THE FILM CRITIQUE AS A FACTOR OF FILM COMMUNICATIVITY

UDC:316.77

Nikola Božilović

The Faculty of Philosophy, The study group of Sociology, Niš

This article has one aim, to show that the film critique has an inevitable role in the communication of the film work. The author respects the aesthetical factors of film communication which consist of the inner structure of the film creation, but involves in the "play" the film critique which represents an inevitable link in the chain of socio−cultural facts of film communication. The film critic is, in this context, the real communicator. He is, in a way, a mediator between the work (author) and the audience (society). The author draws the conclusion that a great number of so-called, theoreticaly non−defined film critiques, which disables the audience from getting a real view into the quality of the film work. Film criticism must give up the parameters of literary and art criticism and it has to prove itself as an autonomous one, be it is based on aesthetical, psychological or sociological criteria. The possibilities of sociological film criticism are especially considered in this article, which (criticism), with the other factors of film communication makes its inevitable ingredient.

Key words: *art criticism, film criticism, the possibility of an immanent criticism, arbitral courts, public opinion rejection, the sociology of film criticism, rational premises, emotional experience.*

1. FILM CRITICISAM AS A FACTOR OF FILM COMUNICATIVITY

When we speak of film communication we must not neglect film criticism which is an integral part of the communication chain. Often its role and place are overlooked although it could be proved that they sometimes represent the determining factor in communication with certain film works. A critic is in a way a link between this work and the audience, id est, between, the author and the recipients, shortly − he is a real communicator. A critic is, according to Hauser "a skillful carrier of mediation" and that is why he has the most

---

important role at mediation. "He, with his reception at the first sight, unreserved authority determines the reception of the artistic impressions to the measures of importance and quality one should keep when faced with the object of his experience" [1].

Film criticism is, as well as the art it refferes to, the most recent kind of criticism. The first attempt at film criticism, with the use of aesthetic criteria, was made by Adolf Brison in 1908, the theatre critic of the Paris magasine Le Temps, of the film "The Murder of Duke de Giz". Until that time a simple narration of the story or plot of the film was considered criticism.

2. FOR THE FOUNDATION OF THE THEORETICAL BEGINNING

Up to now film criticism, id est, the film critics did not achieve a clear social position. They mostly have to blame themselves for that because they let some common and amateur newspaper articles written by uneducated people be counted as criticism. That is one of the problems of film: everybody has a different opinion about a film and try to raise his individual attitude to the throne of common importance. "It is still considered that, about music, painting, literature, only those who theoretically are well familiar with the matter, are going to judge, can write, or they are creators themselves in some of these already stated artistic disciplines (theatre was most often the subject of literary writers, dramatists, aestheticians, then some ex−directors or dramatists). Film brought more "freedom" so more people thought that they were qualified and able to judge cinematographic works (in fact, their' criticism' was pure formula I like... −I don't like...) without a profound explanation for the stated judgement." [2] A criticism is really one kind of a relationship between a subject and an object, but anyway each individual opinion is not necessarily and cannot be at the same time critically valuable. The film critic B. Belan also blames film and film critics for the position non−adequate to their cultural contributions. "A great part of film criticism, says he, "still borrows methods and parameters from literature and art criticism. The same could be said for film production as well, which is for these reasons rarely regarded as a mass culture or new culture, rather as divulgatory, banal, low culture. As it overcomes those inferiority complexes towards the authorized culture, film could take over the function of an avant−garde culture because it belongs to it, which it had already   had in the past". Film criticism shares the destiny of film in this way, which by itself shows a dependent relationship. It seems, however, that the use or borrowing of critical methods from the other arts is not the only and the greatest parameter of the actual weaknesses of the existing film criticism. In fact, the analyses of an enormous number of critiques showed one serious weakness − the lack of a precise theoretical origin/common ground. The general confusion in writing about film is evident. These are the common examples which show how individual attitudes and simple reflections are nominated as general statements. One more bad characteristic of the critics, which is also dangerous in a social and artistic way, often evident in some film critics − they appear as conscious advertizers of films. "The critics more often accept indirect corruption. The critiques in the most widely sold newspapers are sometimes written by critics who are at the same time directors of publishing companies that publish the books they are writing about, or at least have some business relationship with them: they expect the same publisher to publish their book; the film critics have some sort of

business relationship with the film company at the same time when they appear as gentle judges of the works that company produces" [3].

