

Auteur Theory

and its implications

IJOART

AUTHOR:

ANEK CHAUDHURI

Preface

The dissertation has been prepared through meticulous research and valid references relating to the field of Cinema. The paper is based on the Auteur Theory proposed by the French critics in the 1960s and thereafter, has been devised and polished by various theorists.

The theory has been utilised as a derivation to justify, appreciate and scrutinize the art of filmmaking and the factors that create the pantheon of good directors by the undersigned person.

Aneek Chaudhuri

IJOART

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to thank Mr. Deb Chowdhury who first inculcated a strong inclination towards the medium that initiated this piece. This was in 2013, when authorship came under my scanner.

I am grateful to my professor Mr. C.G. Jain for bearing with me through the long period of gestation. The blame for the delay or any kind of blemishes present in the material rests squarely on my shoulders.

I express my respect and gratitude to Dr. Debasish Chaudhuri, Ph.D. in Human Resource Management, who has guided me technically in the completion of this paper.

Finally, a special word of thanks to my mother and my fiancée for inspiring me at every stage from inception to its emergence as a finished entity.

Aneek Chaudhuri

IJOART

INTRODUCTION

In film criticism, auteur theory holds that a director's film reflects the director's personal creative vision, as if they were the primary "auteur" (the French word for "author"). In spite of—and sometimes even because of—the production of the film as part of an industrial process, the auteur's creative voice is distinct enough to shine through all kinds of studio interference and through the collective process.

In law, the film is treated as a work of art, and the auteur, as the creator of the film, is the original copyright holder. Under European Union law, the film director is considered the author or one of the authors of a film, largely as a result of the influence of auteur theory.

Auteur theory has influenced film criticism since 1954, when it was advocated by film director and critic François Truffaut. This method of film analysis was originally associated with the French New Wave and the film critics who wrote for the French film review periodical *Cahiers du Cinéma*. Auteur theory was developed a few years later in the United States through the writings of *The Village Voice* critic Andrew Sarris. Sarris used auteur theory as a way to further the analysis of what defines serious work through the study of respected directors and their films.

Its Origin

Auteur theory draws on the work of a group of cinema enthusiasts who wrote for *Cahiers du Cinéma* and argued that films should reflect a director's personal vision. The championed filmmakers such as Akira Kurosawa, Satyajit Ray, Alfred Hitchcock, Howard Hawks, and Jean Renoir are known as absolute "auteurs" of their films. Although André Bazin, co-founder of the *Cahiers*, provided a forum for auteurism to flourish, he explained his concern about its excesses in his article "On the Auteur Theory" (*Cahiers du Cinéma* #70, 1957). Another element of auteur theory comes from Alexandre Astruc's notion of the *caméra-stylo* or "camera-pen", which encourages directors to wield cameras as writers use pens and to guard against the hindrances of traditional storytelling.

Truffaut and the members of the *Cahiers* recognized that movie-making was an industrial process. However, they proposed an ideal to strive for, encouraging the director to use the commercial apparatus as a writer uses a pen, and, through the *mise en scène*, imprint his or her vision on the work (minimizing the role of the screenwriter). Recognizing the difficulty of reaching this ideal, they valued the work of directors who came close.

The definition of an auteur has been debated upon since the 1940s. Andre Bazin and Roger Leenhardt presented the theory that it is the director that brings the film to life and uses the film to express their thoughts and feelings about the subject matter as well as a world view as an auteur. An auteur can use lighting, camerawork, staging and editing to add to their vision.

Developments

In his 1954 essay "Une certaine tendance du cinéma français" ("A certain tendency in French cinema"), François Truffaut coined the phrase "la politique des Auteurs", asserting that the worst of Jean Renoir's movies would always be more interesting than the best of the movies of Jean Delannoy. "Politique" might very well be translated as "policy" or "program"; it involves a conscious decision to value and look at films in a certain way. One might see it as the policy of treating any director that uses a personal style or a unique world view as an Auteur. Truffaut criticized the Cinema of Quality as "Scenarists' films", which are works that lack originality and rely on literary classics. According to Truffaut, this means that the director is only a *metteur en scene*, a "stager". This tradition suggests that the screenwriter hands the script to the director and the director simply adds the performers and pictures. Truffaut provocatively said: "(t)here are no good and bad movies, only good and bad directors".

