



DOI: 10.54919/physics/55.2024.143ge9

Analysis of the American directors' works in the context of the European theory of auteur cinema

Iryna Gavran*

Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts
01601, 36 Ye. Konovalets Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

Serhii Honcharuk

Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts
01601, 36 Ye. Konovalets Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

Volodymyr Mykhalov

Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts
01601, 36 Ye. Konovalets Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

Halyna Kot

Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts
01601, 36 Ye. Konovalets Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

Artem Parokonnyi

Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts
01601, 36 Ye. Konovalets Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

Abstract

Relevance. The relevance of this study is determined by the trends in the development of New Hollywood, which have radically changed the essence of modern cinematograph.

Purpose. The purpose of the study is to identify the specifics of New Hollywood cinema, which resonated in the work of modern Hollywood directors as an influential and competitive area. Examples from films by American directors and authors were analysed.

Methodology. Methods of scientific analysis, comparison, and generalisation were used in the study of the topic. In addition, analytical and systematic methods were applied in their unity, which is necessary for studying the art history aspect of the problem, working on the historical and factual base and clarifying the terminology of research. Using the method of introspection, the paper investigated and systematised the problems of director's self-fulfilment, which contributed to the awareness of the specifics of the theory and practice of author's cinema parity.

Results. Based on the results of the study, conclusions were drawn about the specifics of creating author's models of modern cinema under the influence of the canons of New Hollywood author's independent cinematograph.

Conclusions. It was established that the determination of factors of professionalism creates psychological models of professional activity and professional self-consciousness of the individual. The practical significance of the study consists

Suggested Citation:

Gavran I, Honcharuk S, Mykhalov V, Kot H, Parokonnyi A. Analysis of the American directors' works in the context of the European theory of auteur cinema. *Sci Herald Uzhhorod Univ Ser Phys.* 2024;(55):1439-1448. DOI: 10.54919/physics/55.2024.143ge9

*Corresponding author



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

in expanding the arsenal of knowledge about the specifics of the author in cinema and, in particular, the author's cinema of New Hollywood and makes it possible to use them in training courses on the theory and history of cinema and directing.

Keywords: director-author; author's self-expression; independent cinema; American cinematic art; mass and elite audience; avant-garde.

Introduction

Hollywood cinematograph is undoubtedly one of the most popular in the world. Hollywood-made film production sets the fashion in practically all genres of cinema and has a considerable impact on the film industry of other countries. American films can boast almost the largest budgets in the world. At the same time, the use of the latest technologies in American cinema contributes to a viewer's deeper immersion in the real and unreal audiovisual world of cinematograph.

In the second half of the 1960s, a unique phenomenon emerged and developed in the artistic culture of the 20th century until the mid-1980s – the cinematograph of the New Hollywood, aimed at establishing new trends in cinematic art. The representatives of New Hollywood destroyed the focus of existing cinema at that time on the declaration of the class world in favour of a liberal view and radical skepticism regarding American virtues. In fact, classic Hollywood was turned primarily to American problems.

Such transformations were accompanied by changes in the existing at that time status of cinema in the system of technogeneous arts. Thus, for example, television took over the functions of promoting certain universal and, in particular, American values to the audience. In turn, representatives of the new Hollywood cinematograph began to turn to less ideologised images of American society. Another important circumstance turned out to be that the directors of classic Hollywood cinema created films exclusively for the evening rest of the audience, which forced independent distributors to buy them in packages along with short films and new materials. Let us recall that modern Hollywood companies are still involved in the production and sale of related products – such as books, TV shows, music CDs, toys, games, videos, T-shirts [1].

In an attempt to classify American auterism, as well as to find its fundamental differences from the mass box office cinema of Hollywood, film critics expressed opposite opinions. Thus, some still believe that its main principle is the independence of the financial plan from major Hollywood studios and ways of its distribution – film festivals, television, and CDs. Other film critics are convinced that independence is more a social position of the author of the film, a deliberate deviation from the canonical norms of Hollywood film production and the obligatory presence of deconstruction of meaning [2]. Cinematographic practitioners and theorists see the fundamental differences between independent cinema and box office Hollywood differently. However, the criteria proposed by them not only accurately describe the difference between the analysed cultural phenomena, but also allow the authors to further rely on the features of independent cinema as a phenomenon other than the film industry when analysing the thematic features of American independent cinematograph. It is worth giving an example of a theoretical approach to the differences between

independent and box office cinematograph. American film director and avant-garde specialist David James divides American cinema into three groups: the first is occupied by box office cinema, the second – author's cinematograph, and the third – avant-garde cinema. It is generally accepted that author's cinema borrows some methods and means, ideas and priority areas from avant-garde cinema and uses it to create full-length films that could be watched by a considerable number of viewers. It is a more accessible movie, but it is still different from Hollywood [3].

In general, avant-garde and independent films carry a certain message that differs from the historical time and place. Directors, creating such films, should think about this within certain historical limits, and then the answers to key questions will be different at different times. Thus, for example, in the 1970–80s, various ethnic minorities in the United States were quite active, while a considerable proportion of African Americans began to express their dissatisfaction with the fact that they were either not shown at all in the cinema, or shown falsely. Therefore, at that historical moment, shooting an authentic movie about themselves and for themselves, was primarily a radical act. Such films were mostly associated with the cultural traditions of certain ethnic groups, reflected their struggle for emancipation, civil rights, which became the main theme for avant-garde American cinema of that period. It is important that today in mass Hollywood cinema, the audience is presented with African-American, Asian characters, representatives of sexual minorities, whose screening until the mid-1970s was impossible for Hollywood cinema [4]. As a result, the creators of author's independent cinema were doomed to limited public attention. Since innovative films were too different from films of classical cinematograph, an elementary psychological mechanism of the viewer was triggered: a person thinks and perceives by analogy, as the new correlates with the conventional, while the speed of perception and understanding of what was seen directly depends on the degree of coincidence with the known and familiar.

