

Arnau Erta Majó

Professor Casey Pleming

Engl. 0301-04

30th April 2014

The Seventh Art Or The Great Business

Since Thomas Edison in America and Lumiere Brothers in Europe presented cinema to the public, there has been a discussion about what should be the nature of this technology. Firstly, everyone saw cinema as a business (like circuses or fairs) until the appearance on the scene of George Méliès, who changed this conception by using cinema as a storyteller. Then, some people started to think about cinema as a new form of art, creating a division regarding the true essence of cinema. These different views about cinema are a problem because it has led to big-budget (but poor quality) films drawing big audiences and hundreds of millions of dollars, while those films which have a high artistic quality only sell a few tickets, consequently making producers unwilling to invest in them. As I see it, cinema should be considered an art, and solving the problem explained above will help to make more high quality films.

However, there are people who believe that, above all, cinema is a business. People with this opinion argue that at least somebody has to invest a certain amount of money in a film for it to even be possible. Moreover, these investors do not give the money for free; they expect a return. In this sense, they feel cinema is a business since it is like the stock market: executives called producers invest money expecting a bigger return. In addition, people who maintain this view also defend the big-budget cinema industry, pointing out that it is a big industry not only in the United States but also in the rest of the world. This industry moves a lot of money, another point that leads to think

that it is a business not an art.

I completely understand these views about cinema. It is true that all movies need an investor who not only sees the idea but is also able to figure out if it would be a good film, deciding whether or not to give his money to the artistic team to make the movie. Moreover, it is totally true that this producer wants to win money with this investment. However, that fact does not have to be at odds with the artistic quality of the film. What is more, have already been done very good films that in addition they have had great incomes yet there are a lot of good projects that are rejected because they are a risky business, which the producer prefers to avoid due to the risk of not making enough money.

However, since my point of view cinema is an art like painting, sculpture, music, literature, architecture, and dance. What is more, filming is a conglomeration of all other arts because in movies, you find music, dialogue, dance, architecture, shoot composition (which is very similar to the scene composition that painting require), and nowadays, thank to the 3D movies, audiences can experience the same sense of volume that sculptures try to transmit. Furthermore, cinema is art because it is a creative work that tries to transmit emotions and feelings to an audience. That is the very definition of art. Moreover to refute the argument that it is not an art because cinema moves a lot of money I will argue that the selling of any artwork moves big amounts of dollars

Maybe some opposing views believe that cinema is not an art. However there are some situations where it is impossible to deny that film is the most current art. For instance, the film *Avatar* (2009) was not a great story, but it was an incredible artistic experience for the sights, similar to the experience of viewing a Pollock painting. Furthermore, any screenplay of Woody Allen could be considered literature due to his

ingenious dialogues or situations which with the characters have to struggle. Also, great composers and musicians have worked on cinema, composing widely acclaimed soundtracks. Therefore, geniuses of cinema are able to create and build authentic emotional and impressive experiences for the eyes and ears. Thus, because of these examples show how cinema can be an art since it pursues the same goal the expression of human feelings through the excellence.

Despite these different views of what cinema is, it is in everyone's best interest to help projects that could become great films instead of investing this money in low quality movies, most of time comedies, that just are a sure investment but cannot be good movies, nor great deals. I think that if producers (in general) would invest in fewer movies that were of better quality, everybody will be benefit. For one, there will be better films (in regards to artistic quality), people will acquire more culture, and in the other side producers will make more money per project instead of doing a lot of movies with less quality and consequently a poor income per film. The point I am making is to change the model of produce more movies with few incomes (due to its low quality) to make less films but with a high artistic quality. In a nutshell, this new model of promoting high quality films producers would lead the industry to win at least the same money that low quality movies offer nowadays, but it will provide the public with more culture, also ensuring the best movie projects always will go ahead.

Audience Analysis

The target audience of my discussion would obviously be people from the film industry, which includes those who make and star in movies, such as directors, actors, cameramen, and etc. However, my audience also includes those people who distribute the movies and, most importantly, the public: either professionals (like critics or juries) or just those who watch films to have fun.

Yet the most interested group would be the producers and those who manage companies in this industry. This group would be the concrete target audience since firstly, I am appealing directly to them and secondly, because we are discussing if they should change their point of view as well. They will be a resistant audience ...

Remember that you need to choose a resistant audience for this paper, so try to focus here, explaining how your target audience is resistant to your position.

Also, be sure to add a discussion of how the rhetorical appeals are used in your paper; specifically explaining how you establish exigence (a sense of need and urgency) for this issue.