



**Free**

# Welcome to issue 2 of ONE + ONE

## The Brighton Filmmakers Journal

Each issue, we bring you interviews, essays and reports written by creators, for creators. Rather than something separate, we see analysis and criticism as being another part of the creative process. These articles feed in to our own work, and we hope that – whether you agree with their content or not – they inspire you in some way to do something yourself.

One + One is fiercely independent. We are supported by kind donations from local businesses and individuals, and we've traded off salaries and glossy paper for a chance to honestly criticise the film industry. We believe that we must, all of us, escape from the accountants, middlemen and bureaucrats who cling to us like leeches syphoning wealth and power in exchange for their supposedly expert input.

Our last issue focused on how films and their creators can – and must – change. This time, we've tried to take some of those ideas and lay them bare in the real world. Daniel Fawcett has spoken to James Mackay, who confirmed some of his beliefs about filmmaking and the industry, and adorned them with new insights. Dan Childs has unearthed another beautiful and unique gem – Vincent Moon – and spoken with some of his musical collaborators. James Marcus Tucker has investigated film and truth in relation to an abhorrent crime: the war in Iraq. And I embarked on a quest for Orson Welles, during the course of which I was hoping to challenge my entire, rational view of the universe.

Enjoy the journal. Please, get in contact with us should you wish to discuss anything you've read here, or come along to the Brighton Filmmakers' Coalition (details on back cover) to meet possible collaborators.

**Matthew Hamblion**

## Contents

**04**

Vincent Moon  
**Dan Childs**

**08**

Awesome Welles  
**Matthew Hamblion**

**12**

Interview with James Mackay  
**Daniel Fawcett**

**16**

Art Prophesising Life  
**James Marcus Tucker**

**20**

Cinema and the Enlightenment to Come  
**M. Bradlè S. Tuc**

**24**

Film Challenge  
**Fiona Hurd**

**26**

Contributors

### Issue 02

Published on 08.08.09

Very special thanks to James Mackay for his advice and support.  
Thank you to Tim Pieraccini and Emma Bailey

Cover image: Still from *Salò, or 120 Days of Sodom*, director Pier Paolo Pasolini  
Design: Benoit Schmit, [www.buenito.com](http://www.buenito.com)

Search Facebook for 'one + one: the brighton filmmakers journal'  
[info@brightonfilmmakers.co.uk](mailto:info@brightonfilmmakers.co.uk)

One + One has been produced collaboratively by a group of Brighton-based filmmakers and is a not for profit project. A pdf version of this journal is available at [www.brightonfilmmakers.co.uk](http://www.brightonfilmmakers.co.uk)

# Vincent Moon

## The Rise of the International Free State

Dan Childs

On a warm May evening in Paris six men are gathered in a narrow side street under an archway. One plays an accordion, another a tambourine and an upturned bin as a drum, another strums a steel string guitar, the fourth plays a double bass and the fifth is singing sweetly into a megaphone. The sixth man holds a video camera.

Gradually people stop to listen until there is a small crowd around them. The band are giving the performance of their lives, all the more intense for its spontaneity and unusual location. Soon, a wonderfully rendered version of this impromptu show will be viewed on many thousands of eagerly awaiting computer screens around the world. For the sixth man is Vincent Moon, and this is a Take Away Show.

Over the past few years the new tools and services ushered in by Web2.0 have spawned an exponential proliferation of 'free' culture. Blogs, podcasts and sites allowing the sharing of user-generated digital photographs and videos are helping to shift creative control away from the professionals and into the hands of an army of amateur creatives. Millions of people are publishing their own writing or photography, making their own films and TV programmes and generally taking an active role in creating culture rather than

just being passive consumers. The creative industries that were a product of the twentieth century are sailing into uncertain waters, struggling to redefine their role in a world where creativity is no longer controlled.

La Blogotheque is one such site; a cutting edge French online magazine that gets under the skin of new music. When, in 2006, its founder, Chryde, suggested to the young film and photography graduate Mathieu Saura aka Vincent Moon that they should come up with a more interesting approach than simply interviewing bands, the result was *Les Concerts à Emporter* or the *Take Away Shows*.

The premise was simple; to accost musicians when they were in Paris and ask them to play their music on streets

**“The creative industries are sailing into uncertain waters, struggling to redefine their role in a world where creativity is no longer controlled”**

corners, rooftops, in subways and parks; whilst Moon would record the performance in one unique take, and allow serendipity to do the rest. But the results were to belie this simplicity of approach, revealing films with an intangibly magical quality that were neither music video nor docu-

mentary but something fresh and new. The performances were stripped down, intimate and immersive. These were films that had a curious relationship with the environments in which they were shot.

The Take Away Shows have progressed over the years and Moon now shoots them all over the world, but they remain true to their original ethos. Moon sums this up very well in his blog: “I think cinema at its best, is a way to impact the reality, to create things in this reality, and then to re-sublime this reality by the act of editing. One simple example: a night in Paris, I did a video with a band called HIDDEN CAMERAS, just after their show. I asked them to go out to play in front of their audience, which was still there outside of the venue. They were ok, and then they played for twenty minutes with everybody clapping and singing and being so fuckin' happy. The camera was just an excuse to create this, but after the first second they began playing, they forgot the camera and this moment existed. I didn't even need to record it. That's cinema to me. Then, the traces of such moments, in the films, are just dust, sometimes beautiful dust...”

I was interested to find out more about how Moon creates this “beautiful dust” so I contacted a few of the artists who have been featured on the Blogotheque. First up, the charming Erika Forster and Heather D'Angelo from Brooklyn electronic indie-pop trio Au Revoir Simone.

**DC** - So how did Vincent first contact you?

**HD** - Blogotheque was still a relatively new thing when Vincent first reached out to us. He got in touch with us through email, inquiring if we would allow him to film us doing a portable performance. I remem-

ber being really confused that he decided to contact Au Revoir Simone with this request, considering that we're an electronic band. I mean, we can't just tote a guitar around and sing songs in a park like most bands can. We require power strips. No one had ever suggested anything like that to us before, so he struck the three of us as completely original, so we were game, despite our reservations. We had a rare window of free time when he was going to be in town, so we agreed to meet up with this crazy French guy in Williamsburg, Brooklyn. We brought a Casio that had internal speakers and some batteries, and a few shakers. We had no idea what he expected of us.

**DC** - Did he involve you in the creative process as far as choosing location etc?

**EF** - Yes, totally. Someone would throw out an idea and we would just see what felt right for everyone. He was definitely the director but wanted everyone's participation and comfort.