Thus, it was identified that "author's cinematograph will be a success only when the directors create and develop their own artistic tradition when an individual work will be compared with a specific area, with the phenomenon as a whole", but this, in turn, causes a certain contradiction because, falling into the realm of tradition, it already ceases to be avant-garde. Based on this, it becomes clear that the author's cinematograph with the search for new expressive means (for example, an alternative composition of films that argues with a linear, consistent composition) is doomed, at best, to insufficient attention to itself, at worst – to a complete commercial failure (Tarantino films are rather an exception here since the director combines the author's concept of "Pulp Fiction", innovative in essence, with numerous commercial supports) [5]. The mass success of genre films is also explained by the fact that the majority of viewers see the

immutability of artistic clichés. The author's cinematograph destroys basic illusions, therefore it has few viewers since in general, stress-resistant people are a minority [6]. Moreover, the confirmation or refutation of the basic illusion is a litmus test, which can distinguish a genre film from an author's film.

Materials and Methods

The theoretical basis of this research is the work of scientists, historians, and critics who study and analyse the cinematograph of the New Hollywood and modernity. Among them are S. Ann Wells [7], A. Bartosiewicz & A. Orankiewicz [8], T. Berliner [2; 9], G. Bettinson [10], T. Cerasulo [3], M. Ghourchi & S. Mosaviyan [11], P. Clogher [6], A. Kanjere [12], and others. Within the framework of the topic under study, the problems of director's self-fulfilment that still arise today were analysed. In modern scientific literature, various aspects of the director's self-fulfilment and the director's idea of the New Hollywood era are analysed. This study was conducted in two stages. At the first stage, the concepts of "New Hollywood cinematograph", "director's idea", "director's self-fulfilment", "independent cinema" were described. The prerequisites for the emergence of the author's independent cinema; features of the author's independent cinema of that time and modernity; the most famous representatives of the New Hollywood era, as well as the influence of New Hollywood cinematograph on modern cinema were considered. In accordance with the tasks of this stage of research, the most common method of information analysis used by modern scientists was applied. The method of analysis in the process of theoretical understanding of the subject and object under study makes it possible to divide the phenomenon into its components and trace them according to various aspects related to the purpose set for the scientist.

At the second stage of the study, the universal model of the author's cinema of New Hollywood was compared with the creation of modern Hollywood films, which helped to effectively show the difference between approaches to creating author's films of the specified time and modern films. For this purpose, the method of comparative analysis was used, as well as the basic principles for designing a universal model for creating author's cinema were applied. Let us recall that comparative analysis is general scientific method for searching and identifying similarities or discrepancies in the same type of qualities (features, changes, development trends) of the studied objects based on the collected statistical data or empirical studies. Next to comparative observation and comparative modelling, there is a component of comparative studies as a comprehensive methodology for comparing objects for their systematisation, typology, cognition of essential connections, development of a research strategy. The fundamental condition for applying this method is that the studied objects have at least one common property, against which it is possible to distinguish the studied variables.

The paper presents the results of an empirical study, which considered the problems of the director's self-fulfilment, as well as the degree of awareness of modern scientists in the field of problems of the author's cinematograph in New Hollywood. The paper demonstrates the stages of the research, reflects its results

and provides a detailed analysis of current scientific sources. Based on the results of studying this problem, conclusions were drawn about the need to learn how to create modern cinema under the influence of canonical materials of the author's independent cinema of New Hollywood. The paper presents recommendations for students of higher educational institutions (art areas) regarding materials on the history of cinematograph, directing, conditions for creating author's modern cinema from the point of view of the director's worldview. The study shows that the most important factors for creating an independent author's film include the development of a personal vision and perception of the world.

Results

The problems of independence of author's cinema from established traditions are considered by L. Tronchin & N. Scaroni [13]: "As in all other arts, in cinematograph, the process of the flow of radical moves into mass production, as well as the transition of authors from one status to another, is completely natural. In fact, mass art absorbs everything socially adaptive in its constant variability". At the same time, everything that is mass lends itself to nostalgic archaization, becomes aesthetically considerable and playful, returning to the sphere of playing out independent cinema. In the same way, mass culture was considered by L. Tronchin & N. Scaroni [13], who also substantiated the differences between mass culture and elite culture. In the author's cinematograph, "the power and ability of the art of directing to transform reality are fulfilled. Independent directors either believe in this possibility or deny it in the plot and content of their films, trying to demonstrate to the audience: you are watching my work and do not change for the better or for the worse", says the iconic American director of independent cinematograph John Sayles [12]. He draws attention, first of all, to the fact that the director of an independent film sees a specific viewer in front of him. If the director of the author's cinema imagines an ideal viewer who will understand his idea or appreciate the implementation of the idea, then the Hollywood director first of all strives for fame among the maximum possible number of viewers. This position brings independent cinematograph closer to the group of closed texts, evaluating it as part of an elite culture.

English independent film director Michael Winterbottom primarily focuses on creative freedom: "from the point of view of the filming process, I think I have always wanted to make films the way I want. For author's cinema, in which artists strive to make films exactly the way they want, without being included in the studio system, this is not the best status". Notably, all companies that finance and distribute non-mainstream film products are called independent in the United States. But almost all of them, as well as large studios, are focused on profit and create films for this purpose. One of the most pressing problems of independent cinema is financing. For high-quality implementation of any project, in particular, low-budget films, certain costs are required. In an interview, Dutch director Hany Abu Assad pointed out: "there are two official ways to raise the budget for an independent film. The first is subsidising. It can be public financing or sponsorship, something like rich companies

that give money to poor artists. There is no need to return the money received as a subsidy. The second way is commercial. One will need to return the money invested. Therefore, the film should involve star actors and an accessible story. However, there is also a third way – partisan. This means trying to make a film very cheaply, but so that the cheapness does not affect the quality" [11].

