke Windeløv
Zentropa Entertainments

Dogme #29: The Bread Basket (USA)
Director: Matthew Biancniello
Producer: My way of the Highway Films

Dogme #30: Dias de Boda (Spain)
Director: Juan Pinzas
Producer: Atlantico Films

Dogme #31: El Desenlace (Spain)
Director: Juan Pinzas
Producer: Atlantico Films

D. Lars von Trier:

THE DOCUMENTARIST CODE FOR 'DOGUMENTARISM':

1. All the locations in the film must be revealed. (This is to be done by text being inserted in the image. This constitutes an exception of rule number 5. All text must be legible.)

2. The beginnings of the film must outline the goals and ideas of the director. (This must be shown to the film's 'actors' and technicians before filming begins.)

3. The end of the film must consist of two minutes of free speaking time by the film's 'victim'. This 'victim' alone shall advise regarding the content and must approve this part of the finished film. If there is no opposition by any of the collaborators, there will be no 'victim' or 'victims'. To explain this, there will be text inserted at the end of the film.

4. All clips must be marked with 6-12 frames black. (Unless they are a clip in real time, that is a direct clip in a multi-camera filming situation.)

5. Manipulation of the sound and/or images must not take place. Filtering, creative lightning and/or optical effects are strictly forbidden.

6. The sound must never be produced exclusive of the original filming or vice versa. That is, extra soundtracks like music or dialogue must not be mixed in later.

7. Reconstruction of the concept or the directing of the actors is not acceptable. Adding elements as with scenography are forbidden.

8. All use of hidden camera is forbidden.

9.	There must never be used archived images or footage that has been produced for other programs.

Lars von Trier, Zentropa Real, May 2001-07-25

REFERENCES

"A New Form of Minimalist Movie is Making Big Waves". 01/22/2000.
　　　Economist, The. 8154(354):86.

Bazin, André. 1967. *What is Cinema? Volume I*. Hugh Gray, trans. Berkeley,
　　　Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

---, 1971. *What is Cinema? Volume II*. Hugh Gray. Berkeley, trans. Los
　　　Angeles and London: University of California Press.

Best, Steven and Douglas Kellner.1991. *Postmodern Theory*. New York, The
　　　Guilford Press.

Carroll, Noel. 1988. Mystifying Movies: Fads and Fallacies in Contemporary
　　　Film Theory. New York: Columbia University Press.

Casetti, Francesco. 1999. "*Theories of Cinema, 1945-1995*". Francesca
　　　Chiostri, Elizabeth Gard Bartolini-Salimbeni, and Thomas Kelso trans.
　　　Austin. University of Texas Press.

Corliss, Richard. 10/11/1999. "Putting on the Dogme", *Time* 154(15): 84.

Currie, Gregory. 1996. "Film, Reality, and Illusion". David Bordwell and Noél
　　　Carroll ed. *Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies*. London. The
　　　University of Wisconsin Press.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1991. *Cinema 1: The Movement Image*. Minneapolis.
　　　University of Minnesota Press.

---,1991. *Cinema 2: The Time Image*. Minneapolis. University of Minnesota
　　　Press.

Derrida, Jacques. 1995. *Specters of Marx*. New York and London:
Routledge.

Docker, John. 1994. *Postmodernism and Popular Culture*. Cambridge: Press
　　　Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Douchet, Jean and Cèdric Anger. 1999. *French New Wave*. New York:
　　　D.A.P/Distributed Art Publish.

Finney, Angus. 1996. *The State of European Cinema: A New Dose of
　　　Reality.* London. Cassel.

Fallesen, Leif Beck. September/1998. "An Overview of Current Affairs in
　　　Europe's Capital." *Europe*. 379:45.

Geuens, Jean-Pierre. 2001. "Dogma 95: A Manifesto For Our Times".

Quarterly Review of Film and Video. 18(2):191-203.

Jameson, Fredric. 1991. *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London: Verso.

---, 1998. *Post Modernism and Consumer Society*, ed. E.Ann Kaplan London, Verso.

Hallam, Julia and Margaret Marshment. 2000. *Realism and Popular Cinema*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Hgart, Matte. "Danish Cinema and Politics of Recognition". 1996. David Bordwell and Noél Carroll ed. *Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies*. London. The University of Wisconsin Press.

Hutcheon, Linda. 1989. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge.

---, 1994. *Irony's Edge*. New York: Routledge.

K. Denzin, Norman. 1991. *Images of Postmodern Society*. London: SAGE Publications.

Lehrer, Jeremy. "Denmark's DV Director Thomas Vinterberg Delves into The Celebration". <http://www.indiewire.com/people/int_Vinterberg_Thms_ 981014.htlm>.

Lucia, Cynthia. March/1997. Breaking the Waves. *Cineaste*. 22(4):72.

Macdonald, Kevin and Mark Cousins. 1996. *Imagining Reality.* London, Boston: Faber and Faber.

Macnab, Geoffrey. July-September/1999. ''Şölen' ve Dogma'95" Gülşen Sayın Teker trans. *25.Kare*. 28:1-6.

Mascelli, Joseph V. 1965. "The Five C's of Cinematography", Hollywood, California: Cine/Grafic Publications.

McGee, Patrick. 1997. *Cinema, Theory, And Political Responsibility in Contemporary Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Monaco, James. 1981. *How To Read A Film*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nelmes, Jill. 1996. *An Introduction to Film Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Orr, John. 2000. *The Art and Politics of Film*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh

University Press.

---, 1998. *Contemporary Cinema*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

---, 1993. *Cinema and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Plato. 1989. *The Collected Dialogs of Plato*. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns ed. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Porton, Richard. 1999. "Something Rotten In the State of Denmark: An Interview with Thomas Vinterberg". *Cineaste*. 24(2/3): 17.

Rees, A.L. 1999. *A History of Experimental Film and Video.* London: British Film Institute Publishing.

Rundle, Peter. 33/11/99. "We Are All Sinners". <http://www.tvropa.com/tvropa1.2/film/dogme95/news/interview/trier_interview2.htm>.

Solia, Tytti, Astrid S. Widding, and Gunnar Iversen. *Nordic National Cinemas*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

The Official Dogme 95 Website <http://www.tvropa.com/tvropa1.2/film/dogme95/index.htm>.

Trier, von Lars. Nov/2002. "The Documentarist Code For 'Dogumentarism'." European Film Academy e.V. 13: 7