**DC** - How long did the shoot take?

**EF** - The first thing we did with him in Williamsburg years ago was under an hour I think.

**DC** - I'm interested in the way Moon seems to break down the barriers between audience and performer and creates a magical atmosphere out of seemingly rudimentary elements. How do you think he achieves this?

**HD** - What I recall about him the most is his excitable almost nervous energy, his big smile, and his ability to make us feel like we were going to get something re-

ally special on film. He ran circles around us with his camera as we tried to play the keyboard and sing while walking down Bedford Avenue. I was mildly embarrassed about the scene we were making, and could hear people snidely commenting about it, but nothing deterred Vincent. He was full of spontaneity, exuberance and these remarkable bursts of inspiration. As we were walking by the record store, Soundfix, he noticed that they had a bar, so he immediately ushered us in there to play a song while sitting on bar stools. I felt kind of bad that we were disturbing the peace like that. People were quietly reading in chairs and working on their laptops, and here we come in like we own the place, with a film crew to boot, and make a racket. But at the end of our song, everyone clapped.

**EF** - Everything about working with Vincent Moon feels very fated. He has a way of being, working, capturing that implies everything is perfect and all happening exactly as it should. His trust is infectious and being around him, I can't help but feel excited about everything that is happening, already happening, around me.

It was a long-held belief that a performance space is ideologically neutral until performers give it meaning. However more recent critical analysis of space indicates instead that any space comes already ideologically loaded with meanings produced by shape, décor, location, history and so on. There are no empty spaces, only variably different spaces. If this is true of an indoor theatre or venue, then it is obviously far more apparent in an impromptu outdoor setting, where random elements will be presenting themselves. On discussing two Take Away perform-

ances by Czech band The Havel, Moon notes that "In those two videos, shot on a warm Sunday night in Manhattan, the music isn't the main element. It is just part of something else, the life of a city at dusk, the interaction between sounds from two Czech musicians and children laughing, a couple kissing, dogs barking, boys skateboarding. New York as the best scenery possible, as usual". So it would appear that, for Moon, the potential audience within the film, even momentary passersby, become unwitting performers almost on equal terms with the musicians. The illusory divide between the performance world and the real world has melted away and the two worlds exist as one with exciting results. By placing the performers in the real world rather than on a stage, Moon is forcing them to react not only to the camera but also to their environment. The opportunity for serendipitous occurrences charges the films with energy. I spoke to Fred Nicolaus from experimental folk rock band Department of Eagles who had observed this first hand - "in many of them there's this cool random thing that happens that would be very hard to plan out. In ours, Daniel [Rossen] was doing a version of "Deep Blue Sea," wandering across a field where some kids were playing. A soccer ball rolled into the shot and without breaking stride or interrupting the song, Dan kicked it back. You can't really plan on that kind of thing. It's the kind of moment Vincent really seems to relish, and he has a nose for figuring out ways to make those things happen".

I feel that the Take Away Shows are akin to site-specific theatre, in that there is the same feeling of possibility and the transformation of the everyday into the sublime; of entering another world where the normal rules don't apply. Moon's films

and the situations that they spark get right to the essence of performance. They bring people together. Heather D'Angelo again: "On stage, I'm less likely to try making a strong connection with the audience because my eyes are always fixed on all the knobs I have to turn and drum pads I have to switch. But I found that when I only had a shaker and a portable Casio at my disposal, it forced me to be more present.

I think the experience was really good for me because I became more aware of how important performing is. (Playing music is not the same as performing, obviously) And it also made me a bit less fearful of the public."

Moon asks the question: "Is the music first, or is it the images? The images follow some kind of sonic rhythm, but the music maybe wouldn't be played there if the camera didn't ask for it. And in return the music is influenced by how the camera looks at her, in a very subjective way. Nothing comes first, both elements, images and sounds, are then together. As those 'outsiders' of music and their surroundings."

And it is these 'outsiders of music' that Moon so determinedly seeks out all over the world. Watching the Take Away Shows and his more recent collaborations you get the overwhelming impression that there is a thriving international community of talented artists creating for the love of creating and not for fame or financial gain. Moon has mentioned in his own blog that he has been inspired in his endeavours by the enchanting true story of the *last of the pirate utopias*...

In September 1919 thousands of black shirted Italian mutineers led by

Gabriele D'Annunzio, an Italian dandy, poet and playboy, captured the port of Fiume (currently Rijeka in Croatia) from American, British and French forces.

**"I think cinema at its best, is a way to impact the reality, to create things in this reality, and then to re-sublime this reality by the act of editing"**

- Vincent Moon

D'Annunzio installed himself as dictator (or Commandante) and drafted a charter giving his subjects unparalleled social freedom and declaring music to be the fundamental principle of the new free state of Fiume. For the eighteen months before Italy captured the city in 1920, this piracy-funded city of dreams was home to wandering soldiers, anarchists, artists, musicians and bohemians. Each day would begin with a speech from D'Annunzio and each night would end with a concert and fireworks display over the port. The Fiumians believed themselves to be on the crest of a wave of liberty and creativity that would wash away the stagnant waters of the old world:

*"We are the island of wonder, which in its journey across the ocean will carry its own incandescent light to the continents stifled in the darkness of brutal commerce. We are a handful of illuminated beings and mystic Creators."*

It seems to be Moon's mission to keep on travelling the globe, carrying his own incandescent light to streets corners, subways, parks, and rooftops; helping to unite mystic creators across the globe.

# Awesome Welles

## Fakery, Truth and Orson's Ghost

Matthew Hamblion

When I was a child, I was enthralled by images of the space age. They had this simple and hopeful power, unlike the images of greed in the popular culture of the time. Back then, I thought human salvation could be found in science, but now I am increasingly critical of the company it keeps, and I realise: I've lost my faith in science. I wonder, what is there for a life long sceptic to place his faith in?

So I find myself in a graveyard, and it's midnight, and I'm on an exposed hill. It's pitch black; I can just make out the faint lines of the church and the headstones below. I'm sitting on a tomb, with my finger on a shot glass and I open my mouth and say, "I would like to invite anyone who may be listening to speak to us, but, uh, particularly, we would like to contact Orson Welles."

During an editorial discussion, I was asked which filmmaker I would like to try and get an interview with. I am interested in storytellers and self-mythologisers. The way I see it, whether or not *Citizen Kane* is actually the greatest film of all time is irrelevant, because, mythologically speaking, it is. I said I would like to interview Orson Welles; that I would try my hardest to get hold of him.

