

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

Chapter 1 : Joel and Ethan Coen : R. Barton Palmer :

Quentin Tarantino interviewed by Michel Ciment and Hubert Niogret for Positif magazine at Cannes festival, 23 May 1992. Positif: The scenario of Pulp Fiction owes its origins to some stories by Roger Avary and you.

Career Writer, director, producer, visual artist, songwriter, and actor. Actor in numerous films and television shows, including *Heart Beat*, *Zelly and Me*, and *Twin Peaks*, *Ramiriez*, and *Nadja*. Contributor of segment to *Lumiere et compagnie*. Segment director of "Dangerous: Member Directors Guild of America. Writings *The Alphabet* short film, *The Grandmother* short film, And producer and production designer *Eraserhead*, *Libra*, *Dune* adapted from the novel by Frank Herbert, Universal, With Mark Frost *Storyville*, And executive producer and sound designer *Twin Peaks: With others Driven to It*, With others *The Straight Story*, Disney, *Rabbits* short film for Internet, *Axxon-N* short film for Internet, *Darkened Room* short film for Internet, *Dumbland* animated series for Internet, Also author of unproduced screenplays, including *Gardenback* and *Ronnie Rocket*. Writer and director of the French television series *The Cowboy and the Frenchman*. *McCrillis*, writing in *World and I*, pointed out the "hidden, seamy side" that Lynch so often explores. But in the mids Lynch left home to study painting in Philadelphia, and as Combs quoted him, "I went to the big city and it scared me. It was real frightening. A kid was shot and killed half a block away. Our house was broken into three times. There was violence and hate and filth. The first, a film loop that was designed to be projected onto a sculpture, showed six human forms as they developed, caught fire, and vomited. Next came a four-minute short called *The Alphabet*, showing a child menaced by animated letters; its unique style impressed the American Film Institute AFI, which gave Lynch money through a program that usually favored veteran filmmakers. With aid from the AFI, production began in 1975. After exhausting his AFI grants, he stopped filming for nearly a year and sought a commercial producer in vain. He resumed production with money from friends, supporting himself with a paper route. The furnishings include a dead plant and a photo of an atomic blast. Henry joins his girlfriend Mary X and her parents for dinner, which consists of small, roasted birds that struggle and bleed as he tries to carve them. Now a single parent, Henry is unable to escape his demanding child. He imagines that his radiator conceals a paradise, where a deformed woman with curly blonde hair sings about heaven and smashes fetus-like objects underfoot. Its head swells and looms towards Henry, who suddenly appears in "heaven" with the woman in the radiator while an apocalyptic blast occurs. Lynch gave little thought to the audience potential of *Eraserhead* while it was in production. When the film premiered at the Los Angeles International Film Exposition *Filmex* in 1977, *Variety* gave readers in the industry a pessimistic review. After screening *Eraserhead*, *Barenholtz* signed it eagerly. He introduced it to the midnight-movie circuit, where it became a cult hit with young adults and other late-night film goers. To explain the popularity of *Eraserhead*, writers sometimes liken the film to the punk and new wave rock music that emerged at the same time, and which abandoned the sentimentality of s youth culture to forecast a grim future. Some reviewers found the result a dark social comedy, parodying familiar situations of love and marriage. *George Godwin*, who examined the "dream" from a psychological standpoint, contended that it is a nightmare of sexual repression. Sex made Henry a reluctant parent, and his sexuality remains as irrepressible and troubling as the baby. *Godwin*, who called the baby the dominant image of the film, argued that its head and neck, combined with a bulbous body that lacks both arms and legs, "can only be one thing"â€”the male sex organs. And keep their power. The film is based on the true story of *John Merrick*, a nineteenth-century Englishman who was terribly deformed by a rare disease. *Merrick* has inspired numerous biographers and playwrights, as well as screenwriters *Christopher DeVore* and *Eric Bergren*. Their script attracted producer *Jonathan Sanger* and financier *Mel Brooks*, both of whom viewed *Eraserhead* and decided that Lynch, despite his limited experience, would be an asset to the project. Lynch helped write the final version of the script, then filmed under conditions far more generous than those of *Eraserhead*. Filming once more in shadowy black-and-white, Lynch lingers on scenes of English factories; he shows *Treves* operating on the mangled

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

victim of an industrial accident. Some reviewers disliked the tone of the film, arguing that the script was too sentimental, its distinction between good and evil too simply drawn. Instead Lynch prepared to film his own original screenplay, "Ronnie Rocket," which he described in *American Film* as the story of "a three-foot-tall guy with red hair and a sixty-cycle alternating current. The book depicts an interstellar war fought among alliances of nobles, some monstrously evil, others led by a young idealist who is prophesied for greatness. The nobles battle for the planet Dune, an arid world where huge, vicious sandworms bar access to a drug that gives its users mastery of space and time. As scriptwriter, Lynch strove to capture as much as possible of the intricate detail that had made the book popular. But *Dune*, more than three years in the making, proved a major box-office disappointment. After Lynch agreed to keep the film on a low budget, his backer gave him total creative control of the project. First he shows cheerful scenes of the town in unnaturally bright, saturated color. Suddenly a man watering his lawn is convulsed with a stroke, and as a nearby dog blithely drinks from the garden hose, the camera dives into the grass where it reveals a swarm of insects. The ear, he discovers, came from the husband of a local nightclub singer; a gangster cut it off to frighten the singer into having a violent sexual affair with him. By the end of *Blue Velvet*, Jeffrey has killed the gangster and small-town tranquility seems to be restored. Lynch, however, closes the film by focusing on a robin with a writhing insect in its beak. *Blue Velvet* attracted widespread interest, both in the film community and among the general public, and gained Lynch such honors as a second Academy Award nomination for best director. Its scenes of sexual torment, however, sparked great controversy. The reactions of reviewers and film goers, while generally intense, ranged from outrage to admiration, and often involved a confused mixture of each. Wall, editor of *Christian Century*, called *Blue Velvet* the best film of the year. A writer for the *International Directory of Films and Filmmakers* characterized *Twin Peaks* as "a strange offshoot of *Blue Velvet*, set in a similar town and with [Kyle] MacLachlan [from *Blue Velvet*] again the odd investigator of a crime the nature of which is hard to define. The film sparked divided opinions among critics, some finding it "even more violent and sexually explicit than *Blue Velvet*. Lynch next wrote and directed *Twin Peaks: Fire Walk with Me*, a motion picture derived from the show and set in the same milieu.

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

Chapter 2 : David Lynch. Rozmowy - Richard A. Barney - ebook - Åšwiat EbookÅ³w

/ Tim Hewitt --Out to Lynch / David Chute --Blue movie / Jeffrey Ferry --A dark lens on America / Richard B. Woodward --David Lynch / David Breskin --Interview with David Lynch / Michel Ciment and Hubert Niogret --An interview with David Lynch / Kristine McKenna --Twin peaks: fire walk with me: the press conference at Cannes / S. Murray.

