Aesthetics or Ethics? Italian Neorealism and the Czechoslovak New Wave Cinema

Lubica Učník
Murdoch University
Western Australia

> *A man who has no conscience, who doesn't die, who cannot laugh, who is unaware of personal responsibility—such a man is of course the perfect unit needed in a manipulated, bureaucratically regimented system. In contrast, Man as portrayed by Czech culture of the last decade is a potential revolutionary, because he finds life in such a manipulated system unbearable (Kosík, 1973, p. 399).*

According to Mira Liehm, neorealist films were often described in terms of "film consciousness"[1] and despite differences between filmmakers, "all these artists, one so unlike the other, brought to life a phenomenon with clearly defined technical and moral components that influenced almost all subsequent film trends in the West and in the East."[2] Describing the work of Roberto Rossellini, Liehm explains that neorealists were not concerned with "true pictures of facts" or "slices of life." According to her, this is a "misunderstanding of the technique." What they were interested in was an impact on the viewer of a "life as represented in film."[3] Neorealism was "a moral weapon aimed at the artistic conventions of the past."[4] Reality is not an independent phenomenon that exists 'outside' of representation. There cannot be an "autonomy of external reality."[5] Reality is always a construction of the filmic text. It is not an accident that the neorealist style can be traced to the Soviet montage cinema.[6] Yet neorealists did not aim to represent life as a struggle of the people against the bourgeoisie as Soviet filmmakers did, but as a struggle of an individual against an overwhelming reality. As Liehm notes, "Zavattini's theory of 'necessity to render facts as they are'" was recognition that reality is constituted through "the relationship between men and reality" and is always open to "ontological cognition."[7] Instead of concentrating on aesthetic properties of neorealist films or enumerating techniques that supposedly define Neorealism, I will argue that Neorealism—understood not as a mode of aesthetics but as a method of a filmmaker's ethical-political engagement with the everyday—is the lasting legacy of Italian cinematography to world cinema. I will

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:15 AM
Deleted: *independently*

[1] *Liehm, 1984, p. 5.*
[2] *Ibid., p. 129. See also Sorlin, 1991.*
[3] *Liehm, 1984, p. 71.*
[4] *Ibid.*
[5] *Ibid.*
[6] *Ibid., p. 16.*
[7] *Ibid., p. 73.*

substantiate this thesis by exploring certain parallel trends in Italian and Czechoslovak contexts.

To understand this claim, it is important to note that the classification of films labelled as neorealist is problematic.[8] ***Critics and filmmakers themselves persistently questioned Neorealism's 'actuality' as a coherent movement. Moreover, assuming that there was a movement called Italian Neorealism, some of the critics charge that neorealist films were not economically successful and the aggressive 'commercial war of images' by Hollywood hastened its 'death'.***[9] ***Yet as French Nouvelle Vague, Czechoslovak New Wave cinema, or more recently, Iranian films***[10] ***indicate, Neorealism in different guises seems to be that constant 'return of the repressed': despite the triumph of Hollywood, dedicated to production of films with guaranteed financial return, there are times when filmmakers understand their role to be more than just the production of entertaining and commercially lucrative films. They take upon themselves the role of the conduit of social conscience. So, for example, Alistair Whyte proposes, as Liehm did when speaking of Italian Neorealism, that the experimental nature of the Czechoslovak New Wave of the late 1950s and 1960s is ineluctably tied to "serious moral and social problems."***[11] ***He suggests that filmmakers intermingle "humour and tragedy" by manipulating "stylistic techniques that create a certain element of fantasy"***[12] ***in order to produce "more serious, more experimental, more socially critical films."***[13] ***Likewise, Václav Macek claims that in the late 1950s, under the influence of Italian Neorealism with its ideals of social truth, young filmmakers attending the Film Academy in Prague rejected film schematism and socialist realism's lies of the previous years to assert their right to authenticity, originality and a meaningful artistic standpoint.***[14] ***The most important criteria became "truthfulness, desire to show human emotions and conflicts rather than class defined narratives and***

---

[8] *See, for example, Sorlin, 1991; Liehm, 1984. See also Furhammar and Isaksson, 1971, pp. 87-92. For a critical appraisal, see Bazin, 1971; 1971; Deleuze, 1989, pp. 1-6. For a critical account of literary Neorealism, see Procaccini, 1978.*

[9] *See Mattelart, 2000.*

[10] *Richard Corliss—noting the influence of "Italian postwar neorealism"—writes that "Iran is today's one great national cinema. Not since the Czech New Wave of the mid-60s has a country made such a lovely noise at the big festivals and in Western capitals ... Directors Abbas Kiarostami (A Taste of Cherry), Jafar Panahi (The White Balloon) and ... Mohsen Makhmalbaf (Gabbeh) are ... revered in the world film" (Corliss, 1999, p. 85).*

[11] *Whyte, 1971, p. 94.*

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *Ibid., p. 124.*

[14] *Macek, 1996, pp. 13 & 23.*

schematic sketches."[15] *In certain way, this claim is the same as made by Liehm when she argued that Italian Neorealism was "a moral weapon aimed at the artistic conventions of the past."*[16]

I want to argue that one of the attributes of Neorealism—from its defining moment in Italy, through the French Nouvelle Vague, the Czechoslovak New Wave to Iranian films, for example—is the creation of space for and by filmmakers to account for the ethical freedom of the individual in the face of the overwhelming 'reality' of our globalised world. In the following account, I will look at Italian Neorealism's appropriation by filmmakers of the New Wave Cinema, keeping in mind that it is also important to affirm Simona Monticelli's claim that Neorealism is not a singular event but it is an extension of preceding "Italian film production".[17] *Accordingly, Czechoslovak New Wave cinema did not materialise out of nothing; it was a continuation of a longer history, beginning in 1898.*[18] *In the following essay, I will attempt to 'weave' together two stories: one is a kind of history of Czechoslovak cinema and politics of filmmaking; the second is a claim about ethics. I will outline filmmakers' effort to negotiate political reality they faced and their attempt to transfer their ethical concerns about the present into their films. I will follow their endeavours through parallels between Italian Neorealism and Czechoslovak New Wave Cinema.*

Czecho-Slovakia

Properly speaking, we can only talk about Czechoslovak film industry after the First World War. Until 1918, there was no Czechoslovakia. Thus, the post-First World War period marks not only the establishment of Czecho-Slovakia, but also the beginning of the production of Czecho-Slovak, or rather, Czech films. It was **not until** *1921 that the first Slovak narrative film Jánošík was produced, and not by filmmakers from Slovakia, but by the Slovak American Film Company. (Jánošík is the Slovak counterpart to Robin Hood, although Jánošík came from a poor family, was captured and hanged.) The director Jaroslav (Jerry) Siakel and the camera operator Daniel Siakel, Slovak brothers living in America, produced the film in two versions: one with the hero hanged at the end (as the Slovak folklore has it) and which was targeted at*