It is important that some filmmakers also distinguish the so-called ideologically independent cinema. Thus, the American textbook "The study of media" analyses the films of the famous independent director John Sayles, which indicates that none of his films was complex in formal or narrative terms, all had witty dialogues and narrative confidence that can be expected from a successful screenwriter of genre films. However, these are not films that would be produced or shown at the film distribution by major studios. John Sayles is a symbol of American independent cinema and is not involved in the production of commercial films. Classical author's cinema in general can differ in the following characteristics: the presence of creative freedom of the director; attracting viewers to intellectual reflection; the presence of criticism of bourgeois ideology; offers of alternative values; demonstrative depiction of resistance to stereotypes that have developed in mainstream films; organisation of discussions and roundtables by directors who touch on topics raised in films that carry educational functions; support for alternative rental methods (in movie houses, university cinemas, rental companies that specialise in non-commercial cinema).

Concluding the review of approaches to the criteria for distinguishing independent and mainstream cinema, let us turn to official information from the companies' websites. The main criterion for accepting films for competitive consideration by the organisers of the Independent Spirit Awards, the most honourable independent film award, is their low budget, that is, the budget of the film together with post-production should be less than 20 million dollars. The New York Independent Cinematography Award "Gotham Awards" defines the following criteria for compliance:

- money economy on movie production;
- film distribution is carried out using special departments of studios, independent distributors, or own distribution. Before film release, a contribution to a commercial New York or Los Angeles movie theatre should be made. The film is shown for at least 7 consecutive days;
- the film is advertised and sold during the New York or Los Angeles film distribution using the methods adopted in this industry. The film is shown to the public in 16 mm, 35 mm, or 70 mm formats or in digital format, providing images and sound in a format suitable for presentation in commercial cinemas.

An analysis of the fundamentals of film production and a comparative analysis of the director's role in independent and Hollywood cinematograph showed that in both Hollywood and American independent cinema, the director is a key figure who determines the development and process of making a film, takes a close part in the final establishment of the visual culture of individual episodes and, most importantly, is responsible for the appearance of the film as the final artistic product. At the level of using

screen means for expressing the author's idea, directors of independent and Hollywood cinematograph rely on the same elements, so the difference lies in the non-standard reading and the nature of artistic discoveries, in the dominance of the treatment or plot, genre or extra-genre character, as well as at the level of philosophical generalisation. The distinction between independent cinematograph and other types of cinema is also based on different social and philosophical ideas about the purpose of cinematograph and its role in people's lives.

Independent and mass cinematograph perform various cultural and social functions. The myths that form the basis of Hollywood cinematograph and ensure the reproduction of the cultural system are exposed in independent cinematograph. From the point of view of the system approach, the role of independent cinematograph corresponds to the function of self-control of the system. The division of cinema into independent and mass reflects the fundamental differences used by the elite point of view on culture. It can be mentioned that independent cinematograph exists due to the emergence of mass culture phenomenon in the sense that researchers put into it. Before the 19–20th century art met the class requirements, but with the massification of society all institutions responsible for preserving the elite segment of art are being separated. Independent filmmakers create original and unique films that vividly reflect the personality of the director, his vision of the world, visualise his author's fantasies and illusions. Such films, as a rule, are not perceived by all viewers. Thus, American independent cinematograph can be attributed to elite art, understood only by the "chosen ones" who have a certain artistic perception [14].

Until now, the question of which culture independent cinema belongs to – mass or elite – remains controversial for many. Most likely, this question cannot be answered unequivocally. Without a doubt, author's cinema is not for everyone, but at the same time, it is addressed to every viewer. The problem is that the viewer may not be ready for intensive work, perception of the movie symbol and its decoding. On the other hand, independent cinema, due to its ambiguity and symbolism, allows the viewer to develop a whole range of meanings laid down by the director. Author's cinema is a unique phenomenon, a special type of communication between the author-director and the audience, who perceives and processes symbolic film images. Until the mid-1960s, leading Hollywood studios Universal, Paramount, and 20th Century Fox were run by cinema luminaries who came into business during the collapse of cinematograph. Thus, Peter Biskind in the book "Easy Riders, Raging Bulls" recalls that the youngest of the producers of the major four studios in the early 1960s was 63 years old, the oldest – 92. They joined Golden Hollywood with slave contracts for actors, large-scale filming, and theatrical plots. However, the big Hollywood system was already on the verge of collapse – "Cleopatra" from 20th Century Fox failed at the film distribution, "West Side Story" was the last musical that conquered the film academy rather by inertia. It seems that no one was interested in peplums or a simple movie with dancing [9].

Meanwhile, the consciousness of the young audience was already captured by television, a counterculture riot was in the air, pacifists were drawn to the streets, angry

with the actions of the government and actually frightened by the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Large studios, seriously confused by the fact of social change, looked for an opportunity to survive and gave more freedom to young American directors. These were young directors who shot documentaries with hand-held cameras (M. Scorsese recorded Woodstock), edited films of category B (F. Coppola spent hours in the editing room of R. Corman), worked on television, radio, and in print publications (S. Kubrick, M. Scorsese, R. Polanski, R. Altman, and W. Allen got used to working with scripts on their own in this way). They watched films by Bergman, Fellini, and Kurosawa, falling under the "harmful influence" of the author's theory of French critics-directors. As a result, their films were completely different from the glossy Hollywood picture on the big screen.

