

**SCREENWRITING | DEVELOPMENT  
NETWORKING | TRAINING**

**Cristian Mungiu**  
**Ildikó Enyedi**  
**Thomas Arslan**



# SOURCES OF INSPIRATION

## DOCUMENTATION

CRISTIAN MUNGIU  
ILDIKÓ ENYEDI  
THOMAS ARSLAN

## SOURCES 2

SCREENWRITING | DEVELOPMENT  
NETWORKING | TRAINING

### IMPRINT

2018  
© Sources 2

With the support of Creative Europe MEDIA

**Editors:** Renate Gompper, Marion Gompper  
**Text Editing:** Pamela Cohn, Rick Minnich  
**Graphic Design:** Sonja Jobs

**Lecture | Cristian Mungiu**  
Transcription: Pamela Cohn  
Photos: Fabian Schröder

**Lecture | Ildikó Enyedi**  
Transcription: Pamela Cohn, Rick Minnich  
Photos: Trine Thoresen, Marion Gompper

**Lecture | Thomas Arslan**  
Transcription: Pamela Cohn, Rick Minnich  
Photos: Malgorzata Skwara

### CONTENT

- 02 WELCOME
- 04 CRISTIAN MUNGIU
- 16 ILDIKÓ ENYEDI
- 30 THOMAS ARSLAN
- 36 167 FILMS!
- 38 ABOUT SOURCES 2



# WELCOME

We're very pleased to present the latest master classes from our popular Sources of Inspiration Lecture series. Here we offer thoughts from three exciting and prolific writer-directors, each of whom derives his or her cinematic visions from a diverse array of inspirations.

Cristian Mungiu's journey to making some of the most riveting cinematic work of the 21st century began in the 1980s in what he calls the worst period of Romanian communism where the people lived in survival mode and the possibilities of becoming a film screenwriter and director were "as likely as becoming an astronaut". But this is a man of great perseverance and his touching and humorous stories of how he worked through many iterations – from student cultural journalist and short story writer to midnight radio talk-show host – finally saw him receiving a coveted spot in the state film school in Bucharest. It was there where he learned about the history of cinema and the films of all the great international directors – but without being able to see a single film of theirs. However, he remarks upon the fact that during that period of his youth, all of these restrictions helped him "create and shape my own way of writing. I see it as the starting point as how I write today because I was depicting what was happening rather than explaining how I felt about it. I was describing what I was observing with no judgment attached".

Mungiu acknowledges that in the course of his film career, there have been many "happy accidents", ones that led him eventually to the world stage as a multiple award-winning director, walking away from the Cannes Film Festival with prize after prize for all of his films, starting with his début feature *Occident*, which premiered in the Directors' Fortnight at Cannes in 2002, until his latest Best Director prize there for *Bacalaureat / Graduation* in 2016. His creative and logistical challenges to himself, his crew and his actors (and acknowledging plenty of mistakes, as well) have made for a kind of kinetic cinema that takes its inspiration from observing real life, real people, giving his films an energy and vitality that dives deep into the human psyche. With opportunities over the years to make films in Hollywood and elsewhere, the only stories he's been interested in telling are those from his homeland, creating a bespoke canon of films with a distinctive signature. He says: "I decided I wanted to create the kind of material that respected the rules of fiction but would be very close to reality. I would use some basic principles to tell the story. This became the basis of the style I'm still using today, a style that refers to a point of view and its subjectivity."

Like Mungiu, Hungarian writer-director Ildikó Enyedi has an admirable body of work under her belt. Her 1989 feature film *Az én XX. századom / My 20<sup>th</sup> Century* received the Golden Camera at the Cannes Film Festival that year. Enyedi, being the master teacher she is, presents a piece written by the brilliant German poet, dramatist, and journalist Heinrich von Kleist called "On the Marionette Theater" as the backbone of her lecture in order to explicate how she went about writing and directing her latest

film *On Body and Soul*, winner of the Golden Bear at its premiere at the 2017 Berlinale. She explains the profundity the story has for her this way: "I brought it to you because it illustrates in such amazing simplicity, complexity and exactness what I experience again and again during my work in film: the grace and incomparable beauty of people fully absorbed in their work. In this very bold text, in an imaginary dialogue between himself and a famous ballet dancer, Kleist is circling around the very sensitive question about what makes your presence on stage, on screen, facing your crew or in front of your laptop, fully present, totally consistent and authentic."