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:16 AM

Deleted: *The beginning of Czech filmmaking can be traced to the opening of the Architectural and Engineering Exhibition in Prague in 1898. The first director and camera operator was Jan Kříženecký (1868 - 1921). His interest was not professional. He saw photography and filmmaking merely as a hobby. Nevertheless, Křížencký's first attempts marked the beginning of Czech film history. He made short 'actualities' from the Prague exhibition. After their success, he produced three short narrative films, each 17 metres long: Pražský Párkař a Lepič Plakátů (The Exhibition Sausage Vender), Dostaveníčko ve Mlýnici (A Rendez-Vous at the Grinding Room) and Smích a Pláč (Crying and Laughing). In Slovakia the progress of filmmaking followed a similar path, only ten years later. The amateur photographer Eduard Schreiber made several short documentaries between 1908 and 1910. He also produced a short narrative film Únos (Abduction). Czechoslovak cinematography, then, started very early.*[19]

[15] *Ibid., p. 13.*
[16] *Ibid.*
[17] *Monticelli, 2000, p. 73.*
[18] *See Bartošek, 1985; Skvorecky, 1971, pp. 54ff; Whyte, 1971, pp. 91ff.*

Czech and Slovak audiences. The second version— made for an American audience— had a happy ending: Jánošík runs away from the gallows into the mountains with his love and lives happily ever after.[20]

The first encounter with the style of Neorealism can be found in the book Náš Film (Our Film). According to Bartošek, the film Šťastnou Cestu (Farewell, 1943), directed by Otakar Vávra, was almost a neorealist drama of that period.[25] *As he further explains, Vávra shot the film in a dynamic pace reverberating with the everyday tempo of modern life. Narrative was linear, yet, by way of the stylistic techniques of documentary coverage, the space constantly changed following multiple activities of characters.*[26] *Bartošek claims that the style of Neorealism, if not the name, was already employed by the Czech filmmaker in the early 1940s. It is important to stress that this kind of designation of a style as neorealist can only be made a posteriori, when we already know what Neorealism means.*

The Second World War was 'kind' to the Czechoslovak industry, if not by granting freedom to choice where subject matter was concerned, then at least in providing industrial possibilities. Antonín Liehm notes that Germans not only preserved but upgraded the film studio Barrandov. The idea behind this upgrade was that Prague would become the film-capital of the Third Reich.[27] *After the War in 1945, the film industry was nationalised by the Government led by President Eduard Beneš. The nationalisation meant that in 1945 in Bratislava, the Slovak film industry with the help of Czech technicians and specialists was established. The year 1947 marks another international success for Czechoslovakia. A film produced before the imposition of Zhdanov's socialist realist formula, Siréna (The Strike), directed by Karel Steklý, received the Golden Lion—the Grand Prix of the International Film Festival in Venice.*[28]

In 1947, in the last democratic election in Czechoslovakia, communists won control of the government. In 1948 they ousted Eduard Beneš and other non-communists and a single-party government became a fact of the Czechoslovak political milieu. From then on, socialist realism became the only stylistic norm for filmmakers. The

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:20 AM

Deleted: *Properly speaking, we can only talk about Czechoslovak film industry after the First World War. Until 1918, there was no Czechoslovakia. Thus, the post-First World War period marks not only the establishment of Czecho-Slovakia, but also the beginning of the production firm Filmový Ústav (Film institution). This firm was founded by the first woman director and producer Tea Červenková with the camera operator Jozef Brabec. Červenková produced and directed four silent films. The Czech film historian Luboš Bartošek describes her as "a Lady driven crazy by film."*[21] *In 1921, the first Slovak narrative film Jánošík was produced by the Slovak American Film Company. (Jánošík is the Slovak counterpart to Robin Hood, although Jánošík came from a poor family, was captured and hanged.) The director Jaroslav (Jerry) Siakel and the camera operator Daniel Siakel, Slovak brothers living in America, produced the film in two versions: one with the hero hanged at the end (as the Slovak folklore has it) and which was targeted at Czech and Slovak audiences. The second version— made for an American audience—had a happy ending: Jánošík runs away from the gallows into the mountains with his love and lives happily ever after.*[22] ... [1]

[20] *Ibid. See also Brož, 1967.*
[25] *Bartošek, 1985, p. 324.*
[26] *Ibid., p. 334.*
[27] *See Piech, 1997, p. 38; Liehm, 1974, p. 84; Liehm and Liehm, 1977, pp. 26-7.*
[28] *Brož, 1967; Bartošek, 1985.*

new (one-dimensional) working-class hero was born. In practice, as David Paul explains, it meant that films were about "how disciplined workers overcome imperialist sabotage; interpersonal conflicts that are resolved through the common struggle to fulfil production plans; peasants discovering the virtues of collectivization and so forth."[29] *In short, any representation of the personal life of an individual was seen as an attack on the Communist Party itself. Not only did depiction of contemporary life disappear from film screens, but struggling, feeling, emotional individuals and their personal problems were simply eliminated. The overall outcome of the imposed cultural policies in Czechoslovakia (and other European State Socialist Societies) was two-fold. According to Paul, films were produced that shunned present-day topics. Instead, films concentrated on the famous events from the Czech history or portrayed the lives of bygone Czech public figures.*[30] *This was a route taken by many filmmakers who wanted to avoid an extremity of socialist realist prescription. The other route was the socialist realist formula per se. This socialist realist principle was taken straight from Soviet cultural policy.*

In 1946, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union legislated so-called Zhdanov decrees that reinforced the control of artistic production by the legislative state apparatus. This legislation was simply an extension of Zhdanov's earlier position. In August 1934, the Congress of the Soviet Writers' Union instituted the doctrine of socialist realism as the only way to depict 'reality' in the Soviet Union. Andrey Zhdanov, using Stalin's definitions of writers as 'engineers of human souls,' defined the responsibility of a writer or filmmaker to represent reality not in "a dead scholastic way, not simply as 'objective reality,' but to depict reality in its revolutionary development."[31] *Zhdanov explained that "the truthfulness and historical concreteness of the artistic portrayal should be combined with the ideological remoulding and education of the toiling people in the spirit of socialism. This method in belles lettres and literary criticism is what we call the method of socialist realism."*[32]

Martin Ciel—taking as his example the journal Náš Film (Our Film)—notes that from 1949 on, all photographs from abroad disappeared and strong pro-Soviet and

[29] *Paul, 1983, p. 16.*
[30] *Ibid.*
[31] *Zhdanov. "Soviet Literature - the Richest in Ideas. The Most Advanced Literature," in R.S.F.S.R., 1979, p. 21.*
[32] *Ibid.*

anti-American propaganda began. Hollywood became the leading exemplar of ideological fraudulence and the socialist realist mode was set as the only mode of artistic expression. Ciel explains that socialist realism's formula should be pure and simple—the 'creative' illustration of life. Under any circumstances, films must not be about life here and now. According to Zhdanov's 'recommendation,' society is in transition; hence, its interpretation should follow the official line that prescribed the ideal society as it will be one day in the very near future.[33]

In Czechoslovakia, there were some efforts to resist socialist realism and to produce films outside its prescriptive mode, as Alfred Radok's film Daleká Cesta (Distant Journey, 1950) demonstrates. However the official ideologues labelled the film Daleká Cesta as 'existentialist' and, because of the censorship regulations, it was forbidden to be screened.