Every work of art, and a film as well represents a media in which different meanings are interfering − philosophic, historical, sociological, psychological, ethical, anthropological and others. According to this, the number of layers can reflect the number of types of criticism. The ideal work of art should be a syntheses of all layers, but it is difficult, even to suppose, that it is possible to achieve it soon (or at all). The problem is that uneducated critics mix these segments without a definite attitude. Ethical principles are given exclusive psychological meaning, and a historical fact is explained as some general philosophic or anthropological ideal. That is why the real film critics, thanks to the mass of such so−called critics, can not attain the position they deserve.

Film criticism, as artistic criticism in the theoretical or disciplinary sense is the closest to aesthetic criticism. The aesthetic critic would, compared to other critical methods (sociological, psychological, ethical), represent one immanent critic of a film work, if one like that is possible at all, namely, if aesthetic approximations of the works of art are immanent to themselves or are they in a certain way evident? If the accomplished work is onthologically autonomical, there is no possibility for immanent criticism.

3. THE POSSIBILITY OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL CRITICISM OF FILM

In the field of communication, the aesthetic analyses are very important for film, and what's more they enable the sociologist to feed his own critical research and to compare results. Because the sociological approach is, as any other scientific approach, one-sided, the film sociologist is, as the critic, in a dilemma. Namely; is he in charge of the evaluation of a film? "If he is giving his judgement he is risking the arbitral court: if he keeps the adequate humbleness and gives up independent judgement, looking for support in the circles of experts, he is faced with the opposition of public opinion which prevents him from finding unique expressive criteria. Difficulties always appear especially in the field of aesthetic judgement, and for clarification of which the researcher who is researching mass culture, specially cares" [4]. How to satisfy that communicative side of criticism without destroying its theoretical and skillful validity? The only way is in the synthesis of the results of the research −aesthetical and sociological as well.

Since in a way he solved this dilemma, a film sociologist in the role of a critic can start with the profound expert analyses of the work. The sociological critique can include the general sociological statements which imply the social segments and the eventual general social and cultural values of film, and it can analyse special social components which are evident in a certain film; − educational, moral, ideological, political, id est, it world be best if a film critique of a sociologist could consist of both kinds of analyses−special and general.

A sociologist should be aware that artistic and the actual life truth are not always the same. Only in that case he be would not jeopardized by going directly into the wrong economical, political, ideological or any other social estimation by his artistic vision. So, a sociologist must know the environment that the film came from and not judge it independently from its socio−cultural context. E. Linden quotes some examples of nondeserved praises of a great number of French, American, or Italian films in GB (Great

Britain in which their "noncompromized, true picture of living in these countries" is emphasized. The same films are, let's say, in their countries characterized as artificial and non−real. The same happened to British films in other countries, which is the consequence of insufficient education or knowledge of the critics [5]. These examples show at the same time how the critic contributes to the false communication thereby giving false information. A sociologist need not be discouraged by the limitations of the sociological method which can not possibly enter all the wrincles of a film; he, first of all, must be afraid of his own weaknesses in using this method. In fact, none of the other critical approaches can give the complete picture of the work, not even if they are used together.

The work is completed by the spectator who, after reading the rational critical judgement, enters the cinema hall and the received rational premises are completed by his own emotional experience. The critical process itself contained these two activities: "one which is feeling and perception and the other which is the rational analyses, with the aim to examine clearly what these feelings and perceptions of ours really are (in fact we ask the questions and give the answers which are the core of rational activity, for ourselves, not for the work of art); both these activities affect each other; the analyses is possible because of the feelings, and they develop and become more clear under the influence of analyses" [6]. So the real reaction to the work of art never appears isolated in a human being; it is not only emotional or purely intellectual and rational but it is always the product of their dialectical unity.

4. FILM CRITICISAM AND TASTE FORMATION

There are, however, more kinds of film criticism which are different, according to their theoretical base. The film producers and experts, on the other hand, are not interested so much in different approaches to the film as they are interested in the common points that every criticism should cover. They understand criticism less theoretically   but more as practical. The critique is the important mediator in communication of the film and the audience so it should be made in such a way as to provoke and enhance communication. E. Tudor quotes Eisenstein that using the general, medial and big plan film provokes three levels of points of a film critique: "The General plan" should judge the ideological (or moral) truth of a film. "The Medial plan" is the point of view of the average spectator and it should first of all relate to "live play of memory". And finally "The Big plan" which has to develop the film into the parts he is going to analyse, as well as the way the film acts. The film critics should move through all three streams because only one factor cannot prove the acceptance of some film as a good one if the other factors are a failure" [7]. Eisenstein obviously thinks that the critique should be close to the film since he attributes to the critique the levels which make the film. Criticism for him should be in the function of the film and not one segment of analyses should be left to chance. It is proved to be the important factor of film communication in this way.