A Brief Portrait of the Artists 1. Barton Fink and Raising Arizona 6. The Coen Brothers Interviewed Filmography Selected Bibliography Index Acknowledgments This project would have been neither conceived nor completed without the advice and support of the series editor, James Naremore of Indiana University. I am grateful to him and also to Matthew Bernstein of Emory University for their careful reading of my initial draft. Incorporating their many wise and pertinent suggestions for revision has removed many an embarrassing error and oversight from the final version. My graduate assistant, Jennifer Lightweis, helped me identify numerous infelicities of form and style. Carol Betts of the University of Illinois Press read the manuscript with great care and saved me from many errors. The Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences library and film stills collection contributed film stills and photographs; I am grateful to Barbara Hall and the many others on the Margaret Herrick Library staff for their kindness and assistance. The Calhoun Lemon endowment and the Psaras Fund contributed money for travel and other incidental expenses. I thank them for their generosity. Carla Palmer lent her enthusiasm for and interest in Hollywood film to this enterprise and graciously tolerated her husband's preoccupation with the necessary research and writing. I have learned much over the years from our conversations about the movies. Joel and Ethan Coen Introduction: A Brief Portrait of the Artists Any book proposing as its subject the oeuvre of a contemporary film director must confront the somewhat uncomfortable fact that such an approach is rather out of fashion, at least in the academic discipline of cinema studies. For the last twenty years and more, film scholars have in various ways challenged the so-called "auteur theory," which is the view that the personality, interests, and vision of the director can be considered, in significant and substantial ways, as shaping his or her films as a unique body of work. In contrast, contemporary film theorists of a postmodern bent have increasingly echoed the cultural critic Roland Barthes theory of "the death of the author," proclaiming a historically conditioned fiction any notion that texts, literary or cinematic, exclusively owe their form or meaning to some "originating" individual. Within cinema studies, the standard view has now become that the principal usefulness of the film "author" becomes its ascription of the inevitable complexity and diversity of an industrial product to the creative urges of one person. The auteur theory, then, is not imagined as speaking uncomplicated truth; rather it may be conceded a certain utility within the context of cinema culture, where authorship functions as a shorthand method for explaining how films come to be what they are and come to say what they seem to say. As a result of the postmodern challenge, the auteur theory does not have the academic respectability it once had. Today film history is no longer organized, except in small part, by the concept of the great director. They have exercised nearly complete control over the ten "small" Hollywood films they have released through At the very least, considering the Coens as their author sharing creative responsibilities, Joel and Ethan can be considered for critical purposes to be an "individual" offers a revealing perspective on a body of work that has made a considerable impact on the contemporary scene. The productions of the Coens bear an obvious imprint that is personal, at least in the sense that it may be traced across their various films and made the proper object of a critical analysis. And yet, even though the films themselves strongly announce their authorship, the Coens have chosen to occupy a kind of anti-authorial position within the industry. This strange fact bears some further comment. It is an interesting paradox that as the place of the director within academic criticism has become less prominent, directors have become increasingly important figures within film culture in the broadest sense. Many directors Steven Spielberg and Martin Scorsese are notable examples as well known to the general public as anyone in the industry has ever been, except perhaps for major stars such as John Wayne and Tom Cruise. More important, perhaps, is the emergence within the Hollywood cinema of the last two decades of a

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

new role for the director, which has become, in Timodiy Corrigan's words, "a commercial strategy for organizing audience reception. What role does this new class of stars play within the contemporary industry? This is not to say, of course, that at other times during the history of the American cinema some directors have not attained a genuine stardom. Griffith, Frank Capra, and Alfred Hitchcock just to choose the most obvious examples were relentless self-promoters and managed, often in the face of considerable institutional pressure, to attain a celebrity diat rivaled that of star performers. What is new today is that, in this post-auteurist age, it is much more common and sanctioned for directors to cultivate a public prominence. Indeed, star directors now find dieir greatest importance in the promotion and marketing of the films they help manufacture. The moral and professional danger of such a development is, perhaps, obvious: The films of auteur-stars 2 I Introduction can, in short, become more or less dispensable with regard to their celebrated position within contemporary American culture. For most viewers, the cult status of Steven Spielberg, for example, makes irrelevant any substantial consideration of the problematic relationship between his more "personal" projects such as Schindlers List and those undertaken more strictly for commercial reasons such as the Jurassic Park "franchise". All the films signed by Spielberg contribute to his celebrityâ€”and his "bankability" within the industry. Though surrounded by the many luminaries among the ranks of contemporary directors who eagerly cultivate their public images, Joel and Ethan Coen have refused to become auteur-stars in anyway In fact, opposing the trend identified by Corrigan, the Coens have done their best not to be well-known "personalities. In other words, their small-scale productions which they write, cast, direct, and often edit reflect deeply their shaping influence, yet make no reference to some media-crafted image of their makersâ€”for the Coens have allowed no such image to take shape. No doubt, the Coen brothers have emerged to celebrity of a sort if only as "names" to be reckoned with in an American independent cinema movement that has flourished spectacularly since the s. No enthusiast of the contemporary Hollywood cinema is unacquainted with their signed work, whose virtues and originality have been recognized by critics, their peers, and those who love independent films. And yet no better indication of their ambiguous place in contemporary filmmaking is the fact that Fargo, while winning numerous awards from the Academy and other juries, is one of their smallest, most idiosyncratic and personal productions. It is a film without stars that lacks any connection to a "pre-sold" property and affords nothing in the way of merchandising possibilities. Yet who would be foolish enough to affirm that this film is typical of its time? The Coens have resisted the pressure that inevitably comes from such success to create something like a bankable "brand name" by work introduction 1 3 ing mostly within the confines of two recognizable genres, film noir and comedy. Furthermore, they have shown little interest in graduating from small-budget work to better-funded productions of greater scope and wider commercial appeal. Both projects, however, remain otherwise quite limited in scale. Such dispersal invites interpretation as a deliberate refusal of the position of the classical auteur, who is generally understood as a unifying force imposing a personal and singular design on a variety of materials. What matters most about the Coen brothers is that they have made some of the most provocative and engaged films to appear in the New Hollywood era. And yet their work has not been much taken up by diose within academe. In part, one suspects, this is because they have not played at being "authors" as other contemporary independent directors have, notably perhaps David Lynch and Quentin Tarantino. My hope is that the discussion to follow will demonstrate that their films demand and repay serious study. This book emphasizes the engagement of the Coens with postmodernism, broadly considered, as the second chapter explains in more detail. This book, then, is not mostly about them for which they will undoubtedly be grateful. Readers who are interested in more biographical details, production history, and star gossip than will be found here are directed to the six fan-oriented books that have thus far appeared details can be found in the bibliography. They dislike appearing on talk shows, being "seen" at industry-sponsored events, or even granting interviews which they often refuse, as they did when I requested one to appear in this book. It is significant, I think, that the Coens offer the fullest and most forthcoming accounts of their work to French journalists for the film journal Posi4 I Introduction tif, which obviously has a limited circulation in the United States. A selection of these interviews, which I have