The situation changed a little after 1956 when the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union took place. The revelations about the distortion of socialism under Stalin's leadership made many reassess their political conscience and look at the past and present from a different perspective. In Czechoslovakia, struggles between the Soviet-backed old guard holding on to power and new democratic forces among the Party's leadership combined with the cultural forces trying to break free from the straight jacket of socialist realism and the imposition of an optimistic socialist way of life on the population culminated in the Prague spring of 1968. The way was open for a new artistic representation in cinema.

The Film Academy of Music Arts

To reconnect film history to Neorealism and its influence on Czechoslovak filmmakers, the important step in this story is the founding of the Film Academy of Music Arts (FAMU) in Prague by decree on 25 October 1945. The importance of film education to the success of filmmaking can be traced to the Soviet State Film School, which was the first established film school in the world in 1919. The formation of an Italian film school in 1934 in Rome had had a similar effect. The school graduates were Roberto Rossellini, Michelangelo Antonioni, Guiseppe De Santis, Luigi Zampa and many

[33] *Ciel, 1993, p. 14.*

others.[34] ***Similarly, it is generally acknowledged that the so-called Czechoslovak New Wave Cinema was the cinematographic movement of the (mostly young), University educated (the Film Academy of Musical Arts) filmmakers reacting against the imposition of the Soviet blueprint of socialist realist form and style. Galina Kopaněvová notes, in the 1960s, the most important stimulus for the resurgence of Czechoslovak cinematography came from the Prague film school.***[35]

At first, the University curriculum placed stress on the 'correct' educational model for the new socialist filmmaking,[36] ***which meant that only some of the films from Soviet Montage Cinema were shown. The theory of this school was 'improved' by Zhdanov's prescriptive formula of socialist realism. In 1950, the first generation of film graduates entered the industry. Kopaněvová praises Vojtech Jasný and Karel Kachyňa for overcoming the indoctrination of the early film school's curriculum based on "illusive, compromised Zhdanov's aesthetics" and to successfully compete with the younger graduates who were spared such didactic practices.***[37]

Later, as in many other soviet satellite countries, Italian neorealist cinema was admitted to the Film Academy's curriculum.[38] ***The Film Academy's later syllabus was more open than was the case at the beginning. Under the influence of professional filmmakers who became teachers at Film Academy, students evaluated films made in Italy and France, especially works of Italian Neorealism, French New Wave Cinema and Cinema Verité. They were also introduced to works of their Polish counterparts from the Polish Film School.***[39] ***A similar account is given by Žalman mentioning Chaplin, Pudovkin, Fellini and Truffaut as important inspirations for young cinematographers.***[40] ***In light of the stringent restrictions imposed on every foreign film originating from capitalist countries, the reason for allowing Italian neorealist films seemed to be that the Party saw these films as opportune examples of the deprived life of proletariat living under capitalism. According to this kind of logic, Italian neorealist films revealed***

---

[34] ***Liehm, 1984, p. 6.***
[35] ***Kopaněvová, 1989, p. 22. For a different reading, see Hames, 1985, p. 81.***
[36] ***See Kučera, 1959.***
[37] ***Kopaněvová, 1989, p. 22.***
[38] ***See also Dina Iordanova, who writes, "The stylistic influences over Balkan cinema can be located mostly within Europe-the Italian Neorealism and the French Nouvelle Vague … The visual style, however, was mostly influenced by the dynamic camerawork seen in Czech cinema of the 1960s, and by the elaborately staged takes of directors such as Hungarian Milkos Jancso and Russian Andrei Tarkovsky, as well as by the tableau-style of Georgian Serguei Paradjanov" (Iordanova, 2001, pp. 23-4).***
[39] ***See Kopaněvová, 1989, p. 22.***
[40] ***Žalman, 1968, p. 18.***

to lucky workers living under socialism the unethical capitalist exploitation of the masses.[41]

To return to the claim of neorealists that there is no 'neutral reality' independent of representation, we can see how the films' meaning can be read differently. For the Party's representatives, Italian Neorealism revealed the corruption of the capitalist mode of production. Not so for the young filmmakers. As Liehm suggests, "Neorealism holds a special place in the development of East European cinema. In the mid-fifties, its influence in Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia was crucial, merging with the endeavour of these productions to free themselves from Stalinist aesthetics."[42] *For the students of the Film Academy, Neorealism represented the ethical-political possibility of an engagement with the everyday. Thanks to the film practitioners cum pedagogues—such as Milan Kundera, Elmar Klos, Otakar Vávra and Otomar Krejča—teaching at the School offered critical and not demagogic evaluation of films.*[43] *Macek also reminds us that A. M. Brousil invited well-known world film practitioners to speak to students at the Film Academy. Unofficial visits by Cesare Zavattini, Giuseppe de Santis and others were a rule rather than an exception.*[44] *Later on, students were also exposed to many Western films produced and sent to Prague for sale. Most of these films were never bought—shielding the population from the vicious propaganda of the West—but students saw them in the specially organised projections for 'study purposes' only.*[45] *Following these projections, critical discussions followed. Hence, the future filmmakers of New Wave drew their inspirations from Italian Neorealism and Soviet montage cinema, French Nouvelle Vague and Cinema Verité style.*[46]

Patrick Cattrysse writes that "the Czech New Wave ... shows formal analogies with ... Italian Neorealism and with the French New Wave movement ... [and] a cinema verité style. [Films were] generally shot on location. They used natural light and nonprofessional actors who often spoke improvised dialogues."[47] *For Macek, filmmakers enthusiastically adopted Italian neorealist theoretical aspiration in order to portray the everyday life of people. Films ceased to represent the ideal picture of*

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:29 AM
Formatted: Font:Italic

