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Teaching Methods Lecture; Laboratory (screening); Tutorial

Brief Course Description
This course introduces the area of film and television studies, examining basic components of cinematic and televiual forms. We explore fundamental principles of film and television studies, including theoretical and historical perspectives. Topics include art cinema and national cinemas, documentary and experimental film practice, film/TV narrative and formal analysis, sound and editing, genre and authorship, television culture, audience studies and reception theory.

Contact Hours
Laboratory (screening): 2 Hours per Week, for 13 Weeks
Lecture: 1 Hour per Week, for 13 Weeks
Tutorial: 1 hour per week, for 13 Weeks

Learning Materials/Texts - Resources Required (essential)

FILM1010 Course Reader (available at UPrint)

Course Objectives
Upon successful completion of this course, you will be able to:

1. Define the basic concepts of film analysis, including film form, film genres, and the processes of production and reception.
2. Apply the basic concepts to films and/or television programme analysis.
3. Examine films and/or television programmes through theoretical methodology and analysis where appropriate.

Course Content
Topics may include:
* Narrative and Non Narrative Form
* Classical, Modernist and Postmodernist Form
* Mise-en-scène and cinematography
* Auteur theory, genre, ideology
* Cinematic Affect
* Televisual Form and Culture
* Spectatorship, Audience and Reception Studies

Assessment Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essays / Written Assignments</th>
<th>One 2,000-word essay, worth 40%, due at the end of semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One 1000 word film analysis, worth 20%, due mid-semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>2 journal submissions in weeks 7 and 13 respectively, worth 40% (20% each)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumed Knowledge N/A

Callaghan Campus Timetable
FILM1010
FILM AND TELEVISION STUDIES
Enquiries: School of Humanities and Social Science

Semester 2 - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film Screen and Lecture</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>3.00 PM - 5.00 PM</td>
<td>[MCTH]</td>
<td>Starts Week 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Tutorial or Tuesday</td>
<td>4.00 PM - 5.00 PM</td>
<td>[MC132]</td>
<td>Starts Week 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Subject to alternation and addition]
Online Tutorial Registration:

Students are required to enrol in the Lecture and a specific Tutorial time for this course via the Online Registration system. Refer - http://www.newcastle.edu.au/study/enrolment/regdates.html

NB: Registrations close at the end of week 2 of semester.

Studentmail and Blackboard: Refer - www.blackboard.newcastle.edu.au/

This course uses Blackboard and studentmail to contact students, so you are advised to keep your email accounts within the quota to ensure you receive essential messages. To receive an expedited response to queries, post questions on the Blackboard discussion forum if there is one, or if emailing staff directly use the course code in the subject line of your email. Students are advised to check their studentmail and the course Blackboard site on a weekly basis.

Important Additional Information

Details about the following topics are available on your course Blackboard site (where relevant). Refer - www.blackboard.newcastle.edu.au/

- Written Assignment Presentation and Submission Details
- Online copy submission to Turnitin
- Penalties for Late Assignments
- Special Circumstances
- No Assignment Re-submission
- Re-marks & Moderations
- Return of Assignments
- Preferred Referencing Style
- Student Representatives
- Student Communication
- Essential Online Information for Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49% or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% to 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65% to 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% to 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% upwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome to Film and Television Studies – the foundation course devoted to film and television offered in the Film, Media and Cultural Studies major. It is designed so as to best prepare students for film and television study ahead by covering crucial filmic, conceptual, methodological and written material and skills that will be further developed in specialised ways within upper-level courses.

Film and Television Studies is an adventure into the culturally, historically and aesthetically diverse world/s of audio-visual life. Film is a truly ‘international’ form of expression and cultural consumption, and seen as increasingly so. This diversity becomes apparent as we examine a series of different case studies each week from various eras and parts of the world. This will involve analysing films from cultural contexts that are likely less familiar than others, just as it means watching films featuring very different aesthetic approaches to those we might be most familiar with. It is hoped that this ‘newness’ (irrespective of when the given film is actually made) will ultimately prove to demonstrate cinema’s amazingly rich, truly unique ‘tapestry’.