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

translated into English, appears as the final section of this book. As their responses show, when questioned about their work, the Coens often seem to feign ignorance or a lack of interest, particularly with regard to questions about their engagement with classic films, literary texts, aesthetic movements notably postmodernism, and even the philosophical concepts that seem prominently displayed in their films. Thus, although the Coens are undoubtedly notables on the contemporary scene, their "celebrity" as a writing-directing duo could never "exceed" the movies themselves. Though witty, flashy, and filled with inventive visual jokes, their films are Barton Fink excepted more accessible than arty, inviting the viewers engagement on a number of levels. The first chapter of this study explores how the Coens developed their approach to filmmaking while completing their debut effort, Blood Simple, whose astounding success on the film festival circuit launched them on their commercial career in the early s. The second chapter defines their engagement with the complex movement within the arts called postmodernism, while the remaining four offer critical analyses of the six other Coen films that, to date, have made the most impact on the American scene: But first a brief overview of their career is in order. Born Joel in , Ethan in and raised in the St. Louis Park suburb of Minneapolis, Minnesota, the brothers are the children of academics. Their father, Edward, was an economics professor at the University of Minnesota, while their mother, Rena, taught fine arts at St. The brothers, they have often confessed, found growing up in the American heartland boring. They spent much of their time watching television, particularly old movies, which became something of a passion, inspiring them to produce their own "remakes" with a neighbor who shared the expense of buying a used camera. Uninspired by what public education in Minnesota had to offer, Joel and, later, Ethan, persuaded their parents to send them to Simon s Rock, a school in Massachusetts. In an environment that encouraged independent study, they thrived. After graduation Joel spent four unhappy years in the New York University undergraduate film program, taking away little from the experience. Ethan found his college years at Princeton studying philosophy more rewarding. After graduation Ethan joined Joel in New York City, where he had broken into the film industry as an editor working on low-budget horrorfilms. Their big opportunity came when they met Sam Raimi, a young man determined like themselves to break into the industry, which he soon did with The Evil Dead, which was made on a shoestring budget but, after a Cannes screening that drew the approval of the novelist Stephen King, won a commercial release. Raimi showed Joel and Ethan that they could break into writing and directing if they had the right land of project a genre piece with assured commercial appeal and if they could arrange sufficient financing. The brothers decided to do a kind of contemporary film noir, based less on their viewing of classicfilmsthan on their reading of crime fiction, particularly the novels of James M. Joel and Etlian wrote the script for what would become Blood Simple, working side by side, during the weekends of Unlike Raimi, who was happy to use unknown ac6 I Introduction tors in the featured roles, the Coens managed to assemble an impressive cast of mostly young professionals, including the character actor M. Emmet Walsh in the role of the crooked detective, who is also the film s philosophizing narrator. Interesting performances were turned in by the supporting players, including John Getz, Frances McDormand who would marry Joel not long afterward, and Dan Hedaya. They raised just enough to cover the costs of production. In order to make the most of their limited budget, they spent many hours on preproduction tasks, including the design of elaborate storyboards. The twentysomething Coens supervised the shooting, which was done in and around Austin, Texas. Out of money, they handled postproduction duties themselves including the film s spectacularly successful editing and even some reshoots. Their next production, featuring two rising Hollywood stars, Nicolas Cage and Holly Hunter, offered a complete change of pace. Raising Arizona is a wacky comedy about a career criminal who marries or imagines he marriesâ€”die whole film is perhaps a dream a prison guard and attempts to go straight. Hi Cage, ironically enough, finds that the demands of marriage, in parintroduction l 7 ticular the imperative to procreate and start a nuclear family, lead him back into crime, this time abetted by his wife, Ed Hunter. Because the couple proves infertile, Ed urges Hi to kidnap a baby, one of a celebrated set of quintuplets. Like Blood Simple, it is a highly stylized film, but with a very different regime. As far as art-house patrons and studio executives were concerned, Raising

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

Arizona did nothing but solidify the reputation of the writing-directing team. In making *Millers Crossing*, the Coens were thus able to dispose of an even higher budget, which was still small, however, by Hollywood standards of that time: In choosing the classic gangster film as their generic base, the Coens once again found themselves as part of a Hollywood trend of sorts. The end of the s saw the successful release of two widely acclaimed entries in the gangster genre: Their film is at times self-consciously ironic, even dismissive toward its conventions. As Terence Rafferty, writing for the *New Yorker*, put it, "This is not so much a gangster movie as an extended, elaborate allusion to one. The resulting twists and turns of a narrative that hinges on loyalty and betrayal are thus very hard to follow. *Millers Crossing* is a smart, witty, and often engaging film, but in the end it proved too confusing and remote even for art-house audiences. Though the main character, played by Gabriel Byrne, is a good bad guy in the mold of Humphrey Bogart's roles in the classic noir films *The Maltese Falcon* and *The Big Sleep*, his motives are never explained clearly enough to make him the emotional center of the narrative.

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

Chapter 3 : Norman Ciment | Revolvly

Interview with David Lynch Michel Ciment Hubert Niogret An Interview with David Lynch Kristine McKenna Twin Peaks: Fire Walk with Me: The Press Conference at Cannes S. Murray

The late Huub Bals, director and presiding spirit of the Rotterdam festival, asked me to give this talk, and, as I recall, it was well attended; the audience members included, among others, Eszter Balint the female lead in *Stranger Than Paradise*, Bernardo Bertolucci, Sara Driver, Jim Jarmusch, and Rudy Wurlitzer. A feeling of having no choice is becoming more and more widespread in American life, and particularly among successful people, who are supposedly free beings. On a concrete plane, the lack of choice is often a depressing reality. In national election years, you are free to choose between Johnson and Goldwater or Johnson and Romney or Reagan, which is the same as choosing between a Chevrolet and a Ford – there is a marginal difference in styling. Just as in American hotel rooms you can decide whether or not to turn on the air conditioner that is your business, but you cannot open the window. Whether we condemn or applaud the prospect, a first priority might be a simple evaluation of where we are. Whatever name or interpretation we give to this climate, we probably all feel that something is in the process of ending – unless we feel it has ended already. Just as the widespread interest in film that characterised the 60s was superseded in the 70s by a widespread interest in film-makers, the agnosticism about narrative which began with the *Nouvelle Vague* has ultimately led to a belief in headlines rather than stories – a belief that can be found throughout the mainstream of contemporary American media. This change in attitude can be detected in the way news is reported on American television as well as in the more obvious forms of popular entertainment. There are plenty of other signs. One central fact about the new American climate is that neither poetry nor criticism are publicly acknowledged as attractive vocations today, except as means to an end, which is power. To be more specific, twenty years ago, when I was a college student, several of my classmates wanted to be poets or critics. A friend of mine in his early twenties who writes like James Agee and is a Harvard drop-out has no professional or vocational interest in writing either poetry or criticism; he writes Hollywood scripts and his ambition is to direct them. I think his situation is characteristic; and as a corollary to this, most ambitious film critics I know in the States aspire to be not better critics, but more powerful. The irony is that, in the 40s, Agee himself aspired to be a film-maker. Students want to be directors or critics more than they want to direct films or write criticism. The legacy of auteurism is still with us, and while the death of the author may be an established fact in film theory and not incidentally most commercial film-making practice, it carries precious little weight in the more groupie-oriented media. In New York, only the critics are supposed to have power, and the ideas have to fend for themselves. As a direct consequence, scores of advance tickets were returned to the box-office, and the distributor who planned to release the film dropped it like a hot potato. The final irony, of course, is that to have a lot of power as a film critic in the U. Which is another way of saying that power of this kind is ultimately institutional rather than personal, despite some appearances to the contrary, and that the industry and general public are usually in agreement that popular criticism is merely a subdivision of promotion, which is run by institutions. The reason, in fact, why certain American critics are accorded superstar status is precisely the degree to which they reflect the institutionalised power of the industry. If a characteristic American publication of the 60s was *The Village Voice* or *Rolling Stone*, perhaps the equivalent magazine today would be *People*. For instance, one can read almost nothing in the *Voice* about the burgeoning underground movement of chiefly Super-8 films and videotapes shown regularly in such clubs as *The Pyramid*, *Limbo Lounge* and *Danceteria*. It was at one of these that I first saw a 35mm projection of *The New World*, the first part of *Stranger than Paradise*, and while the atmosphere there was hardly conducive to close analysis, it is nevertheless quite unremarkable that the *Voice* chose not to cover the event. What it chooses to cover, and only partially, are works shown in cinemas and by institutions – in contrast to the regular coverage given to more marginal films by Jonas Mekas in the *Voice* twenty years ago, which included reviews