Mention that you want to make contact

with the other side and you'll discover that more people than you'd expect have experience of the supernatural. Over and over again, I was solemnly warned not to get involved with the spirit world. I was told to be cautious and protect myself with a circle of salt and that, after inviting the dead to speak, I could expect to still be hearing

**“ Nothing answered, the night two of us sneaked in to the graveyard near the crematorium and invited Orson, or any spirit, to speak ”**

from them months, or even years, later. I heard stories of household disturbances, assaults by thousands of ghostly fingers and a Ouija board predicting, correctly, that a woman would have twins. Normal people, who you talk to every day, they battle ghosts all the time.

Nothing answered the night two of us sneaked in to the graveyard near the crematorium and invited Orson, or any spirit, to speak. I go back to some of the people I had spoken to about spirits. They say that graveyards, being places people go to *after* they die, shouldn't contain many ghosts, who tend to haunt the sites of horrific events instead. A nice bit of ghost-hunting knowledge that was conveniently

**“ By telling a lie, one can expose a truth, and by presenting the facts, one can tell a lie ”**

absent from our first conversation.

I put my paranormal investigations on ice and watch Welles' final film, *F for Fake*. He saw something of himself in his deceitful subject, the art forger, Elmyr de Hory, and made a film about fakery that wholeheartedly embraces and celebrates the act of faking. It's a film that holds valuable lessons for any filmmaker interested in the intricacies of their medium. For Welles, the content of his film was inseparable from the process of making it. Welles narrates from his editing suite and plays tricks on the viewer – both magic tricks, on camera, and crafty edits and misleading narration, behind the camera – continually drawing attention to the constructed, or *fake*, nature of film.

It is unsurprising that so much of *F for Fake* relies heavily on its editing. Welles believed that most of a director's work lay in the edit: "For me, the strip of celluloid is put together like a musical score, and this execution is determined by the editing; just like a conductor interprets a piece of music in rubato, another will play it in a very dry and academic manner and a third will be very romantic, and so on. The images themselves are not sufficient: they are very important, but are only images. The essential is the length of each image, what follows each image: it is the very eloquence of the cinema that is constructed in the editing room."

The subjects of *F for Fake* are shown debating what it is to create a hoax – supposedly with each other, although this is, rather clearly, down to Welles' editing – but at the same time, Welles is debating with himself, questioning his own legacy,

his own mythology. Talking about filmmakers, and artists everywhere, he says, "What we professional liars hope to serve is truth. I'm afraid the pompous word for that is 'art'."

Indeed, this goes to the heart of a creative debate that is so important it boils over into political struggle and everyday life, too. Welles quotes Picasso as saying: "Art is a lie that makes us realise the truth." There are other fields in art that have taken the power of this concept and used it to fight oppression. I'm reminded of some of what has been written about the Magic Realist literary movement, a Latin American response to years of deceit by European authoritarians. So used to the truth being manipulated to serve the interests of powerful men, authors such as Gabriel Garcia Marquez attempted to write novels where magic or fantasy are indistinguishable from reality, thus seizing back the truth by creating a new folklore, and employing it in the cause of the people.

Yes, it is a mistake to believe that truth and fact are one in the same – it's not that simple. Ghosts may not walk the earth; no man may have the uncanny ability to know in advance when he will be in mortal danger; and priests may not levitate upon imbibing hot chocolate. But fantasy can reveal the human condition and realism can skew it. By telling a lie, one can expose a truth, and by presenting the facts, one can tell a lie.

And if you doubt whether the power of a story can change anything, look at the power the media has over the government, or the power religious texts have over their followers. It's like stories have an all-access pass to our beliefs and moral codes. But, to return to my initial problem, what is stopping *science* from stepping up



O. Welles

and exposing truths effectively? The philosopher Jean-François Lyotard put it best when he said that science is a “[game] of the rich, in which whoever is wealthiest has the best chance of being right.”

I continue my investigations, taking a trip down to Devon, where I was born. Here, beasts stalk the moors and disembodied hands rise from the side of the road to pull drivers to their deaths. Across the border, in Cornwall, I’ve heard there are two twisted trees that form a gateway to hell. Perhaps a change of location, to a place where some people still believe in old folklore, will get me closer to a thinning in the membrane of reality, where the dead can be heard by the living. I have some sound equipment – a condenser mi-

crophone (very good for picking up quiet sounds), a mixing desk and a laptop, for recording on to. I turn the mic up as high as I can before it feedbacks, hit record, and wait. I’ve heard that the voices of the dead can litter the quiet spaces on tape recordings. This, from *Voice Transmissions with the Deceased* by Friedrich Juergenson:

*As it became calmer later in the night, a male voice began to speak. It was the voice of an older man that sounded broken, muffled and slightly hoarse. [...] The whole conversation seemed like a monologue as if he were talking to himself in a half sleep.*

*“We lived in the deepest confusion...” began the voice in German, “...to oppress the people and to enslave them...the others withdrew, not me... that’s why I’m...”*

*The words that followed were drowned out by our own voices. After a short pause, the man began to speak again. He added only one more sentence with a strange content, “We lived in a bad compote (fruit stew)”, then the voice broke off.*

*Right after that, [a] female voice [...] became audible and called out mockingly a stretched “Heil!”*

*In the next moment she added excitedly: “...that was Hitler...he’s not ashamed... he was here...”*

I turn up the volume, rewind, and play. The white noise is like a crashing waterfall. I hear the sounds of the house, cars and birds from outside, my own small movements, all amplified many times... But Welles’ familiar baritone is nowhere to be heard.

I read an article last month, and the writer was bemoaning cinema for knocking classical music from its throne. Once, he pointed out, classical music was the

chief storytelling medium, and now it is film. His ensing argument mainly hung on *Independence Day* being less culturally significant than Beethoven’s Fifth, however, the article does serve to highlight just how much *power* cinema has. And it is a power that is, quite rightly, in danger of being usurped by new media if cinema refuses to evolve.

Perhaps one of the greatest obstacles to realising a new, revolutionary form of cinema is a drive to make *good* films. Welles once said that the only thing that fills him with enthusiasm is experimenting: “Our work once finished has not so much importance in my opinion as that of most aesthetes: it is the act that interests me, not the result, and I am taken with the result only when there is the smell of human sweat, or a thought.” The act of creation is a lot harder to sell than what it produces and so, when you make commercial film or are inspired by commercial film, it is the wealth of *this* act that is, all too often, forgotten. Henry David Thoreau said that, in an unjust state, a just man belongs in jail. Well, in a world such as ours, a revolutionary filmmaker would in all probability experience a reluctance to create *good* films as they are widely understood. The world is full of slick, finished products – but the social interactions, the new trains of thought and the possibility that a work might continue evolving long after it is shown to an audience, these things hold a greater, truer value than a string of numbers after a dollar sign, or the approval of Roger Ebert. Film can be a tool to change your life, and to encourage others to change theirs. When he was asked if he thought a film could change the course of history, Welles replied, “Yes. And it might be a very bad film.”