The idea of this centre of gravity and the intricate workings of the strings of a marionette is Enyedi's touchstone. While it's a complex and somewhat esoteric idea to be the puppet master of both the characters you create on the page and the cast and crew you direct and supervise on the set (a set being the first place Enyedi would consider taking a freshly-landed Martian to show off the potential magic of Earthlings), her conviction as to the validity of her chosen metaphor is unwavering. "Kleist uses this metaphor of the marionette not as an example of movements without a will of their own, but as an example of a complex moving system driven by one single defining force, by one thread. While communicating with your crew that thread is represented by your script, and if it is a good, solid one, one pull puts the whole machinery in motion in a correct and consistent way without a need to define and check each and every little detail. Actually, it gives safety and autonomy simultaneously to the crewmembers as the main thread of the marionette gives freedom to the movements of the limbs while defining the main direction."

After a fairly itinerant youth, German filmmaker Thomas Arslan hit the ground running right after graduating from the DFFB, writing and directing his first feature film *Mach die Musik leiser / Turn Down the Music* in 1993. Arslan is one of the key figures of the "Berlin School", having studied there around the same time as Christian Petzold and Angela Schanelec. The three are considered founders of a fresh low-key German film movement. According to critic Christoph Huber writing a spotlight essay in *Cinemascope* on Arslan, his films are immediately recognisable even though in the course of his career he has made a point of defying categorisation. The reason for this may well be that Arslan lets his imagination roam, allowing himself a lengthy and free-ranging brainstorming process that could involve music, looking at and taking photos, and "aimless walking around" before he even sits down to write a first draft. By way of introduction, he states emphatically: "An idea must come to me, rather than generate from me. Otherwise I do not trust it."

Arslan describes how such a wide-open preparation method allows for unexpected connections between films. This goes some way toward explaining the mysterious ways his films could be said to be in dialogue with one another. "Sometimes a new project also comes from certain 'blind spots' of the previous film, something that was at the edge of the story or had not been developed enough. ...Thus after *Brothers and Sisters* emerged *Dealer* and *A Fine Day*. In retrospect, these films could be considered a trilogy. However, this was not planned from the outset. Here, one film guided me to the other."

After a technically and logistically complicated shoot for his film *Gold* (2013), Arslan discusses how he felt the need for complete freedom in the creation and making of his latest feature *Bright Nights*. "When you work on a film you have to react to so many hard facts and logistical problems. You have to find new solutions and you have to react to these in a creative way. For me, filmmaking is a mixture of these two elements – things that you'd like to do and things that are possible." Thus for his latest film, Arslan made efforts to create an intimacy and a flexibility for himself and his cast and crew in order to explore the intricacies of family relationships, even using the challenging confines and restrictions of a father/son road trip. He describes how he and his cinematographer Reinhold Vorschneider watched lots of films together and cites *Two-Lane Blacktop* by Monte Hellman ("It's the perfect road movie in my eyes. "), as well as Abbas Kiarostami's *Taste of Cherry*, as huge inspirations.

Mungiu, Enyedi and Arslan all beautifully and sensitively articulate the vitality and thrill of finding the perfect "dancing partners" for their creative work, as well as describing myriad cautionary tales one can encounter in the delicate task of imbuing every element and composition of your script with a dramaturgical function.

Ildikó Enyedi's parting battle cry of "Read Kleist!" resounds. After encountering the voices of these talented filmmakers here, many of you might be inspired to do just that. Happy reading!

## SOURCES 2

RENATE GOMPPER  
programme director

MARION GOMPPER  
associate programme director



# CRISTIAN MUNGIU



Cristian Mungiu

## CRISTIAN MUNGIU | CURRICULUM VITAE

Cristian Mungiu is a Romanian filmmaker born in Iași in 1968. His debut film, *Occident (West)*, premiered as part of Quinzaine des réalisateurs – Directors' Fortnight at the 2002 Cannes Film Festival and was an audience hit in his native Romania. In 2007 his second feature, *4 Months, 3 Weeks and 2 Days*, was awarded Cannes' Palme d'Or. The film also received several "Best Film of the Year" awards from several international film critics' associations as well as the European Film Academy awards for Best Film and Best Director. Mungiu returned to Cannes in 2009 as a writer-producer-co-director with the collective episodic film *Tales from the Golden Age* and as a writer-director in 2012 with *Beyond the Hills*, which was awarded Best Screenplay and Best Lead Actresses. *Bacalaureat (Graduation)* was his fifth film presented at Cannes in 2016 for which he won the Best Director prize.