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

of works in progress which he saw in private lofts. For the time being, though, we have the extraordinary success of a low-budget, independent feature called *Stranger than Paradise* – another film made in freedom and, incidentally another which celebrates anything but power. On the surface, at least, it may seem to resemble a Preston Sturges version of the American Dream come true. Significantly, both films are fantasies of other periods mired helplessly in the present. And sustained, contemplative lingering over a mood, idea, person, object or event is anathema to this kind of discourse. The makers of *Dune* and *The Cotton Club* sacrifice their greatest potential strengths – respectively, the visual gifts of David Lynch and the talents of several black dancers – to the nihilistic dictate of the music video, which supposedly assures the widest possible audience. Both films have seemingly busy narratives which lead nowhere, because they lack the dramatic variations which make narrative compelling. By contrast, the narrative of *Stranger than Paradise* is spare and uncluttered, which leaves the audience free to look at the actors and locations. It should be added that the lessons of such a success are not entirely lost on Hollywood, even if Hollywood invariably translates these lessons into bigger budgets. As evidence of this, an article by Dale Pollock in the *Los Angeles Times* early this year is illuminating: We have to start coming to grips with this. This de-escalation offers a hopeful sign, but it is clearly not enough to guarantee freedom. The relative roles that can be played by stars in Europe and the U. Regarding the latter film, I recall a rather desperate transitional period when a free screening in New York with complementary wine and cheese was offered to the public in an effort to stir up interest. But this is the work of individuals, not institutions or computers. One can only turn back to the AFI to see the effects of institutional power being used to preserve the status quo. The brutal truth is that communications equipment often reduces our capacity to communicate. Think of the increasing role played by telephone answering machines in urban society and you have a model for the double-edged role played by video technology in relation to the media. Thanks to cable TV, Americans live not in a global village but in a loose network of estranged communities, scattered feudal strongholds representing some but by no means all minority positions. Avant-garde film, for instance, has so far made few inroads in this area, sometimes for understandable reasons but sometimes due to ignorance or inertia. Playtime with its wings clipped for a video format is hardly the whole film, but it is still a useful reference tool. In the United States now, it is, significantly, easier to acquire *Ivan the Terrible, Part II* with correctly timed colour on videotape than on film. Some of the pleasures afforded by the original films are no longer available, while others are available for the first time, such as the Barthesian pleasure of scanning or skipping through a text with a fast-forward button. Even now, video recorders open the way to creating new texts by intercutting between old texts, and I suspect that in the years ahead this option may create a new genre of intertextual bricolage. Video technology takes a public art like cinema off the streets and places it on the shelf for private consumption. To think about contemporary video technology-which includes laser discs, high-definition video, Advent screens, image processors and all the rest – is to think about armaments and weaponry. The pause button on a VCR confers some of the power of a trigger – the power to stop something or someone dead in its tracks – even if the pause button has an additional capacity which the trigger does not of bringing the dead back to life again. And when we stockpile films on cassette the way that countries stockpile weapons or computers stockpile information, what does this do to the word-of-mouth communication we associate with public forms like theatre and cinema? The unique capacity of video is to make the work mortal and immortal at the same time, a form of survival through mutation – or death through embalment. Expressions of that change are visible everywhere: To understand the present American climate, one should look at a recent Hollywood film, *The Terminator*, which gives full expression to two important facets of this new desire: The surprising thing about *The Terminator* is how fundamentally cheerful it seems, given what it has to say. When the computer-villain Arnold Schwarzenegger has to decide how to respond verbally to someone pounding at his door, and a printout of the choices appears in his brain and ours, the moment is an epiphany of delighted identification: Imagine a remake of *Alphaville* with Alpha as the hero – an Alpha who has absorbed and refined both the brutality of Lemmy Caution – and the iconography of Schwarzenegger – and you have a new form of

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

utopian, neo-Sternbergian erotics, shared equally by Blade Runner, which views the present both as a sordid, densely claustrophobic jungle and as a desirable place to be. Ruiz, in his very different fashion, expresses some aspect of the same desire, rerouted through leftist politics – although for him, as for Godard, the computer-hero is replaced by the myth or the metaphysical system. Ruiz, of course, is a phenomenon conceivable only outside the U. Some of the obstacles which prevent this may eventually prove to be more apparent than real. While responses were mixed, one could argue that the absence of media fanfare again proved more of an incentive than a deterrent. If this means the end of film criticism, let me rephrase Godard – I await the end of film criticism with optimism. Cable is offering a good deal already, which makes one optimistic about it opening up further. In most cases, the films are shown complete and without interruption. The growth of multiplex cinemas in places like Toronto and Los Angeles allows for wider programming, and arts centres from Buffalo to Minneapolis to San Francisco bring in still more. Without the benefit of word-of-mouth communication of the sort we had in the 60s – which was a time when the media was both less monolithic and less trusted, and when not only could a student uprising in New York help spark off a much bigger one in Paris, but a film like *La Chinoise* could help spark off both – we can no-longer assume that most of the best and most relevant work is automatically finding its way to our doorsteps. Nevertheless, there are plenty of maverick triumphs around, with varying degrees of visibility. These are scattered phenomena, not symptoms that can easily be packaged into any particular trend – although it might be noted that many of these works presuppose a certain sophistication about filmgoing as a conscious activity. *Choose Me* demonstrates for the first time that the formal play with parameters of acting and fiction found in Rivette is translatable, up to a point, into a popular and accessible Hollywood comedy. It has been argued that *black leader* is read by most TV viewers as a transmission problem, and it must be admitted that it registers quite differently on film and on video. This entry was posted in Notes.

David Lynch: Interviews. B. in a talk with Michel Ciment and Hubert Niogret of the French journal Positif, the better the interview.