Truffaut's article, by his own admission, dealt primarily with scenarists or screenwriters, precisely the screenwriting duo Jean Aurenche and Pierre Bost, who, Truffaut believed, simplified and compromised many of the great works of French literature in order to support the political agenda of their day. In Truffaut's article, he references the director Claude Autant-Lara's characterization of his adaptation of Raymond Radiguet's *Devil in the Flesh* as an "anti-war" book, citing the problem that the book pre-dated the Second World War. Truffaut applied the term "auteur" to directors like Jean Renoir, Max Ophüls, Jacques Becker, Jacques Tati, and Robert Bresson, who, aside from exerting their distinct style, wrote the screenplays or worked on the writing of screenplays of their films.

In its embryonic form, the auteur theory dealt with the nature of literary adaptations and Truffaut's discomfort with the screenwriters Aurenche's and Bost's maxim that any film adaptation of a novel should capture the spirit of the novel and deal

only with its "filmable" aspects. Truffaut believed that film directors like Robert Bresson were able to use the film narrative to approach even the so-called "unfilmable" scenes. To support this assertion, he used the film version of Georges Bernanos's *Diary of a Country Priest*.

Much of the writing of Truffaut and his colleagues at the film criticism magazine *Cahiers du cinéma* was designed to lambaste not only the post-war French cinema but especially the big production films of the *cinéma de qualité* ("quality films"). Although it has become widely believed that Truffaut's circle referred to these films with disdain as sterile, old-fashioned *cinéma de papa* (or "Dad's cinema"), in fact Truffaut never used the term "*cinéma de papa*". During the Nazi occupation, the Vichy government did not allow the exhibition of U.S. films such as *The Maltese Falcon* and *Citizen Kane*. In 1946, when French film critics were finally able to see the 1940s U.S. movies, they were enamoured with these films.

Truffaut's theory maintains that a good director (and many bad ones) exerts such a distinctive style or promotes such a consistent theme that his or her influence is unmistakable in the body of his or her work. Truffaut himself was appreciative of directors whose work showed a marked visual style (such as Alfred Hitchcock) as well as those whose visual style was less pronounced but whose movies reflected a consistent theme (such as Jean Renoir's humanism). Truffaut et al. made the distinction between *auteurs* and '*metteurs en scene*', the latter not being described as inferior directors making inherently poor films, just lacking the authorial signature.

Impact

The *auteur* theory was used by the directors of the *nouvelle vague* (New Wave) movement of French cinema in the 1960s (many of whom were also critics at the *Cahiers du Cinéma*) as justification for their intensely personal and idiosyncratic films. One of the ironies of the *Auteur* theory is that, at the very moment Truffaut was writing, the break-up of the Hollywood studio system during the 1950s was ushering in a period of uncertainty and conservatism in American cinema, with the result that fewer of the sort of films Truffaut admired were actually being made.

The "*auteur*" approach was adopted in English-language film criticism in the 1960s. In the UK, Movie adopted *Auteurism*, while in the U.S., Andrew Sarris introduced it in the essay, "*Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962*". This essay is where the term, "*Auteur theory*", originated. To be classified as an "*auteur*", according to Sarris, a director must accomplish technical competence in their technique, personal style in terms of how the movie looks and feels, and interior meaning (although many of Sarris's *auterist* criteria were left vague[citation needed]). Later in the decade, Sarris published *The American Cinema: Directors and Directions, 1929–1968*, which quickly became the unofficial bible of *auteurism*.

The *auteurist* critics—Truffaut, Jean-Luc Godard, Claude Chabrol, Éric Rohmer—wrote mostly about directors, although they also produced some shrewd appreciations of actors. However later Truffaut wrote: the *auteur* theory "was started by *Cahiers du Cinema* and is forgotten in France, but still discussed in American periodicals."