[41] *See Žalman, 1990b, p. 385.*
[42] *Liehm, 1984, p. 131.*
[43] *Macek, 1996, p. 16.*
[44] *Ibid., pp. 15-6.*
[45] *See Liehm, 1974; 1983; Liehm and Liehm, 1977; Macek, 1996, pp. 15-6; Žalman, 1968; Skvorecky, 1971.*
[46] *See, for example, Ciel, 1993, p. 18; Trančík, 1966; Brož, 1967, p. 54.*
[47] *Cattrysse, 1997, p. 229.*

society where people will presumably live in one day in the future. They began to show reality that they lived in, with all social problems they daily encountered.[48] *Thus Macek poetically writes that these films "by the spark from Italian Neorealism lighted a small flame that was starting to warm up."*[49]

Italian Neorealism and Czechoslovak Cinema

Similarities between the situation in Italy after the Second World War and in Czechoslovakia after 1956 give credence to Bazin's observation that "neorealism is [neither] the exclusive property of any one ideology nor even of any one ideal."[50] *In the case of Italy, Monticelli argues that "Neo-Realist films provided an immediate response to the desire to wipe out the material and ideological legacies of fascism,"*[51] *while in the Czechoslovak context, Liehm reinforces Monticelli's claim, pointing out that "the neorealist experience ... symbolized the yearning for truth and freedom that obsessed the East European filmmakers as much as the early neorealists."*[52] *As mentioned above, in the case of Italy, the post-war situation prompted the search for new values and, in the case of Czechoslovakia, this search was triggered by the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union.*

Miloš Fiala explains that the Twentieth Congress and its revelations allowed a distinction between socialism and its distortion by the Stalinist cult of personality. Revelations prompted filmmakers to reassess their experience, revealing at the same time "the moral conflict of the period."[53] *Hence Italian post-war experience reverberates in Czechoslovakia. Rossellini can be used here to extend this qualification. The period after the Second World War prompted Rossellini to confront "ambiguous moral and emotional issues" of the time.*[54] *Alfonso Procaccini suggests that "historical circumstances force the writer [or filmmaker] to ask different questions," and through this process compel a redefinition of "one's relationship to society."*[55] *The important point for Procaccini is that Neorealism is not only "a*

[48] *Macek, 1996, pp. 13-4.*
[49] *Ibid., p. 14. Given that Bazin and Deleuze claim that Italian Neorealism influenced also the French Nouvelle Vague, in the following, I will concentrate only on the Italian Neorealism's impact on Czechoslovak filmmakers.*
[50] *Bazin, 1971, p. 87.*
[51] *Monticelli, 2000, p. 71.*
[52] *Liehm, 1984, p. 131.*
[53] *Fiala, 1969, pp. 62-3.*
[54] *Liehm, 1984, pp. 51 & 109.*
[55] *Procaccini, 1978, p. 43.*

manifestation of a subjective state," but it is "a disclosure which exposed a particular objective reality," while directing viewers' "attention on a special social issue," and voicing, "even if indirectly, a judgment on that reality."[56] Thus in both cases, in Italy's pre-war as well as post-war situation and in Czechoslovakia in the late 1950s and early 1960s, there was a need at a certain historical junction to re-examine the question: "What is reality?"[57] For Italian and Czechoslovak filmmakers, the question belonged more to the ethical-political category than to the aesthetic one. In a similar vein, Bazin argued that "neorealism is more an ontological position than an aesthetic one."[58] Likewise, in 1974, at the conference on Neorealism, Lino Micciché said that "Neorealism was 'an ethics of aesthetics.' It was the answer of a generation of filmmakers to the question asked by Vittorini: 'Shall we ever have a culture capable of protecting people against suffering instead of just comforting them?'"[59] Thus, as Bruce Hinrichs observes, "the realist concept was purposely altered and reconceived … to portray the personal, emotional truth experienced in the everyday lives of ordinary people." Neorealist art strove to represent "some fundamental truth of the human condition."[60]

To follow the comparison between the two countries, in Czechoslovakia, after the partial revelation concerning Stalin's policies, it was also a "question of personal conscience."[61] Žalman speaks of "works that by raising social and moral questions addressed themselves to the public conscience." Film representations called attention to "a disturbing atmosphere" created by "the associative sequences giving it a strongly personal dimension."[62] These films represented a reaction and denunciation of the archetypal worker struggling with class enemies. They represented a shift towards the representation of idiosyncratic individuals and their *personal problems*. Film narratives altered from a prescription of an ideal life to a personal depiction of people struggling with their mundane chores. As Siegfried Kracauer observed, "when history is made in the streets, the streets tend to move onto the screen."[63] Echoing Bazin's view that ideology is not an exclusive property of a certain style, Kracauer

[56] ***Ibid., p. 45.***
[57] ***Liehm, 1984, p. 96.***
[58] ***Bazin, 1971, p. 66.***
[59] ***Micciché cited in Liehm, 1984, p. 129.***
[60] ***Hinrichs, 1996, p. 9.***
[61] ***Skvorecky, 1971, p. 45.***
[62] ***Žalman, 1968, pp. 18-9.***
[63] ***Kracauer, (1960) 1997, p. 98.***

stresses that neorealist "narratives serve to dramatize social conditions in general."[64] So, speaking of directors Ján Kadár and Elmar Klos, Žalman points out that they frequently emphasised that "the only art ... is art concerned with the key problems of the time, art that adopts a frank moral and social standpoint."[65]

It is interesting to note the difference between the Hollywood formula which is based on the lonely individual and the neorealist treatment of the individual. While in the former case, it is the individual, existing in itself and for itself alone, separate from the social, in the latter, the individual is not possible to imagine outside of the social fabric in which she lives. The individual's journey as represented by Hollywood cinema—to put it with Theodor Adorno—is possible "as if all you really need to lead the good life is to be yourself and to be identical with yourself".[66] Society is somehow accidental to the final victory of the protagonist over obstacles thrown into his life. It is, of course, the Western genre that is the most obvious example, but this *modus operandi* underpins all films produced by Hollywood. Hollywood films, not unlike the socialist realism's objectives, refuse to account for the possibility of failure. Thus, to return to Kadár and Klos's understanding of art, their films cancel out the view of art that had dominated the socialist world under Stalinism or, as I suggest, the Hollywood formulaic treatment of reality. The point is not to withdraw from society to the imagined life of the individual existing as a self-subsisting atom, but the aim of filmmakers is "to help strengthen man's faith in common sense, in moral certitudes, in the permanent values of truth and life". The focus is on the individual, but it is his life as embedded in society where he must confront his choices as always choices informed by his responsibility towards oneself and the society he lives in. Concerning "man's relationship to society," Žalman notes, the purpose of the individual's actions is "not 'whether' but 'how' to become committed."[67]

The idea that ethical norms can be derived unproblematically from the social life of the community was already questioned by Hegel. It follows then that in the absence of the prescribed mode of good and virtuous life, it is the question of responsibility that comes to the fore. The "ethics of responsibility,"[68] to use Adorno's expression,

[64] Ibid., p. 99.
[65] Žalman, 1968, p. 17.
[66] Adorno, 2001, p. 14.
[67] Žalman, 1968, pp. 17-8.
[68] Adorno, 2001, p. 7.