In American cinema, the concept of "author" appeared, and European cameramen reached out to Hollywood, who were not afraid to shoot on the street, in a cabriolet on the move, in a helicopter with their legs tied to the ramp (as L. Kovac, who thus fearlessly shot "Easy rider"). Natural light, non-classical angles, bold editing – all this instantly attracted the attention of American teenagers and young people – the main consumers of cinema. However, there is no exact reference to the era of New Hollywood as such. Some historians and film theorists consider the social film drama "Who's afraid of Virginia Woolf?" (1966) by Mike Nichols to be the starting point, while other researchers call the film "Bonnie and Clyde" by Arthur Penn (1967), which became the manifesto of the struggle against the capitalist system.

In addition to directors, young actors who have mastered the Stanislavsky system and the art of acting – Dustin Hoffman, Robert De Niro, Faye Dunaway, Jack Nicholson, Al Pacino, Diane Keaton, Peter Fonda, Gene Hackman – have also started a new formation in the creation of independent author's films.

A considerable contribution to the production of the author's films was made by small low-budget studios such as "BBS Productions" of Bob Rafelson and Bert Schneider ("Easy rider", "Five easy pieces", "The Last Picture Show"). Such studios emerged as a result of the collapse of the vertical system that large film studios have previously worked with. The differentiation of these processes led to the creation of the first author corporations back in the 1950s, which, in turn, laid the creative basis for the first small indie studios in the late 1960s. In those days, even experimental films could receive funding, such as the creation of the last Dennis Hopper's film, and avant-garde films by Kenneth Anger and Andy Warhol were particularly popular [15].

Already by the end of the 1970s, the production dictate will considerably restrict the author's freedom. Entering the era of blockbusters with Steven Spielberg's "Jaws" or George Lucas' "Star Wars", filmmakers realised that it was time for globalisation, which dictated the presence of top players in the business who could think for several years to come. In addition, the development of home video automatically increased the demand for movie production. Thus, the rebellious directors of the 1970s were lucky enough to get into the niche of the crisis period in Hollywood. Directors-authors, putting the counterculture as the basis of their own films, allowed themselves to speak

for some time without censorship and romanticization of reality. Let us recall that during the "Golden Age" of Hollywood, artists tried to create the ideal image of America by screen means, recreate the American dream, educating the entire nation with the help of cinema. Modern Hollywood began as the dominant trend in the global entertainment market, which led to the emergence of new business combinations. Since the 1980s, the unification movement of companies into multinationals began. In the era of modern Hollywood, it becomes incredibly difficult not only to draw a line between the film industry and other media and entertainment industries, but also to understand cinema as a cultural and "textual" object in general. It is no coincidence that the synergy in this regard is being discussed [16].

In the 1980s, scientists began to actively develop the concept of modern and postmodern art. This situation also brought certainty to the problem of periodisation of New Hollywood. Researchers such as Fredrik Jameson or Norman Denzin attribute the emergence of postmodernism in American culture to the 1960s. New Hollywood films, with their sensitivity to European influences, can be interpreted as an approximation of American cinema to postmodernism. If the modernist, as Jameson pointed out, forcibly thinks about the new, trying to find out how it is introduced into the world, the postmodernist cares more about breakthroughs, events, more than about new worlds, irrevocable changes in the representation of things, and how it will be implemented. The modernist thinks of things as such, whereas for the postmodernist, content is mostly images. For a modernist, nature is still a zone of life, and the old and archaic is all that exists. Postmodernism appears when there is confidence that the modernisation process is over and nature is familiar. This is a world where culture has become a different nature [17].

Unlike modernism, which insists on a high, unique style, on the artistic ideal of avant-garde art, postmodernism rejects style, a sense of uniqueness and personality. New Hollywood, with its emphasis on directorial style, turned out to be the last sign of uniqueness. Modern Hollywood, with its focus on blockbusters, the brand, and the conversion of this brand to various media formats, began to reject uniqueness. And although some directors, like Steven Spielberg or Brian De Palma, still try to remind people of the classic "storytelling" and style, they are rather an exception. The uniqueness in Hollywood has been replaced by pastiche. Pastiche is an imitation of the unique, "use of linguistic masks". However, unlike parody, pastiche cancels satirical impulses being pure irony. Pastiche implements itself through the so-called nostalgic films or retro films that restructure it on a collective and social level. Retro films produce, bring the lost past closer, breaking it through irony. Since Lucas' film "American Graffiti" (1973), retro has become one of Hollywood's most beloved genres. However, the trend for it was set back in the era of the New Hollywood by "Bonnie and Clyde", yet this film could not be called a pastiche, as it formed a myth, defined the heroes of the generation [18].

Postmodernism destroys the classic attitude to transparent storytelling in favour of citation, while representatives of New Hollywood do not abandon a strong

plot, combine it with the themes and stylistic innovations of European cinema of the "new wave". A typical postmodern film is "Pulp fiction", built as a crime anthology, where everything, including cruelty and violence, turns into an element of an outstanding game. Representatives of the New Hollywood did not play with culture, but created their own "countercultural" utopia, largely romantic [19-21]. In this regard, they still had serious intentions, which made their film the last modernist challenge. This utopia was fleeting, in particular, because Hollywood entered an era of globalisation that left no room for the romanticism of single authors.