By comparison with film – the distinction will be addressed and questioned across the structure of the course and implicitly within an era when we are more likely to watch a DVD version of a film on our TVs – television is often considered to have been a rather more ‘parochial’ form that is more bounded to cultural, national and linguistic specificity. While language has proved rather more of a global stumbling block for ‘TV than it has for film, here in Anglophone Australia we are of course very familiar indeed with the televisual output of other English-speaking countries (especially the USA and the UK), often as much if not usually more so as we are with our own. Appropriately enough for a medium that has always played a key role in national contexts, when addressing television specifically we will examine programs from Australia.
As I will suggest in week one and throughout the course, a traditional understanding of film is one that looks at the history of cinema in regard to the formal and conceptual development of this industrial art form. This approach often asserts film as ‘the primary media/art form of the twentieth century’, sustained by its inherent ‘modernity’ through being an industrial-technological form with a special ability to render the radically changing nature of modern life, but also through its unique affective impact: that the viewer is ‘seduced’ into engagement with a singular audio-visual text or experience. However, a more recent approach is to suggest that this privileged cultural and experiential situating of cinema described above is no longer tenable, because we now access films through other portals than that of the ritualised, quasi-religious site of the movie theatre – e.g., television, DVDs, the internet, mobile phones. Although this approach has been increasingly common in recent years, the process has really been in place ever since people started to watch films on television over fifty years ago. Though there has been – and still is – much resistance to the idea, the development of TV was really the first complicating ‘blow’ to a more romantic and singular view of film.

This second view has a radically transformative impact in terms on our view of how we access and literally ‘see’ films (including of course how we delineate ‘film’ from other audio-visual media such as ‘TV’). As a result, some people now either argue ‘cinema is dead’, or less radically that it is simply a much less central form than we previously thought, and more ‘parochial’ – one town amongst many, rather than the metropolis (like Newcastle instead of New York). However, it is also the case that understanding cinema in the era of the net, DVDs and mobile phones can, strangely enough, lead to a reconstituting of the ‘pure’, almost sacred – in a modern sense – conceptualising of film in regards to its textual make up and experience. Just look at how people with large wide-screen TVs arrange their lounge-rooms just like cinemas, or how the discourse of ‘cinephilia’ has exploded in the era of digital reproduction (especially DVDs) and/on the internet, where people can come to blows over a given film’s correct aspect ratio as transferred to digital form...

The structure of this course will present both the above ‘versions’ of film, one as existing reflexively within the other. Framing the contemporary notion of studying film and television at the beginning of the course, we will also be roughly exploring cinema in a chronological fashion, addressing both historical and present-day approaches, and the notion of film’s unique intensity of audio-visual impact or affect, all the while aware that these ‘originary’ qualities are being reconstituted for and by us thanks to the very technological and conceptual specificity of our digital present-day. The impact of television is here both combative and central yet also often implicit, as for fifty years it has challenged, appropriated, complicated and fragmented our understanding and viewing of ‘film’, directly leading us to the multi-textual image culture zone we face today. Therefore it is appropriate that television affects the structure of the course by ‘interrupting’ a historical survey (itself consciously ‘arranged’ by a course designer) of film, both fragmenting its linearity and reminding us that TV intervened in and permanently altered cinema’s development, and still provides the more likely screen on which we watch films. Film Studies is therefore quintessentially ‘after television’, with films largely now accessed through myriad ‘other’ screens and portals. Yet it may still be ‘cinema’ – just manifest in different incarnations, modes of delivery, and conceptual understanding...

Speaking of context, it is often tempting to see a film as existing in a vacuum – particularly ‘masterpieces’, which (we are told) are ‘timeless’. Today when we can watch a film from any period preserved in hyper-fidelity on DVD, Blu-ray or/on HDTV (or looking more crappy on Youtube or mobile screen), this becomes even more seductive, as the markers of time (scratches, dust, etc.) are erased from the text. It is, therefore, especially important today to emphasise that no matter how ‘great’ a film is (a claim that always needs to be argued for, rather than assumed) – or how well-preserved its digital incarnation is – it was produced at a particular time, and marked by unique industrial, economic and cultural considerations, just as historical ‘location’ is also important when considering its particular aesthetic details.