Do you prefer working within the conventions of a genre? We were more aware of working within a genre in *Blood Simple* than in the case of *Raising Arizona*. *Raising Arizona* seems more unconventional, a mixture of genres. In *Blood Simple*, we were aware that the genre, as a point of departure, unconsciously shaped the film we were making. In the case of *Raising Arizona*, we did not start off thinking about working with a genre. We intended, in a general way, to make a comedy with two principal characters. Our concentration was on them, rather than on what the film would be in terms of type. In the case of *Raising Arizona*, yes. The story was a way of talking about the characters. In the case of *Blood Simple*, we started out with a situation, the general outline of a plot. The characters came from that. And so it was just the opposite. In regard to *Raising Arizona*, why a second time in the Southwest? You come from Minnesota. Perhaps in part because we are not from the Southwest, which seems somewhat exotic to us, probably nearly as much as it is for you. In regard to our second film, that kind of desert country seemed the right setting to us. Once again, *Blood Simple* proceeded in a more organized, more conscious fashion. We did not deal with the real Texas, but an artificial version of it, an assemblage of texts and mythologies. The subject is "murderous passion. But what resulted from that was important to us because the film was imagined as a slice of life, a deliberate fiction that it was normal to set within an exotic locale. All my association with Minnesota, where we grew up, was rather lifeless. It could have been anywhere except Minnesota. Folk tales have a certain importance in *Raising Arizona*, like that of Davy Crockett. When we spoke with the director of photography, Bany Sonnenfeld, about the visual design of the film, we discussed that the beginning the film would be like a storybook, with pretty vibrant colors. That became part of the visual design. But she has a real knowledge of the regional psychology of the South, which is not to be found with many other writers. In the case of *Blood Simple*, the influence came instead from the writers of hard-boiled fiction like James Cain. Right, like the incredible character Stacy Keach plays in *Fat City*. Looking at *Raising Arizona* makes you think a good deal about the animation of Chuck Jones as, for example, in the supermarket scene. This was very much our intention: We tried to give them the energy of the animation in electronic games. It's funny that you mentioned Chuck Jones since we did not consciously think about him in regard to this film, while, in contrast, his *Roadrunner* inspired us in the long scene in *Blood Simple* where Ray John Getz tries to kill Julian Marty Dan Hedaya, then bury him. What was the point of departure for *Raising Arizona*? The idea of the quintuplets? In essence, after having completed *Blood Simple*, we wanted to make something completely different. We also wanted to use Holly Hunter, who has been a friend of ours for a long time. In contrast, *Blood Simple* took shape from an idea for a screenplay. The idea of kidnapping the baby was really secondary. This conflict enabled us to develop the story line, which is his aspiration for a stable family life, and at the same time his taste for unusual experiences. Right, this tension in his character was the driving force of the film for us. How did the other characters take shape, the two brothers who live together for example? At a certain point we said to ourselves: Was your shooting script very detailed or did you allow yourself a certain freedom during production? We worked at the screenplay until we were satisfied with it, and during shooting we were overall quite faithful to it. There was little improvisation in the dialogue. What changed a good deal, in contrast, was the visual conception of the film once the actors came in. During rehearsals, we were able to think of other ways of "covering" the scene with the camera. This was especially true of the scenes with dialogue. We knew what the visual conception was for the shots. It was down on paper, and that was reassuring. For example, the shooting location can pose problems that could not be anticipated. In order to make the most of the money, the film had to be meticulously planned out. Did the actors cause you to change aspects of their characters during shooting? This was especially true with Nicolas Cage and Holly Hunter. Nick is a comedian with a great deal of imagination. The same with Holly. But she

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

surprised us less because we already had her in mind when we wrote her role and because we had known her a long time. She appeared a good deal in plays by Beth Henley. For example, she was in the original Broadway production of *Crimes of the Heart*, which Bruce Beresford adapted for the screen. Could you give me some examples of how the actors participated in creating their roles? For example, we spoke with Nicolas Cage a long time about his moustache and sideburns. We asked if he should keep them for the entire film or, in contrast, get rid of them at some point. He was also crazy about his Woody Woodpecker haircut. The more difficulties his character got in, the bigger the wave in his hair got. There was a strange connection between the character and his hair. That, no, that was not in the script, those Hawaiian shirts. The motorcyclist character coming out of a dream? We tried to imagine a character who did not correspond specifically to our image of what evil is or of a nightmare come true, but rather to the image of evil that would occur to Hi. Being from the Southwest, he would see him in the form of a Hells Angel. We tried to connect the characters with the music. Where did you find the actor who plays this role, Randall "Tex" Cobb? He is not really an actor. He is a former boxing champion. In the beginning, he was a kind of Texas street brawler who then tried without much success to make a career out of professional boxing. He is less a comedian than a force of nature. He did a good job with his part in *Raising Arizona*, but he did cause us some problems. What kind of language did you intend the characters to speak? It's a kind of stylized slang. It's a mixture of local dialect and language that we imagined the characters would get from the kind of reading they probably did: The voice-over narration was one of our initial ideas for the Joel and Ethan Coen story. The first part we wrote was the ten-minute sequence that precedes the credits. In regard to the baby, you establish from the outset a mixture of sentimentalism and ironic distance. Some people find the end too sentimental. Once again, this does not reflect our own attitude toward life. We hide ourselves behind the main character! The two films you have made are very inventive visually. Were there any images that you had in mind before writing the screenplay? Yes, in some cases anyway. When we work for ourselves, however, we allow the visual elements to take the lead in the writing of the screenplay. While writing the screenplay, we knew we would be filming with more leeway and on a broader scale than was in the case in *Blood Simple*, which was more claustrophobic. I remember a specific image that pleased us as we were writing the film: This might seem like a minor tiling, but this image played an important role in advancing our writing of the film. For example, the first setup with the lineup and the character stumbling into the frame was described just this way in the screenplay. We work on the writing together, never separately. We hole up inside a room and we write the screenplay from beginning to end. In the case of *Raising Arizona*, we took three and a half months. We are both always there and never stop consulting one another. The credits point to a separation of tasks that is more rigid than is actually the case. As for Ethan, he is the one who takes charge of production matters. And the image of the two characters coming out of the mud?

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

Chapter 5 : SCREENVILLE: juin

The Coen Brothers Interviewed. Michel Ciment and Hubert Niogret Translation by R. Barton Palmer Interview with Joel and Ethan Coen (From Positif July-August) Your two films belong to genres: one to the detective novel, the other to comedy.

Dir-scr-act , Film Talk Sara Forestier: Forestier also appearing in the leading role. This communicational paradox is Ms. Chifoumi Productions Miss Forestier, why did you want to tell this story, write the screenplay, direct the film and play the leading role as well? There were many reasons for that. I was fascinated by this story, this love story, and the possibilities the two main characters have future-wise. I tried to take a look inside the privacy of their own lives, find out what their lives and their precious moments were like, and what their intimacy meant to them. Was it difficult to write the screenplay? No, because when I wrote the screenplay, I basically wanted to tell a story, and not every detail of it. It is based on what happened to me many years ago. So when you start writing about it, you work on the characters, you clarify everything, and adapt the characters so that you can actually portray them on the screen. You always keep in mind what you really want to say, make sure that you remain loyal to the story you initially wanted to tell, and stay focused to keep everything in perfect balance. Your casting is very interesting. I had cast six hundred men for the character of Mo. And when I saw Redouanne Harjane, he had this dark and destructive look in his eyes, the look of someone who had suffered. He had also lost a lot of weight before we started shooting, something like 45 pounds. When I did my casting " which took me two years " it was almost like an interview. I asked the actors ten questions, I liked that and it helped me a lot to see what they could bring to their part and to the film. I first looked at photographs of his, and with his long black hair, I thought he looked like a character who felt lost without the love of his life. I liked his approach and his spontaneity right away. He just has to be there. I like the characters to be fresh, although you always tend to create certain roles loosely based on people you may have met over the years. Do you have a different point of view on acting now, after directing your first feature? I have much more respect for film directors now, even more than had before. That depends on the role, on the character that I play. What about the speech impediment of your character? How did you learn to do that? Did you do any research? I met several people who stutter, and observing them was very important to me. There was one guy in particular I had been talking to, he stuttered, and I also started to stutter while I was talking to him. Then I shot a very important scene right away. Are there any directors who have inspired you to become a filmmaker yourself? There are film directors that I have worked with who have been instrumental in my work as an actress. He was available, and after he had read the screenplay, he was very curious and wanted to know all about it. When we started talking about the project, I just knew he would be the perfect cinematographer. And then, when I started editing the film, the first thing I did was to keep ten hours of footage " this took me a very long time " and those were used to edit the scenes. How did you manage to do all of that " writing, directing, acting, editing"? But once you start editing, everything is so real, it all becomes so concrete: Was it easy to finance your film? But at one point I had to put the project on hold because of the casting which took me much longer than I expected. So one day, the original financiers had left the project altogether, but I was fortunate to find other financiers. In all, I worked for four years on this film.