It is beginning to dawn on me, by now, that no matter how hard I try to keep an open mind, I simply don’t *believe* enough to make a deadly serious attempt at contacting the dead. But there may be someone who does. I go to London, and attend a séance at the Spiritualist Church of the Holy Mountain. It’s one of those churches that look like a travel agency from the outside and, from the inside, a conference centre. When I think of a séance, I think Victorian pomp, and while it was absent from the assembled group – bizzaros, half Christian, half New Age hippies – it was present in other ways. The medium, Reverend Carl Banks, has many orphans; ghostly Dickensian street urchins who do the work of finding any spirits who wish to talk to you. He stands, in the middle of our circle of chairs, and communes with them, though they are both invisible and silent to us. Once it begins, it happens fast: the spirit guides

**“ Film can be a tool to change your life, and to encourage others to change theirs ”**

bring grandmothers, husbands, wives. One woman speaks to her child. I begin to have second thoughts. I feel like I’m trespassing. The Reverend looks in to my eyes, “They tell me there’s someone who wants to talk to you - someone old, a lot older than you.” Before he gets my grandmother on the line, I go for broke and ask, “Is it Orson Welles?” Our eyes meet, and in that moment, we reveal our innermost truths: that we are both, in fact, liars. The Reverend shifts his attention to a believer, and, eventually, I grow uncomfortable and leave.

# Interview with James Mackay

Daniel Fawcett

It's not surprising that everything James Mackay said to me about his approach to filmmaking and the film industry rang true. He was, after all, the producer of *The Garden*, directed by Derek Jarman. I can say, with confidence, that *The Garden* shaped my idea of what a film *is*. I believe films should be made as a tool for exploring life, for exploring the relationships between collaborators, and his films are truly collaborative in a way that a commercial project could never be. I was interested to find out how James works when he is producing artist's films.

**Q How did you become a film producer?**

When I was at college there was difficulty getting access to equipment, so you couldn't do very much, but I did do a lot of stuff and met a lot of people. I became very adept at persuading people to give me things. I learnt to not take



James Mackay

no for an answer. People were looking for help getting their films made, so apart from just exhibiting I would get money from the Arts Council.

**Q How did you come to work with Derek Jarman?**

I'd heard of Derek Jarman and I'd seen a few of his films - *Sebastian*, *Jubilee*, *The Tempest* - but I'd never heard about his Super 8 films, and it was suggested I get him to come and show

some of his films at the [London Filmmaker's] Co-op. So he showed all these fantastic films and we got to talking about what to do with them, because the problem with Super 8 is that it's very fragile. And Super 8 copies of Super 8 are not very satisfactory. So, with my connections in Berlin and the Arts Council, I started to get money to make 16mm blow ups from the Super 8, and we did a few films. One long one - *In the Shadow of the Sun*

- and four short ones. And at that time Derek had a big show at the ICA, a retrospective of paintings. So rather than show the Super 8s, we transferred them to video, roughly, by filming them on the wall, so they could then show these as a program of films. And it was during the second day of filming them off of the wall that we got bored and started playing around with the projector and cameras and started to make super-imposed things. And Steve, who was working with us, the projectionist, he edited it, a pneumatic edit. And from that we made and developed *Angelic Conversations*. The one thing that was really interesting about Derek is that he didn't really have any notion of hanging around, he just start making something, and it just went.

**Q Did he have an idea where it was going?**

In a sense he was developing it as he went along. If he didn't have any money in order to do it, he'd just go out and do it. He'd be filming a lot, he was filming all the time really and I think that's why he spent time in the 1970's filming on Super 8. Films like *Jubilee*, the genesis of the film was Jordan's dance sequences,

which was shot on Super 8 film - it was actually the basis for the film. He basically started shooting and got people together and then eventually the money became available.

**Q I recently met a fire juggler, and she told me a story about how she was a part of a group of jugglers who were invited to shoot some scenes for *The Garden*. They met Derek in the studio and he presented them with a large rack of costumes, from which they were asked to choose their dream costume. Was he this collaborative with everyone?**

Only with people he liked. He would figure out if he liked them or not and they he would give them a lot of input into the film.

**Q The scene with the fire juggling doesn't appear in the final film, was there much that was shot but not used?**

Not as much as *The Last of England*. There was a few big sequences that were never used. Simply because they didn't fit in. There was less with *The Garden*. I can't think of any whole sequences that we didn't use. I think that we used almost everything.

**Q How did you pitch *The Garden* to the funders?**

We had a sort of assembly of different shots and *The Last of England* had been a critical success, so they were quite easy going.

**Q So they were aware of what his work had been so far?**

Yes, there's always that, and it was cheap, so they knew they'd get the kudos from it and it wouldn't cost them too much. It's quite funny, that relationship between Derek and the funders. When he made [Wittgenstein], they shot that in two weeks. He was doing 14 hour days, and he was dying on his feet. And they made him work 14 hour days, it was awful. I was crying. Really awful. He thought the only way he could do it was to keep it visually very simple, and then he would work with the costume designer - Annie Symons - and have just the background as black. And the BFI didn't want that. They wanted to have an actual background. These people have never made a film in their lives and they haven't got a clue about cinema. Derek, after all, did design *The Devils*, which is a pretty impressive film, in terms of set design, and if they can't accept that...

**Q When you are working with a filmmaker what is the process of developing ideas?**

We just discuss it, talk about it, write stuff down. You kind of put it backwards and forwards a lot. It takes a while to get good, because it has to have a depth to it, it can't be something simple. I only work with a small number of people. It's very difficult to take on more projects because the kind of projects that these people do involve a long term commitment.

**Q What are your thoughts on the way films are funded in the UK?**

Why do you have people who are not creative people - basically the civil service - why should they be the judges of what gets made? The Film Council's money from the government is a part of Lottery funding - it's not from another source, it's all Lottery money, which should be for cultural purposes, but they perverted that right at the beginning. They don't use it for cultural purposes, they use it for semi-commercial failed ventures. There's so much money - they pissed something like £40 million last time. I looked a few years ago.

It's a real problem. If you apply to the Arts Council, you sign your copyright to them. No other company in Europe does that, it's considered ethically unsound in Europe. And there's also this waiver of moral right, which came in in the early 90s. It's a European law - it gives you, the creator, the

**“ I don't think you can change Hollywood - I think Hollywood can change you ”**

rights to your work. But, in this country, you waive that. So instead of actually looking at how other people use a structure where everybody benefits from the work, it's a kind of narrow and commercial process even at the cultural end of things in this country.