Perhaps the most common way that we downplay the socio-cultural, economic and political origins of films is to see them as the magic product of a genius director – since at least the 1950s,
the figure most commonly seen as the primary ‘author’ of cinema and often seen in an ahistorical way. This idea, though being substantially critiqued over the last thirty years within film theory, has been carried over into ‘quality TV’ appreciation with discourses around ‘auteur television’ figures (such as Joss Whedon and Aaron Sorkin.) While the course will consider and often refer to the director as an important figure to be sure, it is also necessary to see him/her (sadly cinema and TV continue to be appallingly traditional boys’ clubs, so it is usually a ‘he’) as also marked by a particular historical moment and culture. In fact, the whole notion of singular authorship of both film and television – seemingly unlikely, such is their institutional and industrialised nature – can itself be seen as cultural and historically ‘constructed’. Authorship is just one important example of the concepts and scholarly discourses we will be exploring within the overall approach of viewing a given film or television programme as ‘coming from somewhere’ while also of course being recontextualised in different eras – such as our own, in which will watch films and increasingly also TV on digital discs and screens.

Likewise, we will be looking at varied readings across the course emanating from particular, often key moments in the development of film studies. No theory or critical argument is ‘true’ or inherently more ‘correct’ than any other and no era has a mortgage on being more ‘advanced’, including our own. The course aims to privilege no particular era or context – while acknowledging its own historical origins as occurring in 2010 at a particular cultural location: this medium-sized town on the South East coast of Australia, and framed by selected perspectives.

Many of the above considerations lead us to the overarching question/s of the course: what is the strange moving-image form we are studying? There are of course no definitive answers – especially today, if there ever was. But the serious consideration of such questions will not only lead us to a rigorous discussion about primary audio-visual forms; it will also lead out onto addressing and questioning the historical and cultural details of the world/s that these forms record, render and essay – in other words ‘reality’ itself. In this sense, film and television studies connect in crucial ways to other Humanities disciplines – notably media and cultural studies, but also history, politics, philosophy, gender studies, art history, English, and modern languages.

Doing this subject real justice would require much more than 13 weeks. To provide a sense of the diversity of moving-image forms over the history of their existence, whole areas have to be regrettably put aside – for example, the avant garde, documentary, and vast areas of television, not to mention countless theoretical perspectives. You will, however, have the opportunity to study many of these areas at another point in your degree with staff that specialise in these areas (for example, there is a whole course devoted to Documentary Cinema, and multiple television courses). Likewise, I have had to limit the cultural and historical contexts and national origins considered. Sadly, for example, there are no films from the former Soviet Union (hugely important, especially in the 1920s), Africa, India, or Latin America, and there is only one film or program deriving from substantially different socio-political contexts beyond capitalist democracy. You will, again, have varying opportunities to study such material, issues and approaches in other courses.

Nevertheless, there is a diverse array of filmic material for us to study. Amongst 10 Western films, we have 4 from the USA, 5 from continental Europe and 1 from the UK, plus 3 TV programs from Australia. But we will also watch three films from important non-Western filmmaking countries: notably Japan, one of the greatest, most ‘genuine’ and diverse national cinemas over 100 years; Iran, voted in 2000 by a panel of international critics as the most important filmmaking nation of the 1990s; and China, which perhaps less surprisingly (considering its increasing economic and political importance) has produced a lot of much-heralded films over the last three decades. Even so, the course does concentrate on films from parts of the world that have produced both a consistently large cinematic output since the beginning of film history and also generated the most substantial written analysis of films available in English (whether in original form or in translation). This means the majority of the course examines both cinema and film writing from Western Europe and the USA.

It is common to view cinema as fundamentally the story of Hollywood. Whether this is due to our ‘addiction’ to such films, being lazy English-speakers, or as illustrative of the true reach and
power of what the USA’s State Department once called “the little State Department” (for its key role in furthering US economic and political interests around the world), any serious historical survey of film cannot limit itself to such a bias. Hence, while considering four films representing different, very important eras and ‘types’ of Hollywood output, we will also watch and discuss a series of key examples from the ‘other’ big Western film-producing base, one that has found it much harder to attain the USA’s global dominance (hosting two world wars and being split in half during the Cold War didn’t help, not to mention being immensely diverse when it comes to culture and language): Europe, notably its most historically dominant filmmaking nations, Italy, Germany, and France.