Discussion

The classical style played a central role in the American film industry and production models from about 1917 until 1960. Classical norms dictated the limits of the functioning of film equipment: camera movement, light setting, colour, sound principles, and so on. These norms established a whole set of prescriptions about what a movie should be like, what a story should tell and how. Formal and stylistic norms developed a model of film production with a characteristic set of economic goals, a specific division of work, and a certain work of the director [22; 23]. Classical cinema was called overly clear cinema. It was aimed at telling a story and developed in the field of certain ethno-socio-political norms. Compliance and slow change of norms served as the foundation for creating a group film style, which was not a monolith but a complex system of specific forces in dynamic interaction [24]. In the classical paradigm, this group film style combined both fundamental concepts – expensive spectacle and low-budget cinema [6; 25].

The expensive spectacles of the classic Hollywood era also set norms that shaped what might be called the "blockbuster mentality". Until the advent of New Hollywood, each of these films was an exceptional, not ordinary event. A turning point in the development of Hollywood was 1948, marked by the "Paramount case" and the collapse of vertical integration. Hollywood entered the era of batch production, which, ultimately, shook the classic paradigm of cinema and led to the approval of a New Hollywood. During the transition period, Hollywood actively turned to expensive staged shows that used cinemascope technology and were shown in exclusive halls [26]. As a result, this mentality won New Hollywood in the late 1970s, and in the 1980s, it ended a short period of Hollywood Renaissance and directorial freedom. Let us point out that in general, spectacular blockbusters are designed for children and teenagers, they are quite conservative and rely not only on big stars, but also on special effects that could eventually become a kind of "stars" themselves (as in "Jaws" or "Star Wars"). These blockbusters, as George Lucas admitted, are largely made for toys, however, they opened the concept of a franchise to Hollywood, that is, the ability to successfully sell not only a single film product, but also its sequels or prequels, as well as related products. Popularisation of franchises became possible due to the foundations of media conglomerates [27; 28].

Let us recall that the most important event for the development of New Hollywood era was the release of the movie "Bonnie and Clyde" in 1967. When Jack Warner

first saw the breakdown footage of Bonnie and Clyde, he banned it from being released in the movies. But the film director, Arthur Penn, was able to get consent from Warner Brothers' purchasing managers, who allowed limited distribution of the film. The initial reviews that followed from the pages of the American media only showed the doubts of the film studio. The film was accused of promoting violence, mocking American values, and absurdity. The reaction of the audience was the opposite: with a budget of 2.5 million dollars, "Bonnie and Clyde" earned more than 50 million at the American film distribution and fascinated audience reviews, mainly from young people. Following the audience, American film critics also began to give the film positive reviews. The key one was the article by critic Stefan Kanfer in *Time* magazine, published in December 1967, which noted the innovation of the film and the emergence of the American new wave. The author claimed that the film is quite a modern movie, due to the blurring of genre boundaries, disrespect for the classical aspects of the content and motivation of the characters. The film "Bonnie and Clyde" was a turning point that announced a new style, a modern trend, and formal and thematic innovations. The film combined commercial success with critical controversy. In addition, the film critic used the term "Hollywood Renaissance", which best defined the period from 1967 to 1980 [19; 29].

The public reaction to the film "Bonnie and Clyde", as well as its success in film distribution, started the production method of not giving studios control over the film production process and giving independence to directors. This made it possible to create a new generation of filmmakers who made up the cast of directors of the New Hollywood era, among whom Stanley Kubrick, Francis Ford Coppola, Martin Scorsese, Roman Polanski, Woody Allen, and others occupy a special place. The new Hollywood era is characterised by features that contrast with the customs of classical Hollywood. Covering the specifics of film production in 1967–1980, the following features can be pointed out: realism and discussion of important social problems become the central plot of films, strikingly moving away from the theatricality and artificiality of old Hollywood cinema; director's creativity; rethinking of established moral norms by artists; demythologisation of ideals [30-32]. In addition, New Hollywood films were filled with violence, sex, rock music, drugs, anti-heroes, protests against the social order and other symbols of the counterculture of the 1960s. There is nothing left of the perfect, glossy, and flattering films of classic Hollywood.

This actually testified to the absolute independence of the director. Large studios, which were at a noticeable loss before the changes taking place in American society at that time, were looking for reserves to get out of the crisis and achieve profit, giving directors independence of creativity. Compared to the Golden Age of Hollywood, which was characterised by the total control of studios over every stage of film production, the films of the new Hollywood, although they had the obvious character of the author's work, were different from each other [33]. This factor played a key role in overcoming the creative crisis in Hollywood. Thus, in order to reduce the cost of creating films on the part of studios and achieve greater realism of

films on the part of directors, filming is partially carried out in natural conditions, and not in studio pavilions, which has become a characteristic feature of independent author's cinema in the United States [34; 35]. Therefore, it can be concluded that in the conditions of the New Hollywood, there is a convergence of author's and classical cinema in the United States. It was in the mid-1970s and early 1980s that the difference between them became less noticeable, and the boundaries between the use of certain techniques disappeared.

A considerable function in the distribution of films by young directors, which marked the beginning of a New Hollywood, was the appearance of drive-ins in the mid-1950s, large open-air cinemas where the whole family could watch films in the car [36; 37]. By 1958, 4,000 drive-ins had been built in the United States, developing not only the tradition of classic family cinema as the phenomenon but also teen cinema. First of all, these were films by independent film studios and film directors, as well as films that were in a limited film distribution in cinemas. It was the spread of drive-ins that caused the growing popularity of non-conventional Hollywood films, and, consequently, the emergence of new trends in American cinematograph [7].

In 1969, young directors Francis Ford Coppola and George Lucas founded the "American Zoetrope" film studio to help young filmmakers like themselves produce, promote, and distribute films. In fact, this film studio was mostly engaged in films by Coppola himself, especially after Lucas left it in 1973. Let us recall that the collaboration between "American Zoetrope" and "Paramount Pictures" is associated with one of the most successful films of the New Hollywood era – "The Godfather" by F. F. Coppola, released in 1972. With 6.5 million dollars spent on production, the film raised 268.5 million dollars at the film distribution. "The Godfather" marked the victory of young film directors-authors, demonstrating their role in the American film industry. It was in the early 1970s that Hollywood emerged from the post-war recession and began to make considerable profits again.