Criticism can influence aesthetical attitudes very much so it can be represented as an important factor in formation of film taste. To the more educated spectators it will offer an opportunity to compare or verify their aesthetic attitudes and the less educated will be

advised to see the real layers of the film, to understand the value of formally expressive approaches, as well as the unity of the topic and form of the film, which will lead to real, artistic communication. A. Hauser showed the influence of the critic on the taste of the audience. "The sensibility and associative ability, the taste of the audience and their aesthetic judgement are greatly influenced by the number of mediators, interpreters and critics, teachers and experts, well before the more or less obligatory measures and criteria of artistic values for these works have not been set up, which have not been yet proved by the academy which are still problematic in public opinion" [8].

The influence of film criticism is proved by the number of empirical researches. In this way the empirical enlightenment of the influences of the means of   mass communication to the choice of films of young people showed that it varies with age, sex and the type of school the examinee attends. It can be seen in this chart [9]:

SAMPLE	GIRLS	BOYS	TOTAL
1) The review in the newspapers	29,7	22,0	22,6
2) Film poster	-	1,6	0,6
3) A photograph in front of the cinema	0,6	3,7	1,8
4) Friends and acquaintances opinion	14,0	17,6	15,4
5) Topic of the film	37,3	46,5	40,9
6) The title	1,4	2,1	1,7
7) The name of the actor	17,0	6,5	13,0

After the topic of the film the critique in the papers is the most important factor in the choice of film for young people. The research showed that with the age of the examinees knowledge develops and the comments on the critique in the newspapers are used as the basis for film selection. So one can conclude that the press and other means of mass communication develop the ability of the critical opinion of the spectators and influence greatly the formation of aesthetic, in this case, film taste.

The analyses of the film audience, its taste and a film critique shows that together with aesthetic, socio−cultural factors play a great part in film communication. Tradition, and culture on the level of education determine the relations and attitudes of the audiences toward films from their own country or abroad. Socio−cultural influences are deeply incorporated into aesthetic attitudes of the spectators but they are not aware of it. Other socio−cultural components which influence the relation with film are national, class, religious, ideological, economical and professional. In   the end the film critique is associated with these factors and it is used to complete a complex socio−cultural chain of film communication.

REFERENCES

1. Arnold Hauser, Sociologija umetnosti (2), Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1986, str. 34.
2. Vladimir Petrić, Osma sila, RT Beograd, 1971, str. 122.
3. Milan Ranković, Opšta sociologija umetnosit, Svetozar Marković, Beograd, 1983, str. 152.
4. Antonina Kloskovska, Masovna kultura, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1985, str. 269.
5. Ernest Lindgren, Umetnost filma, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1966, str. 218-219.
6. Isto, str. 209.

7. Andru Tjudor, *Teorije filma*, Institut za film, Beograd, 1979, str. 26.
8. Arnold Hauser, citirano delo, str. 4.
9. Navedeno prema: Aleksandar Todorović, *Filmski ukus kod omladine*, Institut za film, Beograd, 1971, str. 60.

FILMSKA KRITIKA KAO
FAKTOR KOMUNIKATIVNOSTI FILMA

Nikola Božilović

U ovom članku želi se pokazati da filmska kritika ima nezaobilaznu ulogu u komunikativnosti filmskih dela. Autor uvažava estetske faktore filmske komunikacije koji se nalaze u unutrašnjoj strukturi filmskih ostvarenja, ali u "igru" uvodi i filmsku kritiku koja predstavlja nezaobilaznu kariku u lancu socio-kulturnih komponenti filmske komunikacije. Filmski kritičar je u ovom kontekstu pravi komunikator. On je, na određen način, posrednik između dela (autor) i publike (društvo). Autor zaključuje da je veliki broj tzv. filmskih kritika teorijski neutemeljen, što onemogućava pravi uvid publike u kvalitet filmskih dela. Filmska kritika mora napustiti parametre književne i likovne kritike i pokazati se autonomnom, bilo da se temelji na estetičkim, psihološkim ili sociološkom kriterijumima. U članku se posebno obrađuju mogućnosti sociološke kritike filma, koja (kritika), uz ostale faktore filmske komunikacije, čini njenu nezaobilaznu komponentu.

Ključne reči: *umetnička kritika, filmska kritika, mogućnost imenentne kritike, arbitralni sudovi, otpor javnog mnjenja, sociologija filmske kritike, racionalne premise, emocionalni doživljaj.*