Taken together, the above means most films in the course will involve reading English subtitles. I know some people have an issue with this – however, until we each have our own portable ‘babel fish’ so as to magically understand German, Japanese, Mandarin, Farsi etc., we are stuck with the lesser of two evils (the worst is dubbing, due to bad lip-sync and frequently featuring voices of American actors mouthing characters we’re supposed to believe are from Italy or Iran). A frankly unacceptable choice is to say we won’t watch films in ‘other languages’. Not only, when you think about it, is this appallingly arrogant (the vast majority of people from the non-English-speaking world – taken together of course, the vast majority of the world itself – are used to reading subtitles, fully realising and accepting that most people don’t speak the same language as ‘us’). It also harms us as film-viewers and potential -lovers in the process. Can you imagine going into a bookshop and only choosing books by authors whose names start with A? It would be absurd, as the vast majority of great literature would be forever out of your reach. To only watch films that are voiced in English is to limit yourself to the same degree, and it is getting more so as a higher proportion of films are made each year not in English. When you think about it, considering the linguistic diversity of the world, this is to be expected – yet it is remarkable how often English-speakers nevertheless willingly limit their potential pleasure in this way.

Rather than pedantic or ideologically driven, the above point is above all pragmatic. A quick perusal of prominent ‘best films ever made’ lists (for example, the huge poll conducted every ten years by the venerable British magazine Sight & Sound or the popular book, 1001 Movies You Must see Before You Die), no matter how Hollywood-friendly they still are, will of necessity feature a majority of films not in English. If you are used to reading subtitles, and are therefore already ‘acclimatised’ to the world/s of film, you will have no problems with this aspect of the course. If you are historically resistant to reading subtitles, I guarantee that at the end of the course this aversion will have almost entirely been ‘cured’. Not only is this because you will have hopefully attained an appreciation of, or even a taste for, some types of filmmaking that occur in different parts of the world, but also because the more you watch films with subtitles the less you consciously notice the little lines of text at the bottom of the screen – and you can indeed ‘just watch’…

As a result of all this, we will be addressing some cultural contexts that are perhaps less familiar to you than others. Some consideration will be given in the lectures and tutorials of such details (for example, the particular importance of World War Two to Italian cinema made in its wake), but you might also want to do some of your own net research to bone up on the particular details of a given national and cultural context. (And yes, Wikipedia is appropriate as a first port of call here for a ten-minute cram – whereas it will not be acceptable as a referenced source in your assignments.) Learning, after all, is very much a ‘proactive’ process, and you are encouraged to bring your own insights and perspective to the table. Throughout, the aim is to gain an appreciation not only for the ‘diversity’ of filmic production across different historical and cultural contexts, but also to grasp that there is no singular ‘narrative’ of film here (no nation or written account can account for cinema’s story). There is no one way to understand film or TV (and by extension, the world), but rather a multiplicity. This has immense implications when it comes not only to cinema and televisual aesthetics, but also culture and politics.

The films looked at in the course have over some time been seen as seminal and important works in historical analyses of said audiovisual forms. Many of them are commonly seen as exemplifying ‘great’ cinema given the accolade of being ‘timeless’ (or worthy of repeated re-release
on DVD), while familiarity with the relevant context does certainly add to our appreciation and understanding. There are also one or two films that are less canonical. The television focus will perhaps also explore more fully areas less concerned with judgements about degrees of ‘quality’ as ‘art’, while also involving the questioning of such discourses and qualitative assumptions. Across the course, it is important to be open-minded: an excessively prescribed understanding of what constitutes ‘good’ or ‘great’ audio-visual texts is problematic for a host of reasons (and a loaded opinion on the issue of ‘art’ versus ‘popular culture’ is similarly bound to result in a limiting of scholarly inquiry, not to mention enjoyment of diverse cultural production).

Depending on your usual film diet, particular films we watch might at first appear not to ‘do’ what you feel cinema should. Some of the weeks – such as 3(ii), 6, 7 & 12 – feature quite challenging aesthetic and conceptual works. While in the opinion of countless scholars and film-lovers the world over such films are incredibly rich, creative and stunningly ‘original’, at first – particularly if you are primarily used to classical Hollywood cinema – they might appear to be ‘lacking’ familiar things like obviously linear narrative movement, recognisable character development, and transparent aesthetic form. Sometimes, when we are confronted with films or programmes that are very different from what we are used to, they can at first seem almost ‘perverse’ in their negation of the basic values of feature films as handed down from Hollywood, and therefore for some of you may be difficult to come to terms with. So… if you don’t at first enjoy a film, don’t worry! Not only is there no ‘obligation’ on you in this regard – and a film not desperately and narcissistically demanding that you “love me!” can be quite liberating (if you think about films as if they are people). This also allows you to slowly ‘negotiate’ a relationship to a given film or type of filmmaking over time on ‘equal’ (and thereby definitively ‘adult’) terms. One thing I can guarantee though: While some of these films might be confusing or ‘lacking’ on the level of narrative action, they are quite the contrary on other levels. For one thing, these are often aesthetically ravishing films. They are also packed with fascinating ideas.