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

Chapter 6 : David Lynch - Director - Films as Director:, Other Films:, Publications

The Coen Brothers Interviewed Michel Ciment and Hubert Niogret Translation by R. Barton Palmer. Interview with Joel and Ethan Coen (From Positif July-August) Your two films belong to genres.

The three get a lift from a blind man driving a handcar on a railway. He tells them, among other prophecies, that they will find a fortune but not the one they seek. They sleep in the barn, but Wash reports them to Sheriff Cooley, who, along with his men, torches the barn. Pete and Delmar are baptized by a group of Christians at a river. The group then picks up Tommy Johnson, a young black man, who claims he sold his soul to the devil in exchange for the ability to play guitar. In need of money, the four stop at a radio broadcast tower where they record a song as The Soggy Bottom Boys. That night, the trio part ways with Tommy after their car is discovered by the police. Unbeknownst to them, the recording becomes a major hit. The trio inadvertently fall in with bank robber Baby Face Nelson, and help him with a heist, before he leaves them with his share of the loot. The next day, the group hears singing. They see three women washing clothes in a river and singing. The women drug them with corn whiskey and they lose consciousness. Delmar is convinced the women were Sirens and transformed Pete into the toad. Later, one-eyed Bible salesman Big Dan Teague invites them for a picnic lunch, then mugs them and kills the toad. Everett confronts his wife Penny, who changed her last name and told his daughters he was dead. He gets into a fight with Vernon T. Waldrip, her new "suitor. As it turns out, the women had dragged Pete away and turned him in to the authorities. Everett then confesses that there is no treasure. He made it up to convince the guys he was chained with to escape with him in order to stop his wife from getting married. Pete is enraged at Everett, because he had two weeks left on his original sentence, and must serve fifty more years for the escape. The trio stumble upon a rally of the Ku Klux Klan, who are planning to hang Tommy. The trio disguise themselves as Klansmen and attempt to rescue Tommy. However, Big Dan, a Klan member, reveals their identities. Chaos ensues, and the Grand Wizard reveals himself as Homer Stokes, a candidate in the upcoming gubernatorial election. The trio rush Tommy away and cut the supports of a large burning cross, leaving it to fall on Big Dan. Everett convinces Pete, Delmar and Tommy to help him win his wife back. They sneak into a Stokes campaign gala dinner she is attending, disguised as musicians. The group begins a performance of their radio hit. The crowd recognizes the song and goes wild. Homer recognizes them as the group who humiliated his mob. When he demands the group be arrested and reveals his white supremacist views, the crowd runs him out of town on a rail. Penny agrees to marry Everett with the condition that he find her original ring. The next morning, the group sets out to retrieve the ring, which is at a cabin in the valley which Everett had earlier claimed was the location of his treasure. The police, having learned of the place from Pete, arrest the group. Dismissing their claims of having received pardons, Sheriff Cooley orders them hanged. Just as Everett prays to God, the valley is flooded and they are saved. Tommy finds the ring in a desk that floats by, and they return to town. He claims to have escaped from prison so he can find a stash of money he had hidden, though in reality it is so he can get back to his family before his wife remarries. He corresponds to Odysseus Ulysses in the Odyssey. He agreed to go along with the breakout, though he only had two weeks left on his sentence. He is the accompanying guitarist in the Soggy Bottom Boys. He claims he sold his soul to the devil in exchange for his skill on the guitar. He shares his name and story with Tommy Johnson, a blues musician with a mysterious past, who is said to have sold his soul to the devil at the Crossroads a story more often attributed to Robert Johnson. He later reveals the identity of the trio when they are disguised at a Ku Klux Klan rally, but they kill him by cutting loose a burning cross, which falls on him and the Klansmen. He corresponds to the cyclops Polyphemus in the Odyssey. She is engaged to Vernon T. Waldrip until Everett wins her back. She corresponds to Penelope in the Odyssey. He is frequently seen berating his son and his campaign managers, who are depicted as simpletons. The character is based on Texas governor W. He shares a name with Menelaus, an Odyssey character, but corresponds with Zeus from the narrative. He intends to hang them nonetheless, but when the valley is flooded, he, his men, and his dog all

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

drown. He corresponds to Poseidon in the *Odyssey*. He travels the countryside with a dwarf, who depicts the "little man", and a broom, with which he promises to "sweep this state clean. He falsely identifies Everett, Pete, and Delmar as people of color because they darkened their faces to remain unseen when freeing Tommy. Ray McKinnon as Vernon T. It has been suggested that his name is a nod to novelist Howard Waldrop , whose novella *A Dozen Tough Jobs* is one of the inspirations for the film. Nelson died in a shootout known as the Battle of Barrington rather than by electric chair, as suggested in the film. Stephen Root as Mr. He corresponds to Homer. He corresponds to Tiresias in the *Odyssey*. Work on the script began in December , long before the start of production, and was at least half-written by May Despite the fact that Ethan Coen described the *Odyssey* as "one of my favorite storyline schemes," neither of the brothers had read the epic, and they were only familiar with its content through adaptations and numerous references to the *Odyssey* in popular culture. Clooney agreed to do the role immediately, without reading the script. The Coens used digital color correction to give the film a sepia -tinted look. They wanted it to look like an old hand-tinted picture, with the intensity of colors dictated by the scene and natural skin tones that were all shades of the rainbow. It makes reference to the traditions, institutions, and campaign practices of bossism and political reform that defined Southern politics in the first half of the 20th century. The Ku Klux Klan, at the time a political force of white populism , is depicted burning crosses and engaging in ceremonial dance. Senator from that state. *O Brother, Where Art Thou?* Producer and musician T Bone Burnett worked with the Coens while the script was still in its working phases, and the soundtrack was recorded before filming commenced. Selected songs in the film reflect the possible spectrum of musical styles typical of the old culture of the American South: Two of the variations feature the verses being sung back-to-back, and the other three variations feature additional music between each verse. Best Adapted Screenplay and Best Cinematography. *Soggy Bottom Boys*[edit] The *Soggy Bottom Boys* is the musical group that the main characters form to serve as accompaniment for the film.