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:39 AM
Formatted: Body Text

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:40 AM
Formatted: Font:Italic, English (AUS)

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:29 AM
Deleted:

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:44 AM
Deleted: *runs counter to*

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:48 AM
Deleted: *And*

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:07 AM
Deleted: *If not, then surely its main task in this day and age is*

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:10 AM
Deleted: *T*

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:55 AM
Formatted: English (AUS)

Unknown
Field Code Changed

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:55 AM
Formatted: English (AUS)

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:55 AM
Formatted: English (AUS)

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:35 AM
Deleted: *Ibid.,*

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:55 AM
Formatted: English (AUS)

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:55 AM
Formatted: English (AUS)

becomes linked to an individual's acting in the world. It is this moral attitude of an individual forged by taking up different options that is the theme running through these films. Žalman explains that the link which connects films made by Kadár and Klos, for example, is "the morally philosophical theme of compromise."[69] Thus the film *Obchod na Korze* (*The Shop on Main Street*) made in 1965 and directed by Kadár and Klos can stand as an example of the ethical dilemma of responsibility that an individual must potentially face.[70] It is important to stress the overall framework in which the story unfolds. It is the Second World War and the Nazi Nuremberg Racial Laws against Jews. The Nazi era is explored and used by filmmakers as representative of 'any' authoritarian government—past and present. Through this historical setting, the filmmakers freely explore contemporary society and the moral predicaments faced by people living under the totalitarian order.

Directors use different stylistic methods to highlight this central theme of ethical responsibility.[71] The opening scene of the film is constructed as a montage of various motifs which will be developed and closed through the duration of the plot. So, the opening shot relates to the last scene in the film. While in the first scene, the bird—stork can 'dance' and fly as he wishes, in the last scene of the film, faced with the ethical impasse caused by the Lautmanová's unintended murder, Tono hangs himself. Another motif introduced is the subjective point of view (POV) shot. The first scene is constructed as the stork's POV taken from the high sharp angle revealing prisoners walking in the castle yard and then panning through roofs of the city to show people promenading on the Main street. It is as though we are encouraged to see that we all are prisoners of some sort of order. This high sharp angle shot is repeated and varied throughout the film. The first repetition occurs in Tono's living room—the family dinner with Kolkocký. It is thus related to the opening shot, the supposed POV of the stork. Thus the scene of the family dinner is designed to show, by inference, that Tono is the 'prisoner' of the 'family order' and, in a larger context, a prisoner of political order as well since his brother-in-law is the commander of Hlinka's guards, which makes him the head of the city as well. The shot is taken in a high sharp angle, later used in connection with the long lens which most of the time denotes Tono's subjective POV, when he is not sure about himself, as for example, in the shop, which he came to

[69] Žalman, 1990, p. 201.
[70] The film was awarded an Oscar in the foreign film category in 1965.
[71] The treatment of the story is a mixture of Kafkaesque desperation, with the satirical undertones of Hašek.

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:30 AM
Formatted: English (AUS)
Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:47 AM
Formatted: English (AUS)

appropriate as the new 'Aryan' owner. His moral conscience causes him to feel uncomfortable with the role into which he was forced by his wife. He simply does not know what to say to Mrs Lautmanová who is the Jewish owner of the shop.

The interesting variation of this motif takes place at the end of the film. In front of the shop, the Nazis are rounding up Jews destined for the 'working camp.' It is at this moment when Lautmanová suddenly sees what is happening outside of the shop and realizes the implication of the Jews waiting for transportation. Here the same angle is used but this time as *her* subjective POV. Now it is her lack of knowledge that compels her to scream: 'Tono, what is going on? I don't understand?' Terrified Tono tries to stop her. The problematic nature of responsibility he felt towards her until then turns into panic for his own life. The final moral decision seems to be outside of Tono's control.

Tono's relief when Jews are taken away turns to horror when he unlocks the door of the cellar where he pushed Lautmanová previously. She is not responding to his calls. The high sharp angle from the top implies Tono's subjective POV by revealing Lautmanová's dead body. Marked by her Jewishness, Lautmanová can be free only when her soul leaves the body. The angle never levels (as has happened in all previous variations of this motif) as though to suggest that this time, there is no way back. His moral potentialities are finally exhausted. The connection with the opening scene is established and foreclosed at the same time; a soul is trapped in a body like a bird closed in a cage; to be able to fly free like a bird, a soul has to free itself from the 'prison' of the body. The angle-motif concludes in the same scene, when Tono, sitting on the chair in Lautmanová's bedroom, is framed from above, with the camera using the sharp high angle for the last time. Yet, by this time his inner war and indecision has ended. It is perhaps Lautmanová's finally free soul who is looking at him. The film closes with the dream sequence. To 'dance' with Mrs Lautmanová in front of the people was possible only after their death. Her Jewishness and his 'Aryanism' were incompatible in the eyes of the Racial Law. Only death gave them freedom.[72]

The film is structured around Tono, this atypical 'hero,' who talks to us through his struggle with the conscience as he faces the moral questions at the level of the

[72] Even in his first dream sequence, while he is alive, he does not dare to promenade with her in public..

everyday.[73] ***The film does not offer answers at all. The film only presents the everyday life of this 'antihero' trapped in the totalitarian order by showing that moral decisions are not heroic choices that take us outside of the mundane level of our lives. On the contrary, they are accumulations of the banal and the everyday events, never significant in themselves. And this non conclusion is prefigured when various protagonists simply state 'I do not understand:' the Jew Katz, when he receives a summons to go to the camp; Lautmanová when she sees most of her friends summoned outside of the shop; and Tono on a few occasions. It is left to viewers to engage with the film's meaning and to face the ethical possibilities which we can miss as much as Tono did. The filmic 'reality' is presented to viewers not as a fait accompli, not as something that simply mirrors the existing world. It is up to viewers to make sense of Tono's ethical dilemma.***

In a parallel endeavour, as Rossellini suggests, "neorealism involves a greater interest in individuals ... through the investigation of reality" in order to "reach an understanding of things, and to give them their true value."[74] ***Italian neorealist filmmakers as much as New Wave cinematographers strove to produce films that will present reality anew; so the film simultaneously will reveal and compel spectators to get involved with issues explored. The aesthetics of film style was used to explore social and ethical concerns of society. Czechoslovak filmmakers—as much as those in Italy after the war—recognising spectators' involvement in the text's construction of meaning, attempted to face up to ethical issues that confronted people in their respective political circumstances.***[75] ***Procaccini suggests that Neorealism "serves a double function: to be diagnostic as much as prognostic. ... To bridge the two is to form a political consciousness."***[76] ***In the end, the ideal achievement of this new art will be when the film's ending will prompt in viewers a new understanding of the world around them.***[77] ***In the last instance, it was precisely this possibility of critique triggered by new artistic expressions that the old-new communist guards feared the most. As Liehm and Liehm argue, "every advance, every experiment, as well as any attempt to establish***