As well as aesthetically, historically and culturally diverse films and programmes, we also have a broad array of literature to help us approach them. Each week there will be a series of articles – some of which relate directly to the film, some to the cultural/social/political context, and others that are more purely theoretical in nature. The Course Reader contains work by some of the most famous and important writers within the tradition of film and TV theory and criticism. There is perhaps more reading than you are used to, and some of it is quite challenging. Do not try and read all the essential material the night or afternoon before class. Rather, break it up – and leave the most difficult reading (length-wise, but also in terms of theoretical dimension) for a separate sitting. One of the objects of this course is to try and introduce some seminal film theory and critical analysis of television (sometimes roughly contemporary with the film or programme in question, but often coming from its own quite removed historical and cultural coordinates). As with the screenings, this written material has been selected based on contemporary relevance and status within scholarly discourse (while also trying not to blindly repeat the biases that operate within our own period), and where I think there are real insights to be gleaned no matter from when and where.

Just as you might not immediately ‘enjoy’ (though I hope the long-term effect is on the whole positive!) a given screening because it is so unfamiliar, so too in regards to the readings. Do not expect to ‘understand’ some of the more theory-oriented articles right away, or in total – that is being unrealistic and unfair to both the reading and to you. Across the lectures and in class we will try and get our heads around the important basic points – but it is important to give both yourself and the given author and idea a chance. When it comes to filmic and critical/theoretical work, we cannot expect to ‘click’ with something straight away if it derives from an environment or context alien to us. And this is before we even get to the point of asking if we ‘like’ or ‘agree’ with a given film or text. Again, I encourage you to ‘go slow’: don’t rush to judgement. This issue can potentially become acute and perhaps quite personal with some articles or films, depending on your beliefs and assumptions.

University is supposed to be challenging, where nothing is ‘sacred’ or beyond potential
consideration, so it is unrealistic for us to expect everything in a film, TV programme, or text (or course) to chime with our own political or moral views, our emotional temperature or overall ‘taste’. You should expect not to agree with everything that is said, shown or suggested in a screening, reading, lecture, or tutorial. This ability of films, programmes and readings related thereto, to provoke challenging responses through sometimes extreme content or form, we should arguably in principle greet as evidence of cultural life at its most ambitious. This is where questions such as ‘What is cinema?’ or ‘What is television?’ are not answered, but rather asked again and again as a means to renewal and innovation, and leading onto other questioning – including, sometimes, of a given culture’s (such as our own) assumptions.

I really look forward to your responses, your active contribution to the course!

~ Hamish Ford.

Weekly Course Participation

Each week, you are expected to watch the film, attend the lecture, and do the set readings from the Course Reader in time to attend your tutorial. All written work must show genuine, consistent engagement with the course material, and show regular attendance. If you do attend and engage regularly, your work will show this as a matter of course; if you do not, your work will show it and will suffer accordingly. This is a participatory process: inquire away with a spirit of ‘leave your pride at the door’, because any questions and comments you have about a screening, reading, theoretical paradigm, assessment item, etc., will undoubtedly be shared by many others in the room. In fact, the ‘smartest’ students (including postgraduates, and even Course Co-ordinators!) – the ones who learn the most, and get the best results – are those who readily admit what they don’t know.

It is essential for your participation in the course that you see the films and programmes each week. Many of them are unavailable in local video stores. They are all available on DVD through Short Loans in Auchmuty Library – very important for your written assignments as you’ll want to watch them more than once, with many gaining immeasurably on subsequent viewings (not to mention sometimes valuable supplementary DVD extras). However, it will be a problem on a weekly basis for students to individually watch the films in the library instead of attending the official screening time. To watch movies as projected on a big screen is the way to see them, rather than on a small monitor in the library or on a laptop. So come to the screening, but turn your phones – and any compulsive desire to talk during the film – off!...

It is also essential to keep up to date with the set readings contained in the Course Reader (available from UPrint). As with the screenings and seminars, if you fall behind you will find the course very dull indeed and your grades will plummet. Make sure to allow enough time to read each week in preparation for the seminar, as there are some lengthy and challenging readings, which may also require some re-reading.