# IN MY LIFE AS A FILMMAKER, THERE HAVE BEEN MANY HAPPY ACCIDENTS.

BERLIN-BRANDENBURG | 14 APRIL 2018

CRISTIAN MUNGIU

SOURCES OF INSPIRATION LECTURE ON OCCASION OF THE SOURCES 2 SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP IN BERLIN-BRANDENBURG PRECEDED BY THE SCREENING OF *GRADUATION (2016)*.

With the support of Medienboard Berlin-Brandenburg and MFG Filmförderung Baden-Württemberg.

In my opinion, there are a limited number of things you can teach and learn about cinema. What I can tell you is what I do and how I do it. It might be of help for some people but of no help for others – since the most important thing in storytelling is to find your own way. I shall begin by sharing a few things about how I started.

I graduated high school during the worst period of Romanian communism in the 80s. There were tough times then. Food, electricity, gasoline were all rationed; there was just one TV program broadcasting mostly propaganda; and visiting Western countries was out of the question. People were in survival mode.

## AT SOME POINT IN YOUR CAREER DECISIONS SHOULD BE MOTIVATED BY THE PRINCIPLE OF YOUR PERSONAL POETICS.

I liked watching films but in the late 70s and early 80s there weren't too many to watch. I lived in Iași, a town of half a million with many universities, seven cinemas, but no cinematheque. I was watching all the films coming to town, sometimes twice.

I was also watching all the TV films – as everybody did – but there weren't too many. Nevertheless, I had a special relationship to watching films, especially the local ones. I had the feeling they were quite phony and that I could do much better.

As a teenager, I was writing a little bit, hoping I could become a writer one day, maybe. Since I liked films a lot, I dreamed I could also become a filmmaker someday. But that was as likely as becoming an astronaut. The priority for a boy during those times was to be admitted after high school to a university because if not, you had to do this sixteen-month service in the Romanian army and you really didn't want to go there. If you managed to pass the exam, you would only serve for some nine months in the army or you could do it after your studies, which was much better.

But you had to pass a very difficult exam to be admitted to university. There were twenty, thirty, forty candidates per place. This is because I was born in the baby boom generation in Romania in 1968, right after Ceausescu had forbidden abortions. When I entered school, there were forty-two children in my class and some ten parallel classes in my generation. When my sister had attended that school just four years before, there had been thirty-two kids in her class and just three classes per generation. But that was before the infamous decree about abortions.

During those times there was just one film school in Romania, in Bucharest, and it was impossible to get into the school if you didn't know somebody. It was customary that they only allowed the sons and daughters of people working in the film business or people they already knew. I didn't know anybody in the film industry and nobody knew me. It was out of the question to attempt the film school then and I knew it. I decided to try the university in my hometown and was admitted to the philology department, as we were calling it then. I studied English and Romanian and after graduation I was a teacher of English for a while. But there were things that influenced my later career more than my studies.





(l to r) Cristian Mungiu, Renate Gompfer (Sources 2), Svein Andersen (FilmCamp), Marion Gompfer (Sources 2)

## ... IT'S GOOD NOT TO START TOO HIGH, ESPECIALLY WITH YOUR FIRST FEATURE.

My sister introduced me to this student monthly since I had attempted creative writing. I met some lovely people there, people with whom you could chat about a lot of things. We talked about cinema, literature, religion, anything at all. I started writing for that journal. I also started writing short stories, trying to get them published in literary magazines. Times then were different than they are today: people had way more free time as there was nothing much to do outdoors. The only TV program consisted of just some two hours of broadcasting every day, mostly propaganda. So people were reading a lot, listening to music, and talking.

Then in the late 80s, a “golden epoch” began. Some people, like sailors, footballers or others that could travel abroad started buying VCRs and selling them at home. The VCR was seen as a miracle. You could watch your own films. My parents made a considerable effort and bought one. The era of smuggled VHS films started. Everybody was copying films, very poor copies of very poor films. Still, the improvement was huge. We started watching tons of films, two, three, or four a night.