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

Chapter 7 : David Lynch - The Art Life () de Jon Nguyen, Rick Barnes et Olivia Neergaard-Holm - Shangols

David Lynch. Rozmowy z "Interview with David Lynch". MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET. (Chris Douridas, Michel Ciment i Hubert Niogret), jak r

With a budget of 25 million dollars, it was a serious blow when the box office outcome gave them back only a tenth of the invested funds. This was a delicate time for the filmmaking brothers, as they had reached a specific point in their career where the next project would most likely be the deciding one. But *Fargo*, the humorous dark comedy we have all gotten to love in the years since, turned out to be a huge commercial and critical success, opening the doors of mainstream America for the two brothers whose unique authorial voice had been perceived too unapproachable for the average film lover. Gunderson, the police officer who tries to decipher the monstrous events unfolding around her, is the emotional and moral center of the story, the anchor in the overwhelming storm of wrongdoings that engulfs the small town unused to big-city-corruption and abomination. What should also be noted is that *Fargo* is a typical Coen film in both the thematical and stylistic aspects, and as such served as the stepping stone of the general audience in their entry into the world of one of the most distinguishable filmmaking forces of contemporary cinema. Macy, Peter Stormare and Harve Presnell. A big commercial hit in the United States, *Fargo* experienced almost uniformly enthusiastic response from the critics when it came out in March. How much it resonated within the film-appreciating community can be also seen in the fact it was selected for preservation in the US National Film Registry by the Library of Congress as early as in . A monumentally important screenplay. For educational and research purposes only. Absolutely our highest recommendation. In the interview which follows, initially published in , Joel and Ethan Coen discuss the writing and filming of *Fargo*, its precise characterizations, acting performances and the visual style that emphasizes the spiritual landscape of the bleak Midwestern setting. University Press of Mississippi, Did some news item inspire *Fargo*, as the press kit suggests, or is that another false trail that you two have laid? In its general structure, the film is based on a real event, but the details of the story and the characters are fictional. We were not interested in making a documentary film, and we did no research about the nature of the murders or the events connected to them. But in warning viewers that we had found our inspiration from a real story, we were preparing them to not view the film like an ordinary thriller. Did this kidnapping of a wife organized by her husband create a good deal of sensation in ? In fact, its surprising how many things of this land get very little publicity. We heard about it from a friend who lived very close to where the story unfolded in Minnesota, which also happens to be where we are from. Why did you call the film *Fargo* when the important action of the film is set in Brainerd, which is in Minnesota, and not *Fargo*? Here you returned somewhat to the territory of your first films, *Blood Simple* and *Raising Arizona*. There are some similarities, but also some important differences. These three films are all small-scale productions, their main themes relate to criminality, to kidnapping, and they are also very specific in their reference to geographical locale. But we have always thought that *Blood Simple* belongs to the tradition of flamboyant melodrama, as given expression in the novels of James M. Cain, along with some influence from the horror film. In *Fargo*, we tried out a very different stylistic approach, introducing the subject in a quite dry fashion. Our intention was also that the camera should tell the story like an observer. The structure of the film also follows from the origin of the story in an actual event: Each incident did not necessarily have to be connected to the plot. We also allowed ourselves to withhold the appearance of the heroine, Marge Gunderson, until the middle of the film. This is also a way of signifying to the viewer that he was not watching a genre film, that we were not going to satisfy expectations of this kind. In this way too, the film differs from *Blood Simple*. What is it that drew you to the subject? There were two or three things about the actual events that interested us. In the first place, the story takes place in a time and place with which we were familiar and could explore. And then again it features a kidnapping, a subject that has always fascinated us. In fact, we had a screenplay that was quite different from *Fargo* that we would have been very happy to shoot. Finally, this subject offered us the chance to shoot a

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

crime film with characters quite different from genre stereotypes. When we begin writing, we need to imagine in a quite specific way the world where the story unfolds. The difference is that until this point these universes were purely fictional, while in the case of *Fargo* there was an air of authenticity we had to communicate. Since we come from the area, that helped us take into account the particular character of the place. Is that a gag? No, not at all. Most of the actors come from this part of the country, and they did not need coaching, but Frances McDormand, Bill Macy, and Harve Presnell had to have some training so their accents would blend with the others. This was partly how the characters were developed, and it also contributed to the air of authenticity. The people there speak in a very economical fashion, which is almost monosyllabic. This seems as exotic to other Americans as it does to you Europeans! In fact, the Scandinavian influence on the culture of that area, the rhythm of the sentences, the accent, all of this is not familiar at all to the rest of America. The story could have just as well taken place on the moon! When we were small, we were not really conscious of this Scandinavian heritage that so strongly affects this part of the country simply because we had no points for comparison. Certainly, all the exoticism comes from this Nordic character, with its polite and reserved manner. One of the sources of comedy in the story comes from the opposition between this constant avoidance of all confrontation and the murders gradually piling up. Our parents had always lived in this part of the country, and that means we returned there regularly and were familiar with the culture. Because we had not lived there for some time, we had the feeling of being separated in part from the environment where we had grown up. Someone mentioned to us that in this scene, Frances acts in the very restrained manner of an Oriental, while her Japanese friend is talkative and irrational in the American style. It was certainly our intention while writing this sequence that it should be a digression. This is also what happens in the scenes with her husband. Our intention was to demonstrate that this story is more closely connected to real life than to fiction, and we felt free to create a scene that had no links to the plot. The *Hudsucker Proxy* is no doubt your most stylized film. This one, in contrast, is probably your least. We wanted to take a new approach to style in this film, to make something radically different from our previous films. But curiously, working from actual events, we came to yet another form of stylization, in the largest sense of that term. The end result was then not as different as we imagined it would be! A little like Kubrick did with *Dr. Strangelove*, you begin with a somewhat documentary presentation, then little by little, with icy humor, everything comes unglued and turns in the direction of the absurd. That resulted in part from the nature of the story. There is a plan that is established at the beginning and which in the end changes as the characters lose control of it. When a character, in the first scene, tells you how things are going to go, we know very well that the unfolding of the story will go in a quite different direction. Others have also made reference to Kubrick, and I see the connection. His approach to the material is very formal, but then progresses regularly from the prosaic to the baroque. How did you succeed in never falling into caricature, a danger because of the kind of story you work with? I suppose intuition plays some role with regard to our choice of style, and, even more, it depends a great deal on the actors and their ability to know when they might be going too far. That prevents Marge from becoming a parody of herself. Frances was very conscious of the dangers posed by excessiveness because of the quirk she used of dragging out the end of every sentence. We worked constantly on the set making adjustments with the actors. And that certainly helped, at the same time, to create comic effects and make the characters plausible. The comedy would not have worked if the film had been shot as a comedy, instead of sincerely and directly. The relationship between Marge and her husband is also quite strange. We were intrigued from the moment we started casting by the notion of very simple interplay between them and by the impassive expression of John Carroll Lynch, which seemed to suit the tone of the film perfectly. He is the perfect incarnation of the undemonstrative personality of people from that region. The relations between husband and wife are based on what is not said, and yet they succeed nevertheless in communicating in some sense. The end seems to be a parody of the classic Hollywood happy ending with the husband and wife on their bed symbolizing the return to order and to the natural. The only point at issue in the ending has to do with money. All the characters in the film are obsessed with money. At the same time, we did not want to be

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

too specific, for example, concerning the debt Jerry owes. It was enough to understand that this character had trapped himself by getting involved in some deal that had turned out badly. Moreover, during the entire film, Jerry is a pathetic loser who never stops improvising solutions in order to escape from the impasses he finds himself blocked by. He never stops trying everything, never stops bursting with activity. That almost makes him admirable! What we found interesting from the beginning in the character played by William Macy is his absolute incapacity, for even one minute, to project himself into the future so that he might evaluate the consequences of the decisions he has made. There is something fascinating about his total inability to gain any perspective. We had begun it before shooting *The Hudsucker Proxy*; afterward we went back to it, so it is pretty hard for us to estimate the time it all took. But two years had passed. Was it determined from the beginning that the wife, once kidnapped, would no longer be a physical presence? And at a certain point in the story, it was also evident to us that she would cease to be a person for those who had kidnapped her. Moreover, it was no longer the actress Kristin Rudrud who played her, but a double with a hood over her head. In this case, we had no interest in the victim. It did not seem that at any point the husband himself was worried about what might happen to her.