Assessment Details

Film Analysis:

This involves two steps, both essential to complete the assessment task:

1): Each week two students will be responsible for generating some discussion and analysis of the week’s screening and reading. In week 1 your tutor will assign weeks for this process.

2): The following week, you must hand in a written essay-style analysis of the film/programme in question, informed by the set readings and class discussion. (You will be marked on this written component, not the discussion-prompting of the previous week.) No extra research is required for this assignment beyond the Course Reader.

Length – 1,000 words
Weighting – 20%
Due – In class (& thru Turnitin) the week after your leading class discussion
Weekly Journal:
The purpose of this assessment item is to ensure that you are keeping up with the course, and engaging on a week-by-week basis. You are required to submit a Journal containing brief responses to the screenings within the weekly film schedule, informed where appropriate by the course material. You can make this Journal process work for you via a draft form, by taking notes in preparation for (but also during and after) tutorials. Then, when the time comes, use these notes to type up your Journal in polished form. One reason this two-step process can be enlightening is that your responses to a particular film/programme, idea or reading will likely change (often for the better) over time. The submitted Journal demonstrates the level of your weekly participation in the course and responsible knowledge-building, while the other two assessment tasks involve much more specific, depth-oriented scholarship. You will submit two instalments containing roughly the same quota. Don’t worry about submitting an entry for the week on which you’re planning to base your Film Analysis.

Length – each entry approximately 300 words
Weighting – 40% in total
Due – Friday, week 7, 11 pm. (Turnitin only), installment 1 – worth 20%;
and Friday, week 13, 11 pm. (Turnitin only), installment 2 – worth 20%.

Major Research Essay:
This is your major research-based project for the course, with substantial research contributing to a piece of writing with a clear argument – as opposed to bald, unsubstantiated and argued assertion of opinion – at its core, communicated and developed via sustained, rigorous analysis and research. Though we will have discussed this in more detail, let it be said straight up here that substantial research involves more than a quick Google search, and there will be a ban on using Wikipedia as a quoted source. For this assignment it is essential to do substantial research beyond each week’s set readings. Certainly utilize material in the Course Reader (to ignore these readings is silly, and shows lack of engagement with the course per se), plus the further reading recommendations for each week’s topic listed later in this Outline certainly – but do not rely exclusively on such sources for your essay. In addition to extensive reading, you should also watch other films relevant to your topic where possible.

There will be one essay question for each week/film/topic, as well as some more generally framed questions. Marking the essays, your tutor will take into account the standard of writing, sophistication of argumentation, correct citing of sources, and overall substantive content. You should re-read and proof-read your work many times to ensure you are not marked down for careless mistakes. (See the section at the end of this Outline for some useful essay writing guidelines.)

Length – 2,500 words
Weighting – 40%
Due – 5 pm. Wednesday, week 14 (both hard copy thru the Hub & Turnitin)
# The Course at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date Commencing</th>
<th>Topic and Screening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | 26/07/2010      | *Introduction: The Virtual Moving Image (‘Film 2.0’)*  
Screening: *The Imaginarium of Doctor Parnassus* |
| 2    | 02/08/2010      | *What is Cinema? – Different Stories, Perspectives on the Truth*  
Screening: *Rashômon* |
| 3    | 09/08/2010      | *Spaces, Realities, Images on Screen: Infinite Mise-en-scène*  
Screenings: *The Kid; The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* |
| 4    | 16/08/2010      | *The Gaze of Classical Hollywood Narrative Cinema*  
Screening: *Rear Window* |
| 5    | 23/08/2010      | *Italian Neorealism, Rendering the Ambiguous World*  
Screening: *The Bicycle Thieves* |
| 6    | 30/08/2010      | *Auteurism, Reflexivity and the French New Wave*  
Screening: *Vivre sa vie* |
| 7    | 06/09/2010      | *‘Art Cinema’ Apogee, Modernist Feature Film Aesthetics*  
Screening: *Red Desert*  
*** Friday 10/09 (11 pm): Journal instalment no. 1 due (Turnitin only)*** |
| 8    | 13/09/2010      | *“Like Hollywood but More Honest”, the (Melo)drama of Problematic Nation and History*  
Screening: *Fear Eats the Soul* |
| 9    | 20/09/2010      | *The Big Business and the ‘Little State Department’: Seriously Hollywood*  
Screening: *Total Recall*  
*** SEMESTER RECESS ***  
{Monday 27 September – Friday 8 October} |
| 10   | 11/10/2010      | *Philosophical Questions: Postmodern ‘Indie’ Hollywood*  
Screening: *Being John Malkovich* |
| 11   | 18/10/2010      | *Looking at Television: Technology and Legitimacy, Narrative & Nation*  
Screenings: *Kath & Kim; East/West 101; Hungry Beast* |
| 12   | 25/10/2010      | *50% of a Film & Reflexive Ethical challenges: a Master from Iran*  
Screening: *The Wind Will Carry Us* |
| 13   | 01/11/2010      | *New Superpower(s): Trans/National & ‘World’ Cinema*  
Screening: *Hero*  
*** Friday 05/11 (11 pm): Journal instalment no. 2 due (Turnitin only)*** |
| 14   | 08/11/2010      | ***Wednesday 10/11 (5 pm): Major Essay due (thru Hub and Turnitin)*** |
Weekly Screenings and Readings: Details