We met twice a week at the student journal to chat about the next issues. We talked for five or six hours, about politics, stories, books, cinema, things we'd noticed, smoking like hell the whole time. I started developing my own style of writing while working there. That was very good practice since

the feedback from the other student journalists could be very harsh.

When the Romanian Revolution happened in 1989 we started writing like hell. Overnight, our journal turned from a monthly to a weekly. A few months later we turned it into a daily. I was coming across a lot of situations. Some of them I would just write down for some other time. Also, all the stories we couldn't tell during the years of communist rule because of the censorship could then be told.

That period helped me create and shape my own way of writing. I see it as the starting point as how I write today because I was depicting what was happening rather than explaining how I felt about it. I was describing what I was observing with no judgement attached. At some point, I also started doing a bit of radio and television. Radio taught me to argue and do it fast. I had this live show debating some of the hotter themes so I learned to react to unexpected situations. The model for this was an American TV series about a late-night show called *Midnight Caller* that was very popular in Romania then. I'd get calls from people in the middle of the night on a given theme and they could say whatever they wanted.

By the early 90s, I realized that the fun of working in the press started to vanish. Things were settling in society and it became routine. I realized I didn't



Participants, guests and Sources 2 team

## IT'S EASY TO IMPRESS PEOPLE WITH A FIRST FILM BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOTHING TO COMPARE IT TO.

have any excuse any longer not to try and become a filmmaker since this is what I was telling people I wanted to do. Communism had collapsed and the exam was supposed to be free and honest by now. It was out of the question then to become a filmmaker outside of the official system. Films were still shot on 35mm. You could become a filmmaker only by attending the film school and getting a formal education there. Of course, you couldn't make a cinema film on your own like you can today. I tried to get into the film school twice. They accepted just some seven students per year in directing. There were hundreds of candidates vying for each spot.

The first time I tried I failed because they forgot to call me for one of the exams because of the huge number of candidates. I wasn't the only one in that situation. A professor from the film school who later became my teacher gathered us in a room and told us that yes, maybe that had been their mistake but, honestly, he wouldn't have accepted us anyhow. He could tell we were not good enough for that. Nevertheless, the situation helped me to get into the school the next year. It was a very stressful and irrelevant exam. It was so difficult to discern from all the young people you met who would turn out to be the best storytellers in the future. But the second time I was accepted, they remembered that I was the guy who they forgot to call the year before..

For the entrance examination, I had to analyse a shot from Kieslowski's *Dekalog*, the one where the bee is trying to get out of the glass of water. This says a lot about their idea of film in that period. Metaphors ruled. I left the paradise of my lovely home and ventured into the real world. I moved to Bucharest for film school. I was twenty-six and didn't know much about cinema when I started. I had seen a lot of films on video, but rather B-level stuff. I had seen some classic films but not too many. My exposure to cinema was, so to speak, completely erratic. I was aware of Tarkovski, a cult filmmaker already in the 90s, or of the films of Milos Forman, one of my favorite filmmakers of this period, of Fellini, Antonioni, the French New Wave or Italian neorealism. But I didn't know Ozu or Dryer existed.

The film studies at the school were strange since it didn't have much in the way of means yet. We had this very good teacher, an old master who knew everything about the beginnings of cinema from reading books and issues of *Cahiers du Cinéma* in the 60s when they were still reading in Romania. He was teaching us the History of cinema. He would dictate his lectures and we would write it down. The big problem was that the school didn't have any of the films that he talked about. In other words, we listened to this teacher talking passionately about these films for four years without seeing even a single shot of any of them.

It was all theoretical. In four years of study he managed to talk about cinema up to the 1930s, no further. It wasn't the type of film studies I was expecting, to be honest. I had graduated from another State university but still had to pay for my studies at the film school. Because of this situation, they made an exception and allowed me to work while I was a student. At the beginning, I worked a bit in television, but I quickly decided it wasn't for me. Somehow, I spotted a chance and started working as an assistant for the foreign films that were being shot in Romania at that time because it was cheaper, mostly French and American productions. That was a different kind of experience than film school but very useful in terms of the practical stuff you could learn.