Identifying an Auteur

When you wake up, suppose in the search of eliminating idle-ship trod up a specific miles and you reach a bookstore. If it's a self-check place, either you will look out for the bestsellers, identifying the stocks that are usually tagged 'not bad!' or, you may choose a book by a specific author. If you are one among the class of the followers, then well is the idea to combat boredom. But, if you belong to the latter shows your inclination towards the style (literal and/or beautification) adopted by the auteur a.k.a. the author in crafting a visual synthesis for its readers. In a mere simplification, a creation has to be a modest patent of its creator and this relationship is best understood by the latter group. Although an auteur is to be simplified being most able to foster his/her creation, there are people who would always prefer to treat a piece of novel or poetry as an accompaniment to alleviate monotone or even at times, to pretend the opacity of intellect.

Such is the gap between what we may call as a cinema profounder and a movie fan that tougher becomes the process of identifying a Cinema Auteur.

IJOART

Following Sarris' theory of authorship

Andrew Sarris has been quite courteous to express his credit to the Cahiers critics for the original formulation of the theory of authorship in Cinema. As per the theorist, Truffaut had described the Auteur theory as a polemic weapon for a given time at a given place and taking him by his word, Sarris attempts to cite his ideologies on the same.

The theory strictly overstates that "good films are made by good directors, bad films by bad directors".

But, who according to the critics is a good director?

As stated earlier, a film should often behold the mark of a director's signature, and a portfolio of the director's preceding films determines his visible prominence.

But, what if an able director has not been successful in his previous projects?

The above lying queries have been derived by Sarris into a more justifying position that "a good director may possibly have an off day and a lousy director may end up making a fair odd movie but predominantly auteurs make the better layer of cinema."

Sarris isolates three areas of competence: technical, personal style and inner meaning with respect to directing a film. The first premise acts as a criterion of value to the art-piece. A badly directed or undirected film has no criterion of values, but one can surely make conversation about the sets, costumes, cinematography, editing, music and so forth. If a director is praised with hints of scattered compliments, then his job seeks a scanner of concentration towards every element of mise en scene. That might be the surface of the medium that one gets the acclaim not wholly deserved, but to be a great director one needs to have a blend of an elementary flair of the medium and a technical mastery lest he should be an alien, even to the pantheon of 'good' directors.

To become a great director, one at least needs to be a good director- Andrew Sarris

The second premise is the personal style of the directors that presents a distinctive mannerism of each auteur's films. An auteur should exhibit certain recurrent characteristics as his signature. The aesthetics and visual presentation of a film should be the representations of a director's mind and may express what the director feels and thinks.

Apart from the former canons, the third premise has been defined as "an interior meaning that is extrapolated from the tension between a director's personality and his material... Sometimes a great deal of corn must be husked in order to yield a few kernels of internal meaning."

Internal meaning, sometimes can be pre-planned but most of the times it occurs as a substance of unknown spontaneity on the sets. To understand it more precisely, it needs a patient observance of the art form (even more than once).

Talking of spontaneity and explaining the third premise elaborately becomes quite interpretative. An excerpt from Satyajit Ray's PROTIDWONDI sets in at the road where a mob attacks a Mercedes car; all of a sudden Siddhartha, the protagonist diverts his path to join the mob (furiously) and starts beating up the vehicle with an unscreened motive. Therefore, it is more comfortable to point out the specific moments of screened beauty minus the actual interpretation of the moments of recognition.

Suppose, we are watching a complicated avante-garde creation like Last year in Marinbad; neither do we offer to chuck the tapes and walk out (hardly an option), nor do we have the time or patience to view each scene twice for a closer revelation. Sarris has validly quoted "all I can do is point at the specific beauties of screen meaning and later, catalogue the moments of recognition" which applies to the surface for attaining the so desired 'closer revelation' of the medium.