WEEK 1 ~ Introduction: The Virtual Moving Image (‘Film 2.0’)  
Screening: The Imaginarium of Doctor Parnassus (Terry Gilliam, UK/Canada/France, 2009)  
Reading: none  

WEEK 2 ~ What is Cinema? – Different Stories, Perspectives on the Truth  
Screening: Rashomon (Kurosawa Akira, Japan, 1950)  
Reading:  

WEEK 3 ~ Spaces, Realities, Images on Screen: Infinite Mise-en-scéne  
Screening: The Kid (Charles Chaplin, USA, 1921); and Das Cabinet des Dr. Caligari/ The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari (Robert Wiene, Germany, 1920)  
Reading:  

WEEK 4 ~ The Gaze of Classical Hollywood Narrative Cinema  
Screening: Rear Window (Alfred Hitchcock, USA, 1955)  
Reading:  

**WEEK 5 ~ Italian Neorealism, Rendering the Ambiguous World**

Screening: *Ladri di biciclette/The Bicycle Thieves* (Vittorio de Sica, Italy, 1948)

Reading:

**WEEK 6 ~ Auteurism, Reflexivity and the French New Wave**

Screening: *Vivre sa vie/My Life to Live* (Jean-Luc Godard, France, 1962)

Reading:

**WEEK 7 ~ ‘Art Cinema’ Apogee, Modernist Feature Film Aesthetics**

Screening: *Il deserto rosso/Red Desert* (Michelangelo Antonioni, Italy/France, 1964)

Reading:

**WEEK 8 ~ “Like Hollywood but More Honest”, the (Melo)drama of Problematic Nation and History**

Screening: *Angst essen Seele auf/Fear Eats the Soul* (Rainer Werner Fassbinder, West Germany, 1974)

Reading:
WEEK 9 ~ *The Big Business and the ‘Little State Department’: Seriously Hollywood*

Screening: *Total Recall* (Paul Verhoeven, USA, 1990)

Reading:

*** SEMESTER RECESS ***

{Monday 27 September – Friday 8 October}

WEEK 10 ~ *Philosophical Questions: Postmodern ‘Indie’ Hollywood*

Screening: *Being John Malkovich* (Spike Jonze, USA, 1999)

Reading:

WEEK 11 ~ *Looking at Television: Technology and Legitimacy, Narrative & Nation*

Screening: *East/West 101* (SBS 2007-, Australia); *Kath & Kim* (ABC 2003-2005, Channel 7 2007-, Australia); *Hungry Beast* (ABC, 2009-, Australia)

Reading:

WEEK 12 ~ ‘50%’ of a Film & Reflexive Ethical challenges: a Master from Iran

Screening: *Bad ma ra khabad bord/The Wind Will Carry Us* (Abbas Kiarostami, Iran/France, 1999)

Reading:
WEEK 13 ~ New Superpower(s): Trans/National & ‘World’ Cinema

Screening: Ying xiong/ Hero (Yimou Zhang, Hong Kong/China, 2002)

Reading:

APPENDICES (at end of Course Reader)

~ Helpful readings across the course, especially for your written assignments ~


* * * *

Useful Books in the Library – General Film Studies

- Joanne Hollows, Peter Hutchings, Peter Hutchings & Mark Jancovich (des.), The Film Studies Reader, Oxford University Press, 2000.

* * *