The Arts Council are a cultural funding body and the Film Council are a really bad loans company, because the people who run it make most of the money. It's kind of wrong. The Arts Council, who are getting whittled away by the government, is actually a quite good model, because it essentially just identifies artists and gives them money and monitors how they spend it. A very successful artist

wouldn't need to go to the Arts Council because they are already making lots of money. But if you are an up and coming artist, or an artist whose work is not commercial, or your work is not being sold, it is a really useful and important funder. It gives the money as a grant and

doesn't expect anything in return. The Film Council don't think that avant garde film - artist film, experimental film - has any validity whatsoever, because it's not aimed at a ticket buying public.

**Q Do you think that's why we are just getting boring and uninteresting films in this country?**

But isn't that what Hollywood does? Produce boring and uninteresting work, in that it's truly disappointing now, but it used to be that occasionally it was very good. I can't remember the last good film I saw from there. I quite liked that Darjeeling Limited. Zodiac was all right. I thought the latest Star Trek was awful. I think in the 70's Hollywood



The Angelic Conversation by Derek Jarman

was fantastic, but then it lost it and now it's just run by civilians. Tilda [Swinton] keeps going to Hollywood to make films, she thinks they're good, and that she can use the system to make good work, but I don't think you can change Hollywood - I think Hollywood can change you.

**Q What are you working on that's coming up next?**

I'm working for the Tate, and we're developing 3 projects a year for the next 2 years. Only started 2

months ago - it's a good project. I have some installation projects, one with Lynn Hershman. It's not a film, it's a project in a space for an exhibition in 2011.

**Q What do you look for when you get involved with a film?**

I think the most important thing is to see what other people have done previously. I think that's the main thing. They should, as filmmakers, have interesting work. I am very

keen to see what they have done before, then talk to them about what they intend to do in the future, and see after that if there is any common ground, and see if there is a project we can all work on. I think that's a fairly standard European approach for the art house sector - to look at what people have done then take it forward, rather than looking at it as a clean proposal.

**Q I think that's nice because you're investing yourself and your time into the filmmaker rather than looking at it as a product. It's a bit more human.**

I think that's what the regional film bodies should be doing. They should be trying to work in that way. But they put out these statements saying they are looking for a particular type of film - but what's the point in that? They should be looking at people's work, and seeing what they can do to develop this talent. I think that's one of the things that you're doing that is very important - you're getting people to work together. It rarely happens.



# Art Prophesising Life

## Pasolini's *Salò* and Abu Ghraib

James Marcus Tucker

### The Prophecy

Italian filmmaker Pier Paolo Pasolini was famous for his romantic, sumptuous and often bawdy representations of the historic, agrarian lifestyles in such films as *The Canterbury Tales*, *The Decameron* and *The Arabian Nights*. *Salò* - his final master-work made in 1975 - was a stark departure however, and would become infamous for its sheer brutality, starkness and pessimism. Sam Rohdie, writing in *The Passion of Pier Paolo Pasolini*, notes how the filmmaker saw modern society as "utterly evil, vulgar, corrupt, inhumane and unregenerate". Perhaps he could keep the colourful nostalgia up no longer.

The story transposes the Marquis De Sade's novel *The 120 Days of Sodom* from 18th Century Switzerland to the town of Salò at the end of World War II. Pasolini had first hand experience of the real Salò - Mussolini's last Fascist republic in 1944 - as a young man, where there are particularly notorious instances of wartime massacres by Nazi occupying forces. The film therefore was Pasolini's vision created from a reality he lived through. To represent this utter inhumanity, Pasolini depicts the rounding up and imprisonment of a group of young, naked men and women who are subjected to a series of physical and sexually degrading tortures by four wealthy libertines. The libertines are represented by,

interestingly, establishment figures often regarded for their supposed morality - a Duke, a Bishop, a President and a Magistrate. In *Salò*, they are presented as ruthless, inhumane and sexually immoral. The Palazzo setting becomes a microcosm of a society where those in power are repressive, selfish and fundamentally indifferent to the suffering they create. Pasolini died shortly after making the film. His last message to the world would become a warning; not so much about humanity's propensity for creating horror - for this was obvious enough - but to our lack of ability to recognise its potential in ourselves.

Importantly, Pasolini did this by putting the viewer firmly into the seat of the oppressors. Watching the film, structured as a Dante-esque journey through descending circles of hell, we are forced to view sexual degradations, often in detached, wide an-



Still from *Salò*



Still from *Salò*

gle shots, jaundiced yellow and bleached of saturation. The mise-en-scene frames naked bodies in space, effectually dehumanising them. We are unaware of most of the young men and women's past lives - the narrative spending most of its time devoted to the oppressors' actions, shot from their point of view. It is decidedly anti-erotic in its depictions of sexual acts - the oppressors using the bodies as mere mechanical functions for sexual gratification. The conventional fragmented framing of erotic, pornographic or even Hollywood filmmaking is eschewed for this distancing device.

*Salò* confronts the viewer with its own passivity, detachment and possible implication in the evils of such dehumanisation. The final scene in the film is most successful in highlighting this point. Here, many of the young victims are punished for previous rebellions by being subjected to genital burning, branding, removal of eyes and tongues, anal rape and hanging. The torture is shot from the point of view of each libertine as they take turns in observing the proceedings through binoculars whilst sat in a room overlooking the tortures. The cinematic device of point-of-view is used in this scene to show the torture. We cannot hear the screams of the victims because of the window, and can only view the suffering through the binoculars of the libertines. The

screams are substituted for the sounds of poetry on the radio - Ezra Pound declaring a glorious springtime. The libertines have chosen to view the suffering from a distance, through a window that both physically and emotionally separates them from the scene of punishment. At one point, the Duke even turns his binoculars around, so as to see the scene from an even greater distance than the human eye would. As well as emphasising the idea of the bourgeoisie's detachment and lack of direct involvement with the suffering their class is responsible for, it also puts the viewer into the position of the bourgeoisie. If cinema works on the viewer's unconscious, then here the audience becomes part of the system that is inflicting the torture - seeing through the libertine's eyes. Also, just as the libertine views the cruelty through the square window of the house, the audience views it through the square cinema screen.