The peak of New Hollywood is associated with the emergence of political films that reflected the paranoid state of American society after the Vietnam War [38]. The reaction of New Hollywood directors to new historical processes and diplomatic relations found interest on the part of both American and European viewers. With the appeal to young people as the main audience, Hollywood filmmakers actually stop turning to the genres typical of classic Hollywood: comedies and westerns. Due to the change in the potential audience, new genres appear that immediately become popular – horror films, thrillers, and fantastic fiction [39]. Roman Polanski's film "Rosemary's Baby", released in 1968, showed that the horror genre is popular among the audience. With a budget of 3 million dollars, this film raised more than 33 million dollars in the United States. The director himself wrote the following about the history of the film in his autobiography: "Bob Evans, Paramount's new vice president of production, suggested that I take a look at the galleys of one book. In my hotel room, I spread out the long yellow letters and read the headline: "Rosemary's Baby". After reading the first pages, I thought, "Well, what is this? Another soap opera

that no one needs? I read the rest of the book in one sitting. By the end of the reading, my eyes had popped out on my forehead. When Bob Evans called the next morning and asked if I liked the book, I praised it" [10].

Even more illustrative was the release in 1973 of the film "The Exorcist", directed by William Friedkin based on the novel of the same name by William Peter Blatty. With 12 million dollars spent on its production, the film earned 232 million dollars at the US film distribution, which dispelled all suspicions of film studios about the low-grade and unpopularity of horror films and thrillers. In addition to audience recognition, the film received a large number of laudable reviews from film critics. For example, a critic of The New Republic magazine wrote that this is the scariest film that has been released in all the years of cinema's existence [14]. The need to create similar films led to the fact that film studios eventually began mass production of film products in the paradigm of popular genres, but most of them turned out to be stereotypical and low-quality. "The studios were guided by the theory that when something turned out well once, the same technique would work again and again. If a director succeeded in a particular genre, he became as much a hostage to his image as a similar actor", wrote Roman Polanski [10].

As American society tried to have fun, it was the entertainment component of films that replaced the political one. Musical comedies were increasingly becoming box office leaders, and the fashion for historical films was also returning. It was becoming increasingly difficult to finance search projects with acute social topics. American society was returning to stability, so there was no need to reflect on certain events. These reasons led to the end of the New Hollywood era by 1980. The immediate reason for the change in the desires of Hollywood producers was the failure of a number of films that, if released a few years earlier, would have become potentially triumphant. For example, Brian De Palma's political thriller "Blow Out", released in 1981, collected only 12 million dollars at the US box office without being able to recoup its own budget of 18 million dollars. In 1980, William Friedkin's film "Cruising" failed at the box office. One of the biggest box office failures in the history of Hollywood is considered to be the film "Heaven's Gate" (1980). With a budget of 44 million dollars, the film was able to raise only 3.5 million dollars in the United States. The failure of "Heaven's Gate" led to the fact that the studio "United Artists" went bankrupt and was sold to the studio "MGM". As a result of such heavy losses, studios again began to closely monitor the directors.

Even though the era of New Hollywood was short-lived – less than 15 years, it had a considerable impact on the very perception of cinema in mass culture. If during the Golden Age of Hollywood, filmmakers managed to prove that cinema is a full-fledged art, now it has become indisputable. In addition, the right of directors and screenwriters to work as they consider correct and make films as works of art, not just for profit, was finally recognised. Even with the return of control over film production in the studios, directors and screenwriters had much greater creative independence compared to the cinematographers of the 1920–1950s. In addition, the strengthening of production dictates made it possible to distinguish between the director's work of New Hollywood

and the so-called Modern Hollywood. Notably, New Hollywood was marked by a short period of directorial freedom, when large studios, which were in serious confusion before the changes that were taking place, were looking for a chance to escape and gave considerable freedom to American directors. However, at the same time, the era of New Hollywood and the era of blockbusters considerably overlap. New Hollywood disappeared in the early 1980s after a series of failures of high-budget films by prominent directors, but blockbusters appeared a little earlier, in 1975 [4; 20].

Conclusions

In the conducted study, in accordance with the set purpose and tasks, results were obtained that make it possible to draw a number of conclusions. The author's cinema of New Hollywood as a whole is characterised by the following features: attitude to cinema as an art and intellectual practice; the key role in the creation of the film belongs to the director; orientation of films to the problem and innovation of form; attention to the problems of personality, non-nationality, production of films within co-productions. In terms of its artistic potential and social importance, American author's cinema plays a key role in the culture of cinematograph. If this phenomenon occupies an inconsiderable place in the general information flow, it is thoroughly studied in professional film studies publications. The interpretation of such films is influenced by certain trends in the theory and practice of cinema, characteristic of professional film criticism, which in general is currently developing under the influence of the deconstructivism school.