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

Chapter 8 : O Brother, Where Art Thou? - WikiVisually

Like the Coens and David Lynch, among others, Soderbergh furthered the development of an American art cinema with European characteristics like a privileging of character over narrative, self.

Carter, could serve as a concise summation of the cinematic outlook of Joel and Ethan Coen. Of all their films, though, Fargo strikes the most perfect blend of these two competing, or rather complementary, impulses. Such is the dynamic of Fargo. Macy , whose hare-brained, illegal schemes have gotten him in over his head even before the film begins. In an attempt to wriggle his way out of various entanglements, Jerry engages a couple of cheap hoodlums, Carl Showalter Steve Buscemi and Gaear Grimsrud Peter Stormare , to carry out an ill-conceived kidnapping plot. Is there any other kind? As is so often the case with such scenarios, things quickly spiral downward, and the bodies begin to pile up. Enter the very pregnant Marge Gunderson Frances McDormand, Academy Award-winner as Best Actress for this performance , a local police officer whose investigations eventually lead her to the car dealership where Jerry works. Jerry Lundegaard is the walking epitome of this pervasive emotional crisis; but we also find glimpses of it even in the most minor characters, such as the cashier at the diner, whose forced smile and false-cheerful attitude threaten to crack wide open at any moment. Of the developed characters in the film, only Marge and her husband, Norm John Carroll Lynch , seem truly happy in their lives. To return to Blenkhorn and Entwisle: However, she is more complex than that. It prevents Marge from becoming a parody of herself. Fargo has spawned two American television versions: Fargo , USA, 98 mins Prod. Frances McDormand, William H. The Middle of Nowhere? Cambridge UP, , p. Interviews, William Rodney Allen, ed. UP of Mississippi, , p. UP of Kentucky, , p.

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

Chapter 9 : 30 favorite films of Coen brothers - blog.quintoapp.com

Interview with M. Ciment and H. Niogret, in Positif, October " Twin Peaks: Fire Walk with Me: The Press Conference," with Scott Murray, in Cinema Papers (Fitzroy), August

Although the atmosphere is friendly and Grandrieux is clearly in total connivence. They are not promoting a commercial product with complacent questions here. This type of live radio show winds up a little confusing and disorganized, leaving us frustrated by interrupted sentences and spontaneous digressions that never answered a question raised along the way. The interview would gain in intelligence if written down and edited, structured without this urge to say too much at the time. An interesting approach to interview resulting in a richer, deeper material than the press conference digest in Cannes for instance partial transcript. The art of cinema is the center of discussion. They talk of his relationship with actors and viewers, how a film commands and alter perception of reality. It does sound a little all-knowing and condescending, maybe a feeling prompted by his recent win of the Grand Jury Prize for Flandres at Cannes Which brings the question: Closest art to life itself. What he wants is a simple cinema of reality: Going beyond intellectual complexity desires, will, ideas of cinema in order to make the shot a beginning: There is nothing to see. No preconceived ideas, no intentions, no established meaning, just a "nothing" that will reverberate into the audience and make sense then through the articulation of montage that echo one plan with another. Cinema is a powerful but complicate art. Plans, aesthetic values, positions of actors in the shot, light, camerawork, sound A complex art requiring a lot of upstream work, which paradoxally allows to reach ultimately an apparent simplicity. He humbles before great masterpieces without citing any films or auteurs in particular. Cinema is about patience, humility, a look upon others. Dumont believes in "decodage". A film is an experience of astonishment to be flabbergasted. Screenwriting To write a film is to wait for images, sensations to come up, and to reject silly images. But this is only a preparation, literature cannot be filmed. Only remains the emotion summoned, refined by its wording yet devoid of any constructed sense, and will be the raw substance to work on during shooting. The contemplation of a cinema story is secondary. The audience needs a motif however, a basic love story for identification, to relate to the work. After a long location scouting, the right place imposes itself and should be preserved intact, thus dismissing all the intentions mentionned in script. Any accentuation, characterization is out of question. The scenes will adapt to the real location instead, to maintain the authenticity and truth of a living space with genuine history. Acting Dumont prefers the ingenuity of non-actors who do not ressort to performance tricks. Non-actors convey with their real-life personality which belongs to the story everything that is needed for the film credibility. He regrets his experience with professional actors on Twentynine Palms, and made it despite their active acting. Acting virtuosity is prohibited. He knows exactly what he wants from the actors, so improvisation is not welcomed. And he makes sure the actors do not know too much about the action planned in a scene to preserve spontaneity and surprises. And then being able to give up when it fails to happen, dropping the scene altogether. There are a lot of wasted out-takes. He lets chance and accidents rewrite the course of the story, according to what succeeds or not during shooting. For instance the actress on Flandres cried instead of saying her lines and he kept the scene as is. But another actor abandoned the set, because of the directorial dictatorial? Sound Direct sound, mono, without much sound mix at all. Recording reality, out of control, waiting for something to happen, the accident. Sense is no longer at stake, what he likes is to work where the sense is gone. Reality offers the presence of things that do not imply a narrative construction. Dumont struggles against construction. Prevent an actor to formulate meaning. Make the auteur Ego, gaze vanish. Because the non-neutral audience is there, coming in with their own emotional load desires , and a need of sense. The viewer is "full". Cinema must balance the equilibrium with a whole audience, and provide a full film, finished, ruled, moral, political. The heart of the work is in the story conveyed by actors and scenes , the goal is to carry this story. Takes can be or should be mediocre, unfinished, spontaneous, real, away from the overstated stylization. He says "cut" when he feels the exposition of the audience was

DOWNLOAD PDF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID LYNCH MICHEL CIMENT AND HUBERT NIOGRET

sufficient. Montage The art to compose cinema elements together. Shots too pretty, with an overt aesthetization are discarded. What interests him are the transitions obtained in editing opposition. Associating banal shots that will surge with an extraordinary exposure on the editing table by ways of confrontation with another flat shot. Imprevisibility sparks up on the editing table, long after a shooting "out of control", after watching the dailies. Contemplating the exact transition between shots, the right timing, he feels intuitively the shots to be alright. Grandrieux and Dumont discuss the opening sequence of Flandres: A wide stationary shot of a distant farm to generate a great force. Cut to an extreme close up of a body part, an arm just hurt by the opening of the gate. The close up enters abruptly "inside" the previous shot, and the viewer is pulled in alongside. The film is a "viewer montage". The viewer is captured into the screen. The film is a go-between which leads the scenario and mise-en-scene to operate from the audience. I find it ironical to elaborate such a "populist" speech for such an elitist cinema. I mean it seems contradictory to focus on this "universal viewer" waiting to be mesmerized if such viewer rarely responds to these films. I would always defend minority cinemas that never find their niche despite their overlooked quality.