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 8:59 AM
Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

[73] *It is noteworthy to point out that if the narrative of the film had been couched in socialist realism mode, Tono would have acquired a proletarian consciousness and engaged in an underground struggle against the Nazi occupants with other unsatisfied workers, probably sacrificing his life for his country and Communist ideals along the way.*

[74] *Rossellini cited in Liehm, 1984, p. 137.*

[75] *For a discussion of the spectator's activity in reading film text, see Kracauer, (1960) 1997, pp. 308-9. See also Bordwell, 1985; Bordwell and Thompson, 1997; Sobchack, 1992.*

[76] *Procaccini, 1978, pp. 52-3.*

[77] *See Ibid., pp. 51-5.*

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:29 AM
Formatted: English (AUS)

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:39 AM
Formatted: English (AUS)

contact with native or European artistic tradition of the twentieth century, was considered to be an expression of opposition and rebellion—and in effect, really was."[78]

Dirty Linen

And it is here, where we can see another parallel between Italian and Czechoslovak experience. When films' answer to the question 'What is reality?' suggests that the reality is around us, embodied in those small problems that we struggle with everyday, authorities can only answer with Mussolini: "This is not Italy!"[79] *The same answer was given to neorealists' representation of Italy. In 1949, a new film law on censorship was legislated. This so-called la legge Andreotti, by withholding financial support from the state, severely limited production of films representing struggling people in Italy, in other words, neorealist films. These films were blamed for "'washing dirty linen in public' and of 'slandering Italy abroad.'"*[80] *Giulio Andreotti wrote an open letter to De Sica, demanding to "assume his social responsibility, which cannot be limited to a description of the poverty and abuses of a system."*[81] *Similar charges were laid against filmmakers in Czechoslovakia.*

In February 1959, the First Film Festival of Czechoslovak Films opened in Banská Bystrica. Contrary to general expectations, the occasion was used by official culture to publicly criticise and condemn certain trends in Czechoslovak cinema, especially those films which attempted to look critically at socialist praxis. It was the strongest criticism of the cinema by the Party since 1948. Consider the accusations. The official speaker, cited in Miloš Fiala, asked a number of rhetorical questions, such as: "What are the themes of our films, which should talk about contemporary society?"[82] *Josef Škvorecký explains that Václav Kahuda, the Minister of Culture, blamed directors because they represented "themes taken almost exclusively from private life" that were not sufficiently "optimistic." Moreover, reminiscent of Mussolini and Andreotti's accusations, Kahuda mourned that films showed "contemporary settings exclusively*

[78] *Liehm and Liehm, 1977, p. 231.*
[79] *Cited in Liehm, 1984, p. 57.*
[80] *Ibid., p. 91.*
[81] *Cited in Ibid.*
[82] *Fiala, 1969, p. 67.*

among old decrepit tenements, where life goes on in corridors and dirty flats."[83] *Andreotti would have been delighted to hear Kahuda's indictment and condemnation. In particular, according to Škvorecký, Kahuda condemned the impact of Italian Neorealism. As far as the Communist Party was concerned, it is one thing to approve films that reveal the exploitation of people in capitalist countries, yet it is an altogether different case to apply the same treatment to the socialist society of Czechoslovakia.*[84] *In conclusion, Kahuda asked the question: "When will we see our positive, proletarian, contemporary hero, political and public worker in our cinemas? How will our film help to change life for the better; how will film help to enrich our citizens with ideals, morals, and aesthetic values?"*[85] *Thus, Italian Neorealism turned out to be a blessing as much as a curse for Czechoslovak filmmakers. The socialist dictates had not really gone away.*

Clearly, the Party's moral and political ideals were incompatible with the ones held by filmmakers. The speaker (and the Party) called for a continuation of, or rather a return to, the socialist realism which had dominated cinema screens from 1948. The call was again for those cardboard cut-out positive heroes changing history and building socialism with bright eyes, whose only problem was to fulfil the five year plan and to produce more steel than any other country in the world. Socialist heroes had no personal problems; in fact, they had no personal life at all. Here the personal was always tied to Stakhanov's ideal. It was a call for that imaginary representation of society not yet here, but very soon to be; for the 'land, where tomorrow means already yesterday.'[86] *The only problem with the 'present,' in 1959, was that 'tomorrow' seemed a long way off and yesterday was the Twentieth Congress in the Soviet Union. Given this state of affairs, Škvorecký reminds us that because of the revelations of the Twentieth Congress, charges against filmmakers could not be anymore formulated as "intentional enmity, or of plotting schemes injurious to socialism; [and] the Jews, [directors] Kadár and Jasný [could not be conveniently] accused of a Zionist plot; and even the well-worn CIA failed to get into speeches."*[87] *All in all, two main culprits were identified: the Italian neorealist formula wrongly applied to an otherwise bright socialist*

[83] *Cited in Skvorecky, 1971, p. 60. See also Fiala, 1969, pp. 67-8.*
[84] *See Skvorecky, 1971, p. 60.*
[85] *Fiala, 1969, p. 68.*
[86] *The title of a book which talks about the Soviet Union, where changes are so fast that the tomorrow of other countries is a yesterday in the Soviet Union.*
[87] *Skvorecky, 1971, p. 62.*

life and "the remnants of bourgeois thought, represented by Yugoslav revisionism."[88] *Clearly, Zavattini's theory speaking of "necessity to render facts as they are"*[89] *was dangerous when applied to representations of Czechoslovak life. The Party was interested only in facts, how they should be ideally, that is, sometime in the future. As Škvorecký notes, "the socialist-realist critics tolerated [neo-realism] in Italian films, but were allergic to it in Czech cinema."*[90]

Unlike the Italian situation, criticism was not the end of the affair. In Italy, Andreotti could refuse to give money for film production and the Andreotti Laws could also make foreign distribution of certain films difficult, if not impossible, yet in Czechoslovakia, at least until a regime change, the Party could outlaw already produced films forever without any need to justify its decisions. So, the film ***Tři Přání*** *(****Three Wishes****) directed by Kadár and Klos was singled out and banned. It was accused of "nihilism, petty bourgeois scepticism and defeatism."*[91] *Films such as* ***Tři Přání****,* ***Zde Jso Lvi*** *(****Here are Lions****,* **Václav Krška***),* ***Konec Jasnovidce*** *(****The End of a Clairvoyant****,* **Vladimír Svitáček***), and* ***Hvězda Jede na Jih*** *(****The Star Goes to South****,* **Oldřich Lipský***) were prohibited to be screened and withdrawn from distribution. Furthermore, Kadár and Klos could not work in the film industry for the next two years.*[92] *Reorganisations at the top level of the Barrandov film studio followed and censorship was reinforced through the so-called 'autocensorship of an author.' As Žalman observed,*

> *nobody seems to wonder, why this young generation was blamed and punished; the generation, which grew up and was educated during the socialist era, which knew and experienced only the socialist system and further on, never looked for solutions to the problems beyond this system, but always within it.*[93]

As a result of the First Film Festival of Czechoslovak Films and the criticism of the film industry by the Communist Party and Government officials (which was the same bureaucratic apparatus), cinema was thrown back to the optimistic socialist realism era.