References

- [1] Trinder S. Questions of space in contemporary Hollywood. *Cinema Open Cult Stud.* 2020;4(1):11–4. DOI: 10.1515/culture-2020-0001.
- [2] Berliner T. Hollywood aesthetic: Pleasure in american cinema a reply to critics. *Projections.* 2020;14(2):90–101. DOI: 10.3167/proj.2020.140209.
- [3] Curnutt K, editor. American Literature in Transition, 1970-1980. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2018. Cerasulo T. "Do the hustle": Showmanship, publicity, and the changing landscape of literary authority, p. 237–240. DOI: 10.1017/9781316584484.
- [4] Trotter D. Come-hither looks: the Hollywood vamp and the function of cinema. *Crit Q.* 2020;62(2):37–9. DOI: 10.1111/criq.12556.
- [5] Riabov O. The red machine: The dehumanization of the communist enemy in American cold war cinema. *Quaestio Rossica.* 2020;8(2):536–50. DOI: 10.15826/qr.2020.2.479.
- [6] Clogher P. Moving texts: A hermeneutics of the Gospel according to Hollywood. *Harv Theol Rev.* 2018;111(3):399–400. DOI: 10.1017/S0017816018000160.
- [7] Ann Wells S. Media laboratories: Late modernist authorship in South America media laboratories. New York: Late Modernist Authorship in South America; 2018.
- [8] Bartosiewicz A, Orankiewicz A. The impact of Hollywood majors on the local film industry. The case of Poland. *Creat Ind J.* 2020;13(3):289–90. DOI: 10.1080/17510694.2020.1736452.
- [9] Berliner T. Hollywood aesthetic precis. *Projections.* 2020;14(2):48–51. DOI: 10.3167/proj.2020.140204.
- [10] Bettinson G. Film theory. *Year's Work Crit Cult Theory.* 2019;27(1):160–2. DOI: 10.1093/ywcct/mbx001.
- [11] Ghourchi M, Mosaviyan S. The role of hollywood cinema in geopolitical representation of the middle east. *Geopolit Q.* 2021;16(4):10–2.
- [12] Kanjere A. You and we're the same: Men and women outside the romance pact. *Can J Film Stud.* 2021;29(2):75–7. DOI: 10.3138/cjfs-2019-0020.
- [13] Tronchin L, Scaroni N. Cinema sound: Characteristics and 3D acoustic measurements. *J Phys Conf Ser.* 2020;1655(1):012079. DOI: 10.1088/1742-6596/1655/1/012079.
- [14] Sarasola MD. Hollywood, an american factory of international soft law and social order. *Int J Semiot Law.* 2021;34(1), 28–31. DOI: 10.1007/s11196-020-09757-y.

The New Hollywood as a paradigm has not yet completely exhausted itself but it is gradually being destroyed by new cinematic techniques and methods. The techniques and methods of the classical paradigm, which are being reinterpreted in the New Hollywood and sometimes make it "excessively classic", have also not completely exhausted themselves. The total introduction of digital technologies and 3-D is likely to lead to a paradigm shift in the New Hollywood. This revolutionary stage of New Hollywood is already called Modern Hollywood. Digital technologies may not only help reduce the cost of production, but also change the way of production, which will eventually change the style. Although New Hollywood does not know the concept of "group style" like the classical period, but firstly, it knows examples of resistance to classical style, and secondly, it is an example of post-classical cinema playing with previous codes. The new paradigm will offer a different solution to the style and method of production. With the end of New Hollywood comes the modern stage of Hollywood cinematograph, which has received the name of the blockbuster era – the time of the return of conservative trends and political apathy. The new period that has come in the history of American film production is characterised by a combination of studio control to one degree or another with elements of directorial independence.

Acknowledgements

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

- [15] Yao J, Poague L. Defining the almost undefinable Susan Sontag: An interview with Leland Poague. *Foreign Lit Stud.* 2021;43(1):17–9.
- [16] Mittal R, Sinha P. TVR cinemas: film prioritization and negotiation during crisis. *Emerald Emerg Markets Case Stud.* 2020;11(1):1–5. DOI: 10.1108/EEMCS-06-2020-0242.
- [17] Rich PB. Hollywood and cinematic representations of far-right domestic terrorism in the U.S. *Stud Conflict Terrorism.* 2020;43(2):178–82. DOI: 10.1080/1057610X.2018.1446295.
- [18] Pérez JMG. On classical Hollywood cinema: Beyond the clash between style and canon. *Atalante.* 2019;27:119–21.
- [19] Laugier S. Film as moral education. *J Philos Educ.* 2021;55(1):263–4. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9752.12551.
- [20] Rossi J. French film music scoring in the thirties: a stylistic tripartition. *French Screen Stud.* 2020;20(3-4):193–6. DOI: 10.1080/14715880.2019.1697129.
- [21] Chernozub A, Korobeynikov G, Mytskan B, Korobeinikova L, Cynarski WJ. Modelling mixed martial arts power training needs depending on the predominance of the strike or Wrestling fighting style. *Ido Movem Cult.* 2018;18(3):28–36. DOI: 10.14589/ido.18.3.5.
- [22] Kongyratbay T, Kongyratbay K. Hermeneutical aspects of kazakh heroic epic study. *Mid East J Sci Res.* 2013;18(9):1330–4. DOI: 10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.18.9.12373.
- [23] Kadyraliyeva A, Zholdubaeva A, Mukhanbet A, Omirbekova A, Saparova Y, Daribaeva R. Multiculturalism in Kazakhstan. *Utop Prax Latinoameric.* 2019;24(Extra5):208–17.
- [24] Kondratenko Y, Gerasin O, Topalov A. A simulation model for robot's slip displacement sensors. *Int J Comp.* 2016;15(4):224–36.
- [25] Kondratenko YP, Kozlov OV, Gerasin OS, Zaporozhets YM. Synthesis and research of neuro-fuzzy observer of clamping force for mobile robot automatic control system. *Proceed 2016 IEEE 1st Int Conf Data Stream Min Process DSMP 2016.* 2016;1:90–5. DOI: 10.1109/DSMP.2016.7583514.
- [26] Mykhailovych HI. The role of propaganda in the formation of personal semantic constructs. *Insight.* 2022;8:24–38. DOI: 10.32999/2663-970X/2022-8-3.
- [27] Gryglewski P, Ivashko Y, Chernyshev D, Chang P, Dmytrenko A. Art as a message realized through various means of artistic expression. *Art Inquiry.* 2020;22:57-88. DOI: 10.26485/AI/2020/22/4.
- [28] Najjar L, Baskaya FAT. Drone-based SVP utilization for revitalizing under-valued public open spaces: Case of Istanbul. *Disegnarecon.* 2022;15(29). DOI: 10.20365/disegnarecon.29.2022.17.
- [29] Aizstrauta D, Ginters E. Integrated acceptance and sustainability assessment model transformations into executable system dynamics model. *Proced Comp Sci.* 2015;77:92-7. DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2015.12.364.
- [30] Gozhyj A, Kalinina I, Gozhyj V, Vysotska V. Web service interaction modeling with colored petri nets. *Proceed 2019 10th IEEE Int Conf Intell Data Acquis Adv Comp Syst: Technol Appl IDAACS 2019.* 2019;1:319–23. DOI: 10.1109/IDAACS.2019.8924400.
- [31] Gomolka Z, Dudek-Dyduch E, Kondratenko YP. From homogeneous network to neural nets with fractional derivative mechanism. *Lect Notes Comp Sci.* 2017;10245 LNAI:52–63. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-59063-9_5.
- [32] Tabeikyna EK, Kamalova GT, Hasanov EL, Dzhumagaliyeva KV, Demeuova NK. The place of intelligentsia in socio-economic development of society: The creative perspective. *Creat Stud.* 2021;14(1):235–50. DOI: 10.3846/cs.2021.13639.
- [33] Petryshyn OV, Hyliaka OS. Human rights in the digital age: Challenges, threats and prospects. *J Nat Acad Leg Sci Ukraine.* 2021;28(1):15-23.
- [34] Borysova VI, Ivanova KY, Iurevych IV, Ovcharenko OM. Judicial protection of civil rights in Ukraine: National experience through the prism of European standards. *J Adv Res Law Econ.* 2019;10(1):66-84.
- [35] Nazemi K, Burkhardt D, Ginters E, Kohlhammer J. Semantics visualization – definition, approaches and challenges. *Proced Comp Sci.* 2015;75:75-83. DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2015.12.216.
- [36] Privalko VP, Dinzhos RV, Privalko EG. Enthalpy relaxation in the cooling/heating cycles of polypropylene/organosilica nanocomposites I: Non-isothermal crystallization. *Thermochim Acta.* 2005;432(1):76–82. DOI: 10.1016/j.tca.2004.09.023.
- [37] Naisbayeva AK, Massalimova AR, Zholdubayeva AK. Modern advertising practice: Gender images and stereotypes generation. *Rupkatha J Interdisc Stud Human.* 2018;10(2):118–28. DOI: 10.21659/rupkatha.v10n2.12.
- [38] Najjar L, Baskaya FAT. Spatial Video Projection as a Digital DIY Paradigm for Under-valued Public Open Spaces Revitalization. *Street Art Urban Creat.* 2022;8(2):112–9.
- [39] Najjar L, Baskaya FAT. Spatial video projection and public open spaces: a distinct bibliometric study approach. *Spatium.* 2023;49:30–41. DOI: 10.2298/SPAT230120007N.

Аналіз творчості американських режисерів у контексті європейської теорії авторського кіно

Ірина Гавран

Київський національний університет культури і мистецтв
01601, вул. Є. Коновальця, 36, м. Київ, Україна

Сергій Гончарук

Київський національний університет культури і мистецтв
01601, вул. Є. Коновальця, 36, м. Київ, Україна

Володимир Якович Михальов

Київський національний університет культури і мистецтв
01601, вул. Є. Коновальця, 36, м. Київ, Україна

Галина Миколаївна Кот

Київський національний університет культури і мистецтв
01601, вул. Є. Коновальця, 36, м. Київ, Україна

Артем Пароконний

Київський національний університет культури і мистецтв
01601, вул. Є. Коновальця, 36, м. Київ, Україна

Анотація

Актуальність. Актуальність цього дослідження визначається тенденціями розвитку Нового Голлівуду, які докорінно змінили сутність сучасного кінематографа.

Мета. Мета дослідження – виявити специфіку кіно Нового Голлівуду, яка знайшла відгук у творчості сучасних голлівудських режисерів як впливового та конкурентного напрямку. Проаналізовано приклади з фільмів американських режисерів та авторів.

Методологія. При дослідженні теми використовувалися методи наукового аналізу, порівняння та узагальнення. Крім того, застосовано аналітичний та системний методи в їх єдності, що є необхідним для вивчення мистецтвознавчого аспекту проблеми, опрацювання історико-фактологічної бази та уточнення термінологічного апарату дослідження. За допомогою методу інтроспекції досліджено та систематизовано проблеми режисерської самореалізації, що сприяло усвідомленню специфіки теорії та практики паритетного авторського кіно.

Результати. За результатами дослідження зроблено висновки про специфіку створення авторських моделей сучасного кіно під впливом канонів ново-голлівудського авторського незалежного кінематографа.

Висновки. Встановлено, що визначення чинників професіоналізму створює психологічні моделі професійної діяльності та професійної самосвідомості особистості. Практичне значення дослідження полягає в розширенні арсеналу знань про специфіку автора в кіно і, зокрема, авторського кіно Нового Голлівуду та уможлиблює їх використання в навчальних курсах з теорії та історії кіно і режисури.

Ключові слова: режисер-автор; авторське самовираження; незалежне кіно; американське кіномистецтво; масова та елітарна аудиторія; авангард.