Auteur Structuralism: Peter Wollen

In his book Signs and Meaning in the Cinema (1969), the British critic Peter Wollen formalises this position of the identity of a director being constructed by the viewer, by applying structuralism or semiotic theory. He points out that the impact of American cinema on post-war France was exaggerated because it was so much a breath of fresh air after the limitations of the wartime repertoire, plus the economics of the Paris cinema clubs exposed the French cinephiles to many more films than would have usually been the case. Authorship in this context risks becoming a cult of personality, with certain directors burning very brightly. He also criticises Sarris's position for its over-unification of the Cahiers approach, which, after all, had been evolved by individuals rather than codified by manifestos: some of the Cahiers critics actually preferred metteurs

en scene to auteurs, and some were more interested in theme than style. Directors of the second rank were acclaimed before any real sense of their worth could be arrived at- and now, with almost every movie being labelled 'An X film' the currency is devalued.

Wollen argues for an analysis of directors who have had lengthy careers- in particular Howard Hawks and John Ford. Steven Spielberg or Woody Allen might be considered as auteurs after three decades, but it is simply too early to tell for, say, Kevin Smith or Spike Lee. A director who keeps on making the same film (the kind) may be impressive, but is not great in Wollen's model. On the other hand, a director may be an auteur even if he has made a film about people menaced by a truck or a shark, visits from aliens of various kinds, slaves who go home or a completely misconceived Troy. Although, he writes of locating 'antimonies' within the movies of individual directors, he also argues against the use of auteur theory to insert the idea of a personal vision within cinema and insists that the theory should not be a cult of personality that celebrates the unified artistic vision of an artist who just happens to be working in the medium of film. The name of the auteur is a convenient label under which we can trace a particular set of contesting ideas.

Auteur-ism in Contemporary Bengali Cinema?

The hypothetical impulses that were once stimulated in the year 1962 had by then reached other parts of the globe, especially where films are worth studying about. There have been filmmakers in the vernacular already mentioned although it came to my focused interaction when the actual cr me layer of Bengali cinema revived once again in the 1980s.

The part witnessed the emergence of Rituparno Ghosh with a dating delight 'Unishe April'. First of all, the query got to be reviewed was "what is a film all about?" A film much initiated on one's persistence of vision shall be based on capturing the fleeting moments in a permanent medium; in that way it serves two purposes-one, the persistence of vision gets strengthened and the other is of not revealing the awkwardness on screen. With the new venture, it brought many conclusions to the orthodox philosophy regarding a film. In Unishe April, I remember a scene when Aparna Sen is departing for a felicitation with her male friend; she has always needed her daughter (Debashree) to love her without the urge for a formal respect but does not intend to tell her about it. Debashree stands by the closing end of Aparna's room and her gestures clearly indicating a sheer beautification of awkwardness to converse which has resulted from a growing gap between the two over the years.

'Abohomaan' sparks a similar bridge between two generations stepping parallel to each other, yet, the awkwardness strives. It is a film based on the thin line between temporal and permanent relationships. Somewhere, an intersection can be discovered with a layman's convenience between Unishe April and this film.

In Unishe April, the daughter seeks herself as a reflected image of her mother's and in the latter mentioned piece, the son does the same and hence a complex arrives between two generations disrupting the flow of casual unorthodoxy between them. The tale of relationships, known but hardly expressed and the insecurity of losing self-personality amidst success and freshness has been the discovered genre in 17 of his films (the remaining two to be discussed later).

In his ventures, minus the last two, he has exhibited a particular kind of storytelling where the craft of portrayal and theme overpowers the simplistic nature of its characters. A filmmaking mannerism which relies more on beautification of frames and enriching the interpretative background has been the prime concern for the Auteur. The reason behind terming him as an Auteur is based on the early conclusions placed in 1960-70 which needs not to be perplexed with a personal approach.