For the torturers, the acts are gratifying, and sometimes simply common-place and pedestrian. It is a complete subversion of all that we expect from civilised cultures, from civilised peoples. To depict this he made an unexpected film - anti-narrative, anti-sutural, anti-erotic. This is why *Salò* is so distressing for a viewer. Whilst it proposes a deeply depressing evaluation of humanity when stripped of social conditioning - it is the positioning of the camera and audience that shocks the viewers' subconscious. We watch this, unable to stop it, but at the same time somehow at a safe distance. The audience is put into a very difficult moral position, and forced to contemplate itself as part of a social system that encourages passivity and detachment from reality. It is uncomfortable indeed when one's own inward-looking culture is shown the light so uncompromisingly.

### The Fulfilment

What happened in Iraq's Abu Ghraib prison is by now well known. In 2004, accounts of physical, psychological, and sexual abuse, including torture, rape, sodomy, and homicide of prisoners held in the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq (also known as Baghdad Correctional Facility) came to public attention. These acts were committed by personnel of the 372nd Military Police Company of the United States Army together with additional US governmental agencies.

The images of these atrocities tell a very painful and revelatory story. Taken by the soldiers themselves, the images are more than reminiscent of Pasolini's film. Yet again, we are forced to observe the gruesome act through the eyes (or cameras) of the torturers, and the consequences of humanity stripped of its civility. In one image, two soldiers stand facing camera, thumbs up, behind a group of male prisoners who are stripped naked and piled on top of each other. The indifference to human suffering so acutely rendered by Pasolini is brought to life within our War on Terror myth. The content of the photograph so strongly resembles Pasolini's depiction of naked young men and women grouped together for an inspection of their rear ends, that Pasolini's final level of hell was indeed the desired destination, it seems, for those implicated in the atrocities at Abu Ghraib. According to Jamil, a detainee at the facility, a soldier explained the purpose for their treatment; "These are the orders we have from our superiors, to turn your lives into hell." Like in *Salò*, physically degrading acts seem to focus on the shame of nakedness, sexual acts and closeness to animals in stance and body positioning. In another image released from Abu Ghraib, prisoners are seen being held at the end of leads, dog collars around their necks. Pa-



Image taken at Abu Ghraib Prison

solini's victims similarly bark like dogs at the ends of leads for scraps of food. Unlike *Salò* however, as Western viewers, we are made aware of the victim's "otherness". The characters of *Salò* are predominantly white and the status line is drawn between age and political class. With Abu Ghraib, we recognise the racial and religious otherness (from a Western perspective) of the victims, subjugated and demeaned by the white (Christian?) Western power that has installed itself. The abuses of such power here are not only political, but historical, bringing into questions of colonialism, empire and its often associated guilt.

Why the images from Abu Ghraib are so important is simply that they tell a truth that is so hard to face. The Iraq war itself, so shrouded in half-truths, lies and myths - occurring thousands of miles away and observed from the armchair - became victim to propaganda and censorship. As the adage goes, the first casualty of war is truth. The revealed images from Abu Ghraib finally

opened our collective eyes; leaving us asking if this is just the tip of the iceberg. Journalist John Pilger highlighted how images of the war seen in the West would often be heavily cropped to make sure the worst of the human suffering be kept hidden. Somehow, to witness the full extent of what our country's leaders were doing would be "tasteless". The Arab world's taste was not spared by its own media however. From the USA's played-down (read undercover) involvement in numerous bombings and Latin American regime changes through to the Hutton Enquiry and illegal renditions, this attempt at whitewashing to protect our delicate civilised tastes (and sense of superiority) is nothing new. An estimated 100,000 have been killed in Iraq, and yet the memory of 3000 killed on September 11th dominates.

Today, the debate in America isn't so much "is it wrong to torture", but "is what we are already doing torture?" Water boarding, effectively drowning a detainee to the inch of his life, is a practice not yet recognised by many on the Right as torture and so is therefore considered an acceptable practice. Even two high profile names in the USA (Christopher Hitchens, and right-wing radio "shock jock" Erich Mancow) being water boarded on camera - albeit with the guarantee it would stop if they were suffering too much - couldn't convince the Right that it was indeed torture; although it convinced Mancow in less than 6 seconds! As I think of the Duke sat observing a young man's tongue being cut off whilst listening to the sweet disarming language of poetry, I cannot help but consider its real life contemporary equivalent - let's all imagine a nation sat watching Big Brother or Strictly Something Or Other whilst some of its soldiers are accused of mutilating prisoners on their behalf in Abu Naji. Or let's

just put our fingers in our ears, screaming "la la la" at the top of our lungs.

Pasolini's indictment of our own involvement (personal or cultural) in, and navel-gazing ignorance of atrocities remains as potent and awakening as it was in 1975. The torturers of Pasolini's victims can observe the human suffering they create from a distance as they wallow in luxury. They can convince themselves that any number of acts are not only acceptable (indeed, "standard operating procedure", as it is known), but indeed gratifying. Pasolini was responding to the fascism of his time, but was also sending a stark message for the industrialised world. The hope for this new age is of course citizen journalism and internet imaging, as we have seen in the case of Iran and in demonstrations within our own country very recently. The ease with which information can be shared now makes the injustices of the powerful less likely to go unseen. At least by those with their eyes and ears open. Now as much as ever, we must be prepared to face - in close-up - the effects of our own nonchalant passivity.



Image taken at Abu Ghraib Prison

# Cinema and the Enlightenment to Come

## Part 2: Re-Enlightenment: Cinema and the Rationalism of the Future

M. Bradlè S. Tuc

The Renaissance and the ensuing Enlightenment do not end when their historical timeframes end. Just as the Renaissance was a *Re-naissance* that took over and renewed a task that had occupied the ancient Greeks, so the Renaissance and the Enlightenment set into motion a new task or mission which would define and shape future endeavours. The Enlightenment seeks to rediscover for itself the meaning of 'Order' and 'Reason' for a new humanity. By seeking this new understanding for itself, rather than as handed down from Church and State authority, it thinks about and shapes the world in a radically progressive sense: through continual reform and re-enlightenment. The very idea of the Enlightenment requires that we continually rethink the Enlightenment *for ourselves* and respond to its crises with new ways of thinking. The Enlightenment was not the ultimate resolution, but a task that would require further re-enlightenments. In this sense, every crisis, whether moral, religious, political, economical, social or cultural, requires a rethinking: a re-enlightenment, or an enlightenment-to-come. When our 'Enlightened world' produces war, genocide, inequality, injustice, poverty, slavery and totalitarianism, demands for re-enlightenment resurface. When society

is reduced to the credit and debit sides of a ledger and has nothing to say about life and how it should be led, reconsideration appears crucial. When this world degenerates into cold-hearted sensualism or bureaucratic specialism without spirit or when it reduces art to mere industry, the quest for a new rationality becomes ever more pressing. In times of war and economic collapse, we should not shy away from the demand to rethink the ideas and rationalities that shape this world. German idealism, Marxism, Expressionism, Surrealism, Situationism, La Nouvelle Vague, 60s Counter-Culture and Punk each respond to their own Crisis with new way of thinking. In this sense, for example, surrealism is not simply some kind of madness on canvas, but rather the revolutionary impulse that seeks to uncover a new enlightenment, a new rationality through the liberation from self-conscious rationality and bourgeoisie regulations. The surrealist goes beyond conscious rationality to uncover a new truth and reality in the surreality of the subconscious. The surrealists seek to think for themselves in a radically new way. In this sense, despite all kinds of craziness, even surrealism does not give the Enlightenment ideal completely; rather they seek to uncover

a new enlightenment through re-thinking and re-discovering the world afresh.

After the First World War and its surrounding crises, the mathematician and founder of phenomenology, Edmund Husserl, reflected on the one-sidedness of European culture'. The scientific task, instituted in the Renaissance, had provided a one-sided account of reason. The success of the natural sciences had meant that reason was now primarily associated with a mathematical, value-neutral objectivist understanding of the world. For Husserl this historical development had left another form of rationality hidden and concealed. This was the meaningful, normative and subjective rationality that emerges at the level of life. The sciences had forgotten the world within which their investigations had started: The life-world, the subjective world where 'I live' and 'We live in our community'<sup>2</sup>. Husserl did not intend to give up natural science, but sought to uncover a new science that would overcome one-sidedness, uniting mathematising rationality with the meaningful rationality arising in life. He aimed to do this through analysing the logic of appearances through phenomenology: the science of things as they appear. For Husserl we must rigorously study the essential structure of appearance from the lived body to the intersubjective community. Husserl's task calls for reason, but not that reason, instead he calls for reason-yet-to-manifest: A new Enlightenment.

Maurice Merleau-Ponty finds this return to phenomena, that we find in Husserl, in modern art. Modern Art gives up the naturalism of Leonardo that sought nature in abstract three-dimensional space from a single perspective. Art was no longer a path to nature in its abstract mathematical three-dimensional sense, but it was still a



Still Image with Basket of Apples by Cezanne

path to nature as directly experienced.

*Cezanne never wished to "paint like a savage." He wanted to put intelligence, ideas, sciences, perspective, and tradition back in touch with the world of nature which they were intended to comprehend. He wished, as he said, to confront the sciences with the nature "from which they came".*

*By remaining faithful to the phenomena in his investigations of perspective, Cezanne discovered what recent psychologists have come to formulate: the lived perspective, that which we actually perceive, is not a geometric or photographic one.<sup>3</sup>*

Art can lead us back to the things themselves, to phenomena, to lived experience. Art finds new ways of presenting things that we may have missed as we go about our everyday lives in our everyday natural attitude. Cezanne gives up painterly naturalism in lines and spatial composition in order to re-discover space and nature from its phenomenological roots, its origins in lived experience. He gave up the idea of painting from one single perspective. He acknowledged that we have two eyes, with two separate perspectives;



Eraserhead by David Lynch

we do not see everything in focus and see certain things as blurred. Cezanne and Husserl's tasks are therefore akin in their striving to uncover the origin of all ideas in experience.

What about film as a phenomenological task? Film's phenomenological power rests in its ability to reveal the world in its worldliness. It reveals a world as a context for intersubjective and historical narratives. It can go beyond the three-dimensions of scientific space and present a filmic world. In filmic worldliness colour, texture, depth, sound, and moving image hang together in space along with the rich fabric of human, historical, social, ethical, aesthetic and psychological meaning. Film reveals the world in a phenomenological manner, not divorced from the world, but within its rich fabric of meaning. Film, in this sense, is an aesthetic 'science' of the lifeworld.

In David Lynch's *Eraserhead* we are drawn into such a world. The film reveals the world with its own social-psychological logic, even though this often appears alien to us. In this world, inter-human re-

lations have become alienated and mediated by social anxiety and perception has become distorted and nightmarish. The apparently absurd elements of this film are not flights from reality; rather they reveal the phenomenological and psychological essence of our modern social disorders. Every mundane detail builds to create the fabric of the *Eraserhead* universe, which reveals the alienated lifeworld in all its mundanity and horror.

Derek Jarman's *Blue*, a film made when the director was dying of AIDS and going blind, also yields phenomenological insights. Accompanying Jarman's narration is a completely blue screen, which challenges the conventions of Cinema, but also reveals to the viewer something of the phenomenology of going blind. Vivian Sobchack writes that "phenomenological method reveals *Blue* as not only objectively about the richness, complexity and sensuality of visual perception (as well as its loss) but also as subjectively constituting for viewers an experience of extreme self-reflection on their own dynamic of vision - particularly as (akin to Jarman's experience) it is seemingly 'deprived.'"<sup>4</sup> Here Jarman's film, like Cezanne's painting, reveals something of the nature of perception. The film conveys this loss of sight, not through absence, but rather by creating a new way of seeing. *Blue* reveals blindness not as a lack of sight, but as an appearance in its own right. Blindness is given a texture that forces the filmgoer to experience the film in a manner that radically departs from their usual film experience. The film viewer's eyes are not drawn around the screen following particular images, rather their eyes 'wonder'. This leads them to reflect back on their own vision and the phenomenon of seeing 'non-sight.' Film

reveals and causes us to reflect on the nature of our perception.

Film has the power to 'reveal' whether it is through the philosophical and political experiments of Godard, the pondering dialogues of Linklater, the metaphysical proclamation of Bergman or Tarkovsky, the scientific spirit of Herzog, the social criticism of Trier, Fassbinder, Sirk or Solondz or the mystical revelations of Joderowski or Anger. Can the entire list of filmmakers who have been or are yet to come teach us something? Can they help reveal a fragmented path to an Enlightenment to come? Or do they conceal? Do they create narratives that conceal the true fate of humankind? Do they pave the way for a new Enlightenment or for mass deception?

The charge of mass-deception is common today: The molding of our desires through advertising; one-sided misrepresentation within the news, documentaries or historical period dramas; the perverse ideology that shapes the Hollywood industry with its obsession with celebrity and tedious ill-fitting happy-endings. Yet film has the potential to reveal by re-capturing life with a renewed critical energy, rediscovering within it new ways of thinking and living. This critical energy that strives to rediscover life from its context does not simply present, but rather attempts to get back to life through a critical appropriation of the narratives and methods of filmic framing. In light of this, we cannot simply take our narratives or filmic devices for granted. Rather, if we wish to uncover life we must be prepared to direct our critical energy to film itself. Sometimes

this might mean suspending or bracketing our prior commitments and waiting with genuine honesty to see what the camera reveals. Other times this means searching our different narratives or subverting old ones in order to reveal their inner truthful-or truthlessness.

Similarly, the critic has the power to aid in this process, not through a simplistic reductionistic five star score system, but through critical analysis, social commentary and prescriptive illumination. This is the reviewer as *re-viewer*, who re-casts their eye in a critical fashion, with the purpose of aiding critical (re-)enlightenment. Through their journalistic efforts, they, like the filmmakers, must contribute to the moral and critical becoming (and continual re-becoming) of film and its future development. The Enlightenment idea of rational self-responsibility and rigorous critique transcend the Enlightenment, and seek to mould future revolutionary strivings. In this sense, there is no final manifesto, but a continued process of striving and adapting, renewing and critiquing the great ideas in a process of re-enlightenment and re-revolution.

1 Edmund Husserl, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Tran. D. Carr. (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1970)

2 Edmund Husserl "Shaw and the Vitality of the West" in Husserl: *Shorter works* ed. P. McCormick and F. A. Elliston. (University of Notre Dame Press, 1981)

3 Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics reader*. Ed. Galen A. Johnson (Evanston: Northwestern University Press: 1993) p64

4 Vivian Sobchack, "Phenomenology" in *The Routledge companion to Philosophy and Film*. P/ Livingston & C. Plantinga ed. (Oxon: Routledge: 2009) p437

# Film Challenge Report

May 2009

Fiona Hurd

Illusions surround us; some we create to deal with the harsh edges of reality, others are presented to us as desirable ideals that we should aspire to achieve. The concept of time is self evident, but really, what is time? To the casual observer the difference between 48 hours and a month seems immense, but in the conception of a film challenge a month is actually far shorter than one would presume. Continuing from the overwhelming success of the first film challenge in February of this year the follow up promised to entice, excite and stimulate all involved.

Aside from the obvious time restrictive difference there were other factors which separated the two film challenges. This film challenge was governed by a number of 'restrictions', presented as a list which each team was given and had to adhere to and creatively interpret. One of the over-arching restrictions was that all films had to use Edgar Allan Poe's short story *The Tell-Tale Heart* as a starting point and be somehow inspired by it or produce an adaptation of it.

*The Tell-Tale Heart*, first published in 1843, is a story of a murder, fuelled by insanity, manifested guilt and horror. A servant commits a horrific murder after being driven mad by their master's whit-

ened eye. The madness deepens after the murder and the servant believes the heart of the dead master is still beating. Driven by this belief, a confession of the ghastly deed ensues. The original story within itself is ambiguous and veiled in mystery, as it was written in a first person narrative without the use of any pronouns so the gender of the murderer is never revealed; only assumed.

Daniel Fawcett, who coordinates the Brighton Filmmakers' Coalition, explained the inclusion of these restrictions such as the one above: "The reason for the rules is to expose the process of creating a film. They also serve to break people out of hab-

**“ The reason for the rules is to expose the process of creating a film. They also serve to break people out of habits in an attempt to make new discoveries ”**

its in an attempt to make new discoveries”

Logistically this film challenge was made up of four groups, each consisting of five or six people, although extra help was drafted in along the way, by all groups; from friends, family, casual acquaintances and even people off the street! The groups were constructed so there was an even mix of skills and experience across each

team[;] additionally as far as possible the groups consisted of people who had never worked together before and in many cases did not even know each other. After the initial meeting the four teams had no

**“ We were exceptionally lucky with our team; everyone was totally committed from the beginning, and contributed ideas, energy and support wherever required ”**

contact with each other, while they developed their separate films.

The ambitious reach and distinct interpretations employed in the different teams was truly astonishing to behold; some groups relied on subtleties and sly references to Poe which only the keen eye would catch such as the reading of a Poe book or a mention of a name. Other groups stayed true to the text and story but grafted a modern twist into the theme, while other groups took points of inspiration from the story such as the pacing and character structure.

Speaking with the different groups everyone seemed to bond over the common goal and enjoy the camaraderie, difficulties, joys and pressing demands of the shoots. A common factor savoured by all of the groups was the sense of team-work and obligation towards the film challenge; whether it be blagging free furniture, pulling all-nighters (which every team did) or

just supporting each other in the creative process. As Tim Pieraccini aptly puts it, "We were exceptionally lucky with our team; everyone was totally committed from the beginning, and contributed ideas, energy and support wherever required"

Despite the broad mix of skills and experience within each team, certain tasks and roles were interchangeable so people involved had the chance to learn a new skill in a

practical way whilst absorbing the whole experience; other members of the teams were able to showcase and develop their existing skills in more defined roles within a team dynamic.

Time beats a harsh drum and seemingly no sooner had the challenge begun than we found ourselves at the packed Red Roaster Café on St James Street on a sunny May evening pumping our bodies full of caffeine in anticipation of the screenings. The showing of each of the films displayed a vast array of endeavour and artistic intent. Each film produced its own version of the Poe story, unique in plot, delivery and style. This film challenge showcased the strengths of the participants to work within given restrictions which proved not to be confining, but liberating and demonstrated that constraints do not have to impede artistic vision but instead can propel it and direct it to new and exciting areas of exploration.

# Contributors

What would your super power be?

Photography by Karolina Szatna, inspired by Jan von Holleben



Matthew Hamblion



Fiona Hurd



Daniel Fawcett

Dan Childs



James Marcus Tucker



Benoît Schmit



M. Bradlè S. Tuc



# The Brighton Filmmakers' Coalition

The BFC meet every Sunday at 6pm; the meetings are open for anybody interested in filmmaking to come to and discuss projects and meet other filmmakers. There is also an opportunity for people to show their films or discuss their ideas and receive feedback and advice from other members. The meetings are informal and open to anybody with all levels of film experience.

We run quarterly film challenges in which films are made under rules/restrictions and in a set period of time in a collaborative way; these challenges are a great way to form new friendships and get hands-on experience of making a film in a supportive and un-competitive environment.

For more information please join our facebook page:

The Brighton Filmmakers Coalition OR email [d.j.fawcett@googlemail.com](mailto:d.j.fawcett@googlemail.com)

Please note our venue currently changes from week to week so please check facebook for up to date information.

## Sponsors of One + One



Ethical, Natural, GM Free... [www.infinityfoodsretail.co.uk](http://www.infinityfoodsretail.co.uk)



Illustration and Graphic design, [www.buenito.com](http://www.buenito.com)



Video Production, [www.gilrei.com](http://www.gilrei.com)

And all the individuals who have contributed to the printing costs of the journal.