When you're a young filmmaker you have a lot of fears. You don't really know how a set works. The university didn't offer us such an experience. You imagine things, but the details are not there. For me, working for these foreign productions was a very good experience: I could observe how the director was working with actors, how the set was organised, how to do the choreography of a shot, how to work with extras for the background action. I started learning what every crewmember does,

I did three shorts in a period of some two years. I remember that I submitted all three to a Romanian short film festival, Dakino, and I received awards for all three. It didn't seem much at the moment but it helped me later on. In the beginning of your life as a filmmaker, your decisions about framing, staging, casting, come a bit randomly. During film school, that's fine, you learn, you experiment. But after film school or at some point in your career these decisions should be motivated by the principle of your personal poetics. Why do you shoot like this and not differently? What difference does it make? Is cinema just narrative? Is there an ethics of the use of the means that you have as a filmmaker? What is cinema for you, actually?

The first impulse you have as a young filmmaker is to show that you can do as well as the filmmakers before you. Later though you learn that what's the most difficult is to create your own style, to have a personal vision, a point of view. While making shorts, I was trying to learn how to control the flow of information in the film, the character development, how to manage time, how to create the right rhythm, how to train the actors to deliver the lines the way I wanted.

## LITTLE BY LITTLE, I STARTED CREATING A SMALL SET OF PRINCIPLES THAT HELPED ME NAVIGATE IN THIS SEA OF CHOICES...

about the right lenses to use for each shot and so on; also, to see how a script is adapted when it's shot. I worked as an assistant director, which is a very different job than what I imagined. It's not creative but an organisational role. But it placed me in a good position to meet actors, to work with them a little bit when they needed to rehearse. When you're young, the older actors can intimidate you.

In my life as a filmmaker there have been many happy accidents. When I graduated film school in 1998, a new cinema law had been passed in Romania. It created a new institution called The National Centre for Cinematography, CNC, based on the French model. Due to this, the processes of filmmaking became more transparent. One could apply for money to make a film through a production house. A producer contacted me and asked for a short-film screenplay. We applied, and we won. It wasn't much money, but the timing was perfect. I started making short films right after film school and I even got paid for them so I could make a living as a filmmaker. I applied with two more screenplays for the next CNC pitch and I got the money for these films as well. All the funding for making shorts came to me for two consecutive years.



(l to r) Nicole Mühlberg, Julie Metzdröff  
(Sources 2)



Gualberto Ferrari's group:  
(l to r) Marion Guth, Charlotte Bruneau,  
Gualberto Ferrari, Artemio Benki,  
Petra Oplatkova

One of the most important things you can learn in cinema is to master your craft, your means. If you do, you will tell the story you wished to tell from the beginning. There are too many films that might look okay when they're done but were not planned like that at the beginning. The director just found some logic for his material in the editing. In such cases, the filmmaker is not in control of what he's doing. I wanted to be in control. After making those three short films, I decided I was in control of my

I submitted the film to the CNC and won the financing. I was very happy, but the money was not enough so I had to find more money to make the film. Then another fortunate circumstance occurred. The people at HBO Romania organised a national screenplay competition and the winner was to become part of an international competition meant to take place in Los Angeles, with the participation of the Sundance Film Festival and RKO Pictures. They were promoting this through an ad asking you if

## I WANTED TO CREATE THE KIND OF MATERIAL THAT RESPECTED THE RULES OF FICTION BUT WOULD BE VERY CLOSE TO REALITY.

means enough to make a feature. I wanted to make films that would be loved by the audience. I believe this was a reaction to the unbearable Romanian films I watched in the 80s. I decided I would make a comedy.

When you're young, you really want to show how smart and intelligent and complex you are, so I ended up creating a very complicated screenplay. I decided I would write a story that would take place in seven days. Every thirty minutes, I would go back to the beginning and re-tell it from the perspective of a different character, including some scenes that would completely change and alter what you'd learned before. The humour would come from all these switches and twists in the film. It was called *Occident*. I gave the screenplay to some friends for feedback and somebody asked me if I had been inspired by *Rashomon*. But I hadn't seen *Rashomon* at the time, so I was surprised at the comment. Normally, a film school should familiarize you with the two hundred films that matter in terms of the history of cinema. It wasn't my case. I could say that a lot of my inspiration doesn't come from cinema. It comes from observing reality. For my screenplays, I always start from true stories. I read a lot of press and collect a lot of articles on my laptop, placing them into different folders. I name the folders by theme.