Now, the derivation of Ritu's last two films might put him into a different layer, with due consideration. His 18th, Chitrangada is a character-prime cinema. Here, although, the storytelling is as probing as it was before, the narrative depends more on the character's soul. Here, frames and its beauty does matter, but not as it did earlier. The film states "the choice is yours, it's your life", where a man supposedly identifies himself with the woman's aspects and his feminism holds control of his life; is it wrong to live the way one wants? Or, the society should govern a constitution and else amended, shall be punished to humiliation? If I had to define a genre I would term it as 'explanatory and personal'. This had been something unable to be accepted by the viewers and the critics, although, for indifferent reasons; for the viewers- "how can Ritu Da promote a sexual preference that has always been a stained-up priority, and for the critics- "it is well too personal to adapt on-screen? Was it a way to recover the lack of new scripts?" and less to talk about his last piece' his 19th, which was a both artistic and cinematic disaster 'satyanveshi'.

Aparna Sen is somewhat not worth to leave out in the lists of parallel film makers when comes to our country. Aparna's 36 Chowringhee Lane is another remarkable contribution to cinema, particularly so as a first film. While there are a few scenes that effectually might have been abridged, the film is tightly and logically put together, its syntax guided largely by emotion and the parallelism of relationships which rarely impinges on sentiment. Her own intricately conceived story is the basis of a memorable film about the loneliness and the melancholy often associated with growing old.

36 Chowringhee Lane exhibits traces of awkwardness in a fleeting manner. The lead character Violet is played by Jennifer Kendal whose life moves largely between her tiny residential place and the school where she teaches, with periodic visits to the cemetery and the old people's home where his once robust brother has been kept. Realization of her brother's last phase of life and its relative insurance of her life expectancy typically puts her in frequent awkward states of mind. She soon starts to believe that she has no one to accompany her when she dies amidst her last forty years of solitariness.

It is on Christmas morning that Violet, coming out of church, meets up by chance with a former student, Nandita (portrayed by Debashree), and her boyfriend Samaresh (Dhritimaan Chatterjee). Just prior to their meeting we see the two worrying over whether to go somewhere for coffee and the problem created for Samaresh's pocket by their continuing need for getting about in taxis to gratify their need for snuggling. Violet invites them to her flat for coffee and cake, delighted at the prospect of having some company on Christmas Day after all. Although not being enthused of accompanying an elderly, they sneak in with an almost girlish approach from the old lady.

The callousness of their initial reluctance to take up Violet's invitation does, indeed, quickly erode and we soon see them enjoying her company as much she enjoys theirs. With a concealed motive, soon, the couple is able to ask for the place as a writing corner for Samaresh.

Then, the monsoon arrives and Aparna Sen derives flashes of interpretative brilliance; the tiny flat is occupied by the two new acquaintances and the landlady not present there. The monsoon has arrived and the wind is running through the flat, breaking the lock on the front door. Nandita and Samaresh are blissfully unaware of this. Violet is seen coming up the passage from the lift; leaves are being blown into the flat by the storm. She notices the door with its broken lock. Then, the director makes the scene interestingly ambiguous as Violet is transfixed by the sight of Nandita and Samaresh, seemingly locked in passionate embrace. The reaction depicted as a consequence is not of anger or shock. She seems to be in an awkward position, supposedly, being betrayed.

Japanese Wife is one of the fresh containers of parallel cinema in India, by Aparna Sen. This film derives from transparency and without the urge for any hidden interpretations behind a scene. The concept of this piece revolves around true love across a distance, might be unaffordable to reach physically, but, the essence of love strengthens via exchange of letters. The narrative structure of Japanese Wife differentiates it from a typical Aparna Sen Cinema. The storytelling is tedious and the characters seem hardly convincing, except the one played by Rahul Bose. Although, at times the film is able to bridge up an emotional ride between the characters but soon, it diverts whimsically. In shorter words, a temporal experience overpowering the permanent medium (delightful for the reader but not well showcased to the viewers).

Reviewing the Auteur Theory as mentioned by Sarris in 1962, one gets to know the following attributes of an Auteur (in Cinema):

1. An Auteur should showcase his expertise in all factors of Mise en Scene.
2. An Auteur should show a distinct signature of his flair in all his films that differentiates his films from that of others.
3. Internal Meanings derived from the scenes shall be crafted well by the Auteur.

What does one mean by Mise en Scene?

Mise-en-scène is a French term and originates in the theatre. It means, literally, "put in the scene." For film, it has a broader meaning, and refers to almost everything that goes into the composition of the shot, including the composition itself: framing, movement of the camera and characters, lighting, set design and general visual environment, even sound as it helps elaborate the composition. Mise-en-scène can be defined as the articulation of cinematic space, and it is precisely space that it is about. Cutting is about time; the shot is about what occurs in a defined area of space, bordered by the frame of the movie screen and determined by what the camera has been made to record.

The derivations to declare Rituparno and Aparna as an auteur are worth conversing about.

The first point is Mise-en-Scene; as discussed already, Ritu has been throughout his life an expert craftsman of the medium. He has meticulously designed the frames, lighting, structural adjectives etc. but, still in order to claim an advocacy in favour of him being an Auteur, he needs to attain all three points required to be an Auteur (at least one claimed by Andre Sarris).

On probing deeper, I concluded the need for integration of all the three factors or mentioned characteristics of an Auteur. Now, let's go back to an analytical approach again. Looking back at Rituparno's 17 films, he has not only showcased picture-perfect tales but the motifs and its beautifying significance too has played an important factor to Cinema. He had a

definite style or mannerism of his portrayals. Unishe April had the same transitional shift as in Abohomaan, or, the untold expressed through spatial and temporal excellence in his films like Utsab, Asukh and Bariwaali and so on. Be it his Tagore-ish charm or the conflict in relationships, there is something else to talk about in his films that stays him apart and unlike the others. Rituparno Ghosh has subtly produced the role of women in our society through his CHHOBI (feature films) - how it is and how should it be.

Now, let's talk about his 18th film – Chitrangada which tells us the story about a male choreographer who chooses to be a woman, going against 'nature'-that's what the society calls it. Conveniently dismissed by the members of the 'society' as fading his quality of cinema to justify his own identity (Rituparno Ghosh had been of the third sexual preference) was worth dumping into the bin. I can definitely have an Auteur's signature in it; Chitrangada is Rabindranath Tagore's creation where a girl is brought up by her parents like a male kid and hence due to gender mis-identification, she chooses to be a boy the rest of her life-the Tagore-ish charm appears here. Secondly, it does probe into conflicting relationships but tedious for the audience (including critics) to identify "who's normal and who's not". Thirdly, the transition between two generations does occur as well, yet, it stimulates under-empathy.

His last film, not considering that it was produced without his wholly interference (he passed away), it is not worth talking about, I mean the qualitative aspects of the piece. Let's make it shorter, it is a bad film.

Can an Auteur make a bad film? Or, does one bad film seize the honour of being an Auteur?

Although, the theory put up by Bazin strictly states that bad films are only made by bad directors, Sarris states that an Auteur definitely may have made an odd movie but predominately, he shall make better quality cinema.

If we take a closer look at Aparna Sen's Cinema, it does not differ much that of Ritu's films if the mise-en-scene and motifs are concerned. The transitions between generations, the emotions, intriguing sentiments and the art direction of the films seem as if it is propagating through a parallel path as that of Rituparno Ghosh's Cinema with a steep inclined point of intersection.

Similarity in the context of Auteur Theory-its advocacy!

Some of the responsibility for the meaning of the film devolves to the viewer, who is actively reading the film. The film that they see is not necessarily the one made by the director-in the sense that the critic doesn't necessarily see the film that the director has consciously decided to make from the material available. And it isn't necessarily the film seen by other critics. Whilst Wollen had identified certain recurrent structures within film, there is no universal structure of film within which these structures can in turn be fitted.

Equally, these structural relationships can be located in films by different directors. A particular set of characteristics-say, the combination of smooth tracking shots with reverse-shot structures and even montage, the portrayal of alienated individuals in a hostile environment, the preoccupation with looking and psychological states of mind, the importance of female characters, and the killer as gay-could be identified as Hitchcock-ian, irrespective of Alfred's intentions in making a movie. At the same time, if we were to pick a Brian De Palma film at random- say, Carrie-we may well recognise many of the same codes. Is this an act of homage on De Palma's part-which would involve researching his public pronouncements about his influences- or is it that there is no problem in locating the Hitchcock factor in De Palma?

Coming back to Bengal and its cultural linkage

The delicate grudge of Debashree towards her mother in Unishe April and Bhaskar's ulterior notions about his mother in Shwet Patharer Thaala seems parallel, with a male friend trying to bridge the differences. The prime point of intersection, when instigated, seems to be the cultural surroundings a filmmaker strives on. Focusing on our country, and specifically Bengali Cinema, tradition and culture shall be colliding among the arty lot.

The cinema is always governed by a fist full of social, cultural, economic and political factors. Keeping the trio aside, let's talk about culture. From the sophisticated lots in Bengal, where the richness relies on one's cultural knowing and its following intellect, one cannot keep aside his/her cultural background while making a film. Suppose, Aparna Sen writes a script about a woman, she may easily spot out the qualities that a picture-perfect woman should possess as depicted in the Tagore's or Bankim's novels; it is usual. Same would be in the case of Rituparno Ghosh while crafting a script. There will always be some scope for a contextual intersection while comparing a film with others but, it depends that what factors are the standard derivations that might hamper a film's individuality- the context, the content or the director itself?

As the second point stresses on the individuality of expression, what are the factors that defines a director's/film's individuality? Does the theory not considering cultural aspects? Is the Auteur Theory a vague phenomenon?

Accommodative conclusions

Are the Maura films by Almodovar different to the Abril ones? Can we really distinguish between a Grant/Hitchcock film and a Stewart one –for that matter, how does a Hitchcock/Grant movie differs from a Hawks/Grant one? To what extent, is the director a unified source of meaning?

Appreciating the Director

A film is the result of dedicated inputs from various divisions of the production team- be it writers, cinematographers, editor, assistants and even the script supervisor, each one of them has to carry out their roles with responsibility in order to accept a fruitful portrayal of the output.

Whether the auteur theory is one that suggests the director has a vision, or whether the marks of authorship lead us to posit a Hitchcock or a Fincher, the emphasis in this kind of criticism is placed on the director. This neglects the contribution made to the mise-en-scene by the director of photography or even the set designer, and ignores the role of the writer, the interference of producers and the performances by the actors.

This not only emphasizes the disguised appearances of the minus members of the creative team, but also, pays the director extra homage, which at times, is not deserved. I would like to recall the newly made 'Meghe Dhaka Taara' in Bengali with its star-cast overpowering the director's name. This often happens with new directors whose work gets recognised through the performances on screen rather than the lone credit of being a good director; a director needs to be crafting quality Cinema constantly so as to enter the pantheon of good directors lest he/she should depend much on the portrayals of on screen brilliance through acting excellence. For a true auteur, one should not completely base on recovering a thin storyline through powerful acting, or, concealing bad direction under an experimental art-direction, or, less significant cinematography through good directing techniques. A complete package, that's what one needs to come under the headline of being an Auteur-which needs to collaborative and in case, the director is not the sole crew responsible for the film, credits need to be dispersed or distributed amongst the categorical members of the mise-en-scene.

In that way, the theory is definitely a vague phenomenon that has never been enough to justify itself.

References

1. Andrew Sarris' notes on Auteur Theory
2. Peter Wollen-Structuralism in Films
3. Signs and Meanings-Peter Wollen
4. Our Films, Their Films- Satyajit Ray
5. On the Auteur Theory- Cahiers du Cinema
6. Film Studies-Andrew Butler
7. The Essential Mystery-John W. Hood

IJOART

IJOART