In the first half of the 1960s, the struggle reopened with the Party still managing to keep films from the domestic market using censorship regulations and its

---

[88] *Ibid.*
[89] *Liehm, 1984, p. 73.*
[90] *Skvorecky, 1971, p. 44.*
[91] *Fiala, 1969, p. 68. Noteworthy here is the fact that most of the delegates at the conference, while condemning the film, actually did not see it. See Fiala, 1969; Skvorecky, 1971.*
[92] *Skvorecky, 1971, p. 63.*
[93] *Žalman, 1990a, p. 146.*

bureaucratic apparatus. Despite the censorship getting more and more lenient, there was one final act of conspicuous open interference by the Party resulting in the condemnation of films by Jan Němec and Ewald Schorm and prohibitions on the distribution of O Slavnosti a Hostech (The Party and the Guests, Němec, 1965) and Každý Den Odvahu (Courage for Every Day, Schorm, 1964).

In January 1968, Alexander Dubček came to power and on 1 March 1968, censorship was lifted. Media openly engaged in debates about freedom, democracy and 'socialism with a human face.' Films locked in the Party's vault were released after March 1968. Not for long. On 21 August 1968 all this came to an end. The invasion of Czechoslovakia by the armies of the Warsaw Pact ended artistic freedom in the country. It took another year, but the ensuing normalisation process—that is, the reintroduction of censorship, the reapplication of the Soviet model with central power over the economy, politics and culture—became facts of life in Czechoslovakia until the Velvet revolution in 1989. These events meant the end of Czechoslovak New Wave cinema. Many filmmakers of the New Wave were forbidden to make films, such as, Chytilová, Forman, Herz, Jireš, Jakubisko, Menzel, Němec, Schorm. Many of them left Czechoslovakia,[94] and others turned to the realm of fairy tales for children.

In the years 1956 through 1969, a new style and a new hero emerged. It was this hero's struggle with the dilemmas of conscience and personal responsibility which occupied the big screen in varied forms, reminiscent in many ways of Italian Neorealism. So the circle closes. Czechoslovak New Wave Cinema attempted to do what Liehm suggests was the aim of Rossellini when he finished his film Open City in 1945. According to her, "Rossellini already saw film as an instrument of a modern vision, a way of seeing things 'with one's own eyes.'[95] I suggest that it is this idea—to represent life through 'one's own eyes' and to challenge moral and political complacency of people—that Czechoslovak filmmakers appropriated from Italian Neorealism. It was this new approach that allowed them to explore matters of ethics and politics, to reject the generalisation and prescriptive optimism of socialist realism and search for a new style. These films by appropriating many features of Italian Neorealism investigated Czechoslovak society and searched for a new, more just

[94] ***Among those who left were Forman, Herz, Němec, Schorm.***
[95] ***Liehm, 1984, p. 63, italics added.***

society they wished to live in. Věra Chytilová, Miloš Forman, Juraj Herz, Elo Havetta, Juraj Jakubisko, Ján Kadár and Elmar Klos, Jiří Menzl, Jan Němec, Evald Schorm, Štefan Uher and others attempted to formulate new ways of understanding 'reality.'[96] *They endeavoured to challenge their audience to face up to the moral and political landscape of their lives. The message of the New Wave cinema was enunciated as an ever-present need to confront the everyday in order to lead meaningful lives. This is what Italian Neorealism attempted for the first time in film, and it is this heritage that is taken up anew by filmmakers whenever 'reality' needs to be negotiated again.*

References

Bartošek, Luboš. *Náš Film. Kapitoly z Dějin (1896 - 1945)*. Praha: Mladá Fronta, 1985.

Bazin, André. "*Cabiria*: The Voyage to the End of Neorealism." Trans. Hugh Gray. *What is Cinema?* Vol. 2. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971, 83-92.

Bazin, André. "De Sica: *Metteur en Scène*." Trans. Hugh Gray. *What is Cinema?* Vol. 2. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971, 61-78.

Bazin, André. "In Defense of Rossellini. A Letter to Guido Aristarco, Editor-in-chief of *Cinema Nuovo*." Trans. Hugh Gray. *What is Cinema?* Vol. 2. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971, 93-101.

Bordwell, David and Kristin Thompson. *Film Art. An Introduction*. Fifth ed. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc., 1997.

Bordwell, David. *Narration in the Fiction Film*. London: Routledge, 1985.

Brož, Jaroslav. *The Path of Fame of the Czechoslovak Film*. Prague: Československý FilmExport, 1967.

Cattrysse, Patrick. "The Unbearable Lightness of Being: Film Adaptation Seen from a Different Perspective." *Literature/Film Quarterly*. Vol. 25. No. 3. 1997, 222-30.

Ciel, Martin. "Súvislosti Slovenskej Filmovej Teórie: 1945-1971." *Slovenský Hraný Film. 1970-1990*. Ed. Václav Macek. Edícia Signans. Bratislava: Slovenský Filmový Ústav-Národné Kinematografické Centrum, 1993, 11-25.

Corliss, Richard. "The Kids are Alright." *Time*. Vol. 153. No. 10. 15 March 1999, 85.

Daniel, František. "The Czech Difference." *Politics, Art and Commitment in the East European Cinema*. Ed. David W. Paul. London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1983, 49-56.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema 2. The Time-Image*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.