I started writing the screenplay for my first film by combining some true stories that I knew about, stories with some comedic potential. I didn't have the big picture of the whole screenplay at the beginning. I wanted to make sure I had some specific situations in the film. Then, I started looking for connections between those moments. By the end it was very complicated to follow the screenplay. I took a pair of scissors and cut up the pages of the three parts of the screenplay. I placed all the pieces on a wall to make sure that things happened in the right moment. I kept moving scenes around until it finally worked.

you wanted Robert Redford to read your screenplay. Of course, I wanted.

I started writing as fast as I could together with Ioana, a good friend from the film school. The deadline was very close, and we didn't have anything prepared. We managed to finish it at the last minute and we submitted it. We won the competition. We were given a diploma that stated that we were the winners of "the best Romanian screenplay of the year" and had \$1000 to split between us. But, most importantly, we were sent to L.A. We were very excited. We had just finished film school and all this was making us dizzy. But we were also very naïve.

At the time of that trip, I already had my small financing in place for *Occident*. I was hoping that by going to L.A. I might bump into a producer on the street that would give me the money I was missing to make the film. In L.A., we stayed with this fellow who had left Romania in the 70s; he had a small office where he was designing posters for B-movies. I asked him if he could help me find some financing in the US for my film. He asked me what *kind* of film I was making: action adventure, romantic comedy, or drama. I was surprised – I didn't think in terms of genre. I couldn't really define the genre of cinema I was doing. He told me I had no chance to find money there for a film in Romanian. Instead, he was interested if he could use my Romanian financing for a TV series he was developing.

While in L.A. I met a lot of directors from eastern countries or South America who were looking for an opportunity to work. Some of them had promising careers back home prior to moving to the U.S. They were reading screenplays and waiting. Some of them were even paid well but none of them was working as a director. At the end of the two weeks, I started to believe that moving to the U.S. as an unknown director is not a good idea.





Eric Collins' group: (l to r) Saida Benzel Cedillo, Juan Zapata, Peter Ketnath, Camila Gonzatto da Silva, Kristijan Risteski, Eric Collins, Reinis Kalvins, Aldis Bukšs, Tonia Mishiali

## FILM LANGUAGE IS A VERY MANIPULATIVE LANGUAGE. YOU DO THINGS TO CREATE A CERTAIN KIND OF EFFECT ON PEOPLE...

I figured I would rather go back home to Romania and do my first film there. Ioana, my friend and co-writer, reached a different conclusion from the same experience and felt that the U.S. is where cinema happens. She went back home to Romania, prepared for a year and passed a very complicated exam. She was accepted at USC and graduated from film school for the second time four years later. She still lives in the U.S. but she could never find money to make a film there. She became a film scholar. We stayed friends and we met often in L.A. when I would go there to promote my films. Last year, some twenty years after our first American experience, I produced her first feature film. The action happens in the States, but we produced it with European funding. The film premiered at Berlinale 2018.

I ran out of money a week before wrapping. I borrowed some to finish shooting. I didn't know anything then about production or funding. I thought the film would be good enough to finance itself, but practically how this was to happen I didn't know. They don't teach these things in film school. Somebody told me about this Hubert Bals Fund in Rotterdam. Romania was not in the EU then, so we could qualify as a "third-world" country and so had access to this money. I applied, and, to my surprise, they gave us some money. This was in September. Only five projects out of hundreds of applications got financing. We were very happy.



Miguel Machalski's group: (l to r) Arman T. Riahi, Carolina Hellsgård, Eva Pauné Martínez, Mirjam Ziegler, Mikko Kuparinen, Miguel Machalski, Karol Griffiths (guest), Gábor Fabrícius, Oskari Huttu

I returned to Romania to pursue my own project. I was supposed to start shooting in August 2001, but we were still missing a lot of money. A friend was going to Cannes in May. He offered to look for funding for me in Cannes since, as he put it: *It's easy since everybody has loads of money in Cannes*. But apparently it wasn't that easy. He never called back. I had to decide what to do about the shooting. I decided to just start it with the money I already had, hoping that something good would come, somehow. Of course, nothing came.