[96] Some of directors and some of their films: Věra Chytilová: *Pytel Blech* (*A Bagful of Fleas*, 1962), *O Něčem Jiném* (*Something Different*, 1963), *Semikrásky* (*Daises* 1966); Miloš Forman: *Černý Petr* (*Peter and Pavla*, 1963), *Lásky Jedné Plavovlásky* (*Loves of a Blonde* 1965), *Hoří má Panenko* (*Firemen's Ball* 1967); Juraj Herz: *Spalovač Mrtvol* (*Cremator* 1968); Elo Havetta: *Slávnosť v Botanickej Záhrade* (*The Party in the Botanical Garden*, 1969); Juraj Jakubisko: *Kristove Roky* (*Crucial Years*, 1967), *Zbehovia a Pútnici* (*Deserters and Pilgrims*, 1068), *Vtáčkovia, Siroty a Blázni* (*Birds, Orphans and Fools*, 1968); Ján Kadár and Elmar Klos: *Smrť sa Volá Engelchen* (*Death is called Engelchen*, 1963), *Obžalovaný* (*The Accused*, 1964), *Shop on the Main Street* (1965); Jiří Menzl: *Ostře Sledované Vlaky* (*Closely Watched Trains* 1966), *Skřivánci na Niti* (*Skylarks on a string* 1970); Jan Němec: *O Slavnosti a Hostech* (*The Party and the Guests*, 1966); Evald Schorm: *Každý Den Odvahu* (*Courage for Every Day*, 1964), *Návrat Straceného Syna* (*Return of the Prodigal Son*, 1966), *Farářův Konec (The End of a Priest*, 1968); Štefan Uher: *Slnko v Sieti* (*Sunshine in a Net*, 1962), Organ (*The Organ*, 1963).

Fiala, Miloš. "Rozlet a Brzda. (Naše Kinematografie v Létech 1957-59)." Film a Doba. Vol. 2. 1969, 62-8.

Furhammar, Leif and Folke Isaksson. Politics and Film. Trans. Kersti French. New York, Washington: Praeger Publishers, 1971.

Hames, Peter. The Czechoslovak New Wave. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1985.

Hinrichs, Bruce. "A Trip to the Movies: 100 Years of Film as Art." The Humanist. Vol. 56. No. 1. January/February 1996, 7-13.

Iordanova, Dina. "Balkan Cinema in the 90s: An Overview." Afterimage. Vol. 28. No. 4. January/February 2001, 23-6.

Kopaněvová, Galina. "V Září, v Sorrentu." Zborník Fóra Mladého Filmu '89. Eds. Jan Jaroš; Martin Ciel and Peter Dubecký. (First published in Il Diemma. No. 12. 1969). Edícia Fóra Mladého Filmu. Zväzok 4. Bratislava: Správa Úcelových Zariadení MV SZM, SFÚ-SFT, 1989, 21-7.

Kosík, Karel. "Epilogue: Karel Kosík." Trans. Peter Kussi and Adolf Hoffmeister. The Politics of Culture. Ed. Antonín J. Liehm. Interview: May 1968. New York: Grove Press Inc., 1973.

Kracauer, Siegfried. Theory of Film. The Redemption of Physical Reality. Miriam Bratu Hansen, an Introduction. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, (1960) 1997.

Kučera, Jan. Filmová Tvorba. Základní Otázky Filmové Estetiky. (Přednášky pro Večerní Školu Filmové Tvorby). Praha: FAMU, 1959.

Liehm, Antonín J. "Miloš Forman: the Style and the Man." Politics, Art and Commitment in the East European Cinema. Ed. David W. Paul. London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1983, 211-24.

Liehm, Antonín J. Closely Watched Films. The Czechoslovak Experience. White Plains, New York: International Arts and Sciences Press, Inc., 1974.

Liehm, Mira and Antonín J. Liehm. The Most Important Art. Eastern European Film After 1945. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1977.

Liehm, Mira. Passion and Defiance. Film in Italy from 1942 to the Present. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1984.

Macek, Václav. Dušan Hanák. Bratislava: Nadácia FOTOFO, Slovenský Filmový Ústav - NKC, Filmová a Televízna Fakulta VŠMU, 1996.

Mattelart, Armand. "European Film Policy and the Response to Hollywood." World Cinema. Critical Approaches. Eds. John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson. Consultant Eds. Richard Dyer, E. Ann Kaplan and Paul Willemen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, 94-101.

Monticelli, Simona. "Italian Post-War Cinema and Neo-Realism." World Cinema. Critical Approaches. Eds. John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson. Consultant Eds. Richard Dyer, E. Ann Kaplan and Paul Willemen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, 71-6.

Paul, David W. "Introduction: Film Art and Social Commitment." Politics, Art and Commitment in the East European Cinema. Ed. David W. Paul. London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1983, 1-22.

Piech, Stefan M. "The Impact of the 1989 Velvet Revolution on the Former Czechoslovakian Film Industry." Innovation. Vol. 10. No. 1. 1997, 37-60.

Procaccini, Alfonso. "Neorealism: Description/Prescription." Yale Italian Studies. Vol. 2. 1978, 39-57.

R.S.F.S.R. Problems of Soviet Literature: Reports and Speeches at the First Soviet Writers' Congress. Vsesoiuznyi Sezd Sovetskikh Pisatelei in 1934 Moscow. London: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1979.

Skvorecky, Josef. All the Bright Men and Women. A Personal History of the Czech Cinema. Trans. Michael Schonberg. The Take One Film Book Series. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates Ltd. In Association with 'Take One' Magazine, 1971.

Sobchack, Vivian Carol. The Address of the Eye: A Phenomenology of Film Experience. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Sorlin, Pierre. "Neorealism or the Complexity of Urban Relationship." European Cinemas, European Societies. 1939-1990. Studies in Film, Television and the Media. London and New York: Routledge, 1991, 117-26.

Trančík, Pavol. Niektoré Estetické Problémy Filmu. Bratislava: Slovenský Filmový Ústav, 1966.

Whyte, Alistair. New Cinema in Eastern Europe. London: Studio Vista Ltd., 1971.

Žalman, Jan. "Umlčený Film. Kapitoly z Bojů o Lidskou Tvář Československého Filmu. Part 1." Film a Doba. Vol. 36. No. 3. 1990a, 138-46.

Žalman, Jan. "Umlčený Film. Kapitoly z Bojů o Lidskou Tvář Československého Filmu. Part 5." Film a Doba. Vol. 36. No. 7. 1990b, 385-94.

Žalman, Jan. Films and Film-makers in Czechoslovakia. Trans. George Theiner. Prague: Orbis, 1968.

Adorno, Theodor W. *Problems of Moral Philosophy*. Trans. Rodney Livingstone. Ed. Thomas Schröder. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2001.

Žalman, Jan. "Umlcený Film. Kapitoly z Boju o Lidskou Tvár Ceskoslovenského Filmu. Part 2." *Film a Doba*. Vol. 36. No. 4. 1990, 194-204.

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:25 AM
Formatted: Font:Times New Roman

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:25 AM
Formatted: Font:Times New Roman,

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:25 AM
Formatted: Font:Times New Roman

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:25 AM
Formatted: Font:Times New Roman

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:25 AM
Formatted: Font:Times New Roman

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:25 AM
Formatted: Font:Times New Roman,

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:25 AM
Formatted: Font:Times New Roman

Lubica Ucnik 29/11/2003 9:25 AM
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.27 cm