Karol Griffiths held a hands-on session: Voice Creates Character – Character Creates Plot...

## THIS IS TRICKY TO TALK ABOUT BECAUSE YOU CANNOT SAY THAT ONE KIND OF FILMMAKING IS BETTER THAN ANOTHER.

However, there was a condition: you had to premiere your film in Rotterdam. But this wasn't really matching my premiering in Cannes dreams. But that became less important since I really needed to finish the film. By December we realized we might not finish everything in time for Rotterdam. We needed more funding, we were working on 35mm and the lab was expensive. We went back to the Romanian Cinematography Centre for more funding, but they told us it wasn't possible.

The film was scheduled to screen in Rotterdam in January, but we ended up having to tell them it wouldn't be done in time. This was after the film

was already printed in the catalogue. Very embarrassing, but we ran out of money before the final mix. By chance, in Rotterdam, Marie Pierre Maciat, the Quinzaine des réalisateurs director by that time, spotted my name in the catalogue. I had no idea, but she had been in Romania as part of the Dakino jury for short films the year before. She told the organisers that she would have liked to invite this guy's first film – meaning mine – to play in the Quinzaine after watching his shorts – but good for him that he's in Rotterdam. They told her: "He's just in the catalogue".

So she contacted me and I sent her a rough edit of *Occident*. She liked it and they sent me kind of an informal invitation letter that Quinzaine might be interested in the film. We used that informal invitation to go back to the CNC to tell them that if they gave me an extra installment to finish the film, Romania might have a film in Cannes once again.

We got the money and proceeded to make every possible mistake you can make as a beginner if you want to schedule your film for a festival. I had no idea something like a sales agent even existed. We didn't know the difference between an exhibitor and a distributor. We were very naïve. We had no idea that we needed a press attaché or why we might need one. We were happy to be accepted



Michael Seeber's group: (l to r) Arkaitz Basterra Zabide, Erlend Hella Matre, Andrea Shaffer, Nicola Provesan, Michael Seeber, Stefanie Klemm, Ira Tondowski, Olivier Zobrist



Ludger Pflanz lectured about The DNA of Immersive Storytelling

## WHAT HAPPENS WHEN YOU EDIT? YOU MAKE CHOICES FOR THE SPECTATOR: YOU DECIDE WHAT IS IMPORTANT AND WHAT'S NOT...

at Cannes but we were so stupid, we actually asked them to schedule the film in the last days of the festival because we were afraid of not finishing the subtitling in time. They listened to us. When we got there, there weren't too many professionals still in Cannes. Nevertheless, the screenings were a success. A lot of buyers loved the film. They contacted my inexperienced producer since there wasn't a sales agent attached to the film. My producer didn't know whether to ask for one thousand, or one hundred thousand euros for the film. He ended up by avoiding the buyers altogether out of shame.

The jury also liked the film, so we were asked to stay one more day than when we were scheduled to leave. I was living with six other people in a common dormitory because it was the only thing the Romanian CNC could provide. It was fifty kilometers away from Cannes, but we liked it anyway. They asked us to stay because we were on the jury's short list. In 2002, there were no awards given in the Quinzaine section, but we were eligible for the Caméra d'Or. There were three films left on the short list, my film, Carlos Reygadas' film, and a French female director who actually got it. I was disappointed since we'd been so close.

Sometimes, it's good not to start too high, especially with your first feature. It's easy to impress

people with a first film because they have nothing to compare it to. You're a good surprise. Festivals are always looking for discoveries, fresh talent. Many festivals have these competitions for first or second films. There's a lot of attention for newcomers. After that, it's a bit more complicated. As a filmmaker, after the first film you must decide what direction you will move towards for future work.

I started thinking. The press that was written about the film helped me and the fact that I could talk to the audience at the end of my *Occident* screenings also helped me a lot. That was real feedback. I started cruising the world of festivals with my first film. That period in which you travel a lot as a young filmmaker is very useful. You get to talk a lot about cinema with a lot of people who have different ideas than yours. You get to see so many different types of films and can accumulate a lot of experience. I saw a film that impressed me a lot with its manner of understanding cinema. It twisted a lot of things for me. *La Vie de Jésus* by Bruno Dumont made me ponder about a lot of things.

It took a while to make my second film after the first because one needs to live. I was not making a living from cinema, so I stepped into the beautiful world of advertising. It was actually very useful.



(l to r) Kirsten Harder (Skript Akademie), Renate Gompfer (Sources 2), Ludger Pflanz, Marion Gompfer (Sources 2), Susanne Schmitt (Creative Europe Desk Berlin-Brandenburg), Brigitte Manthey (Medienboard Berlin-Brandenburg), Christopher Buchholz (Französische Filmtage Tübingen | Stuttgart)

## OF COURSE AS A FILMMAKER, YOU NEED TO MAKE CHOICES ALL THE TIME BUT SOME ARE A MUST AND SOME ARE NOT. EDITING IS NOT.

There is the client and you need to deliver something that has a precise meaning to that client. For instance, if you work for Proctor & Gamble, you use their bible. They believed they had learned that every other shot in the commercial needed to have only one precise meaning. It was a very good exercise and it helped me develop my own style of reducing what I have to say little by little from a general idea and distill it to three pages, then to three sentences, and then finally into one sentence. So I took something from that time as well.

By the time I was ready to make my second film I knew that it wasn't enough just to tell a good story. It's also not enough to show that you can do as well as the ones who came before you arrived on the scene. What's more complicated is to do something different than the people before you. I learned that what's more complicated than being complex is being simple. I decided to create the portrait of the kind of film I wanted to make before knowing its story.

I started thinking about cinema. Why do I want to make films and what is cinema in general? What is cinema specifically for me? I think it's good to have a period in your life in which you look for answers about what is specific about this art form. You can tell a million different stories but what is

your vector when you select things? What, from everything happening around you would make good material for cinema? What is the relationship between the idea of reality you get from a fiction film and your need to give fictional sense to the reality? Stories in film and the succession of facts in reality don't follow the same principles.

Little by little, I started creating a small set of principles that helped me navigate in this sea of choices. I decided I wanted to create the kind of material that respected the rules of fiction but would be very close to reality. I would use some basic principles to tell the story. This became the basis of the style I'm still using today, a style that refers to a point of view and its subjectivity. As a spectator, I shouldn't know more than the character knows because I don't know what is happening in the rest of his world more than he does.

I started thinking about the right amount of time for a story in a film – about time in real life versus filmic time, which is edited and therefore interrupted. This continuum of real time is not interrupted by anything – or at least this is our subjective perception when we're awake. Unfortunately, we can't edit our lives and cut out all the irrelevant moments that we must face every day. But to be effective, we do this in films. I decided I wanted



to try to shape a story that could be perceived as following the perception of real time.

Film language is a very manipulative language. You do things to create a certain kind of effect on people. This is tricky to talk about because you cannot say that one kind of filmmaking is better than another. There are a lot of ways. Nevertheless, as a filmmaker, you need to have some principles, some coherence. It occurred to me that some cinematic means are nevertheless less manipulative towards your audience than others.

The best example here is the use of music. When you take away the music from a mainstream thriller, you see that most of the rhythm in the film comes from the music, as does much of the emotion. Music is a language in itself; it can enhance feelings, emotions, it can influence the rhythm, the perception. I was wondering in that moment of my career if it would be possible to have the same emotional effects without using music or editing, that we should stage the scenes for the spectator but let him judge, not tell him where to look, how to feel, or what our opinion is about it all.

In real life things just happen without any kind of significance or any kind of moral code. We are the ones that interpret events according to our internal code of ethics. We give them sense. I wanted to allow the spectator to be able to interpret this succession of moments in film using his own codes.

What happens when you edit? You don't just interrupt this flow of time, but you signal to the spectator that there is somebody's will behind this action. You make choices for the spectator: you decide what is important and what's not. Of course as a filmmaker, you need to make choices all the time but some are a must and some are not. Editing is not.

I started thinking about the difference between mainstream cinema and the cinema I wanted to make and that many other people had made before me. In mainstream cinema, you must be effective and that means you pass on some message in an unequivocal way to your audience. You must press the right buttons when they're supposed to laugh or cry or whatever. Everything advances in a logical manner. I decided to question all the decisions you make as a filmmaker. What's important for a filmmaker is to be coherent with your own model, to be coherent with your own way of understanding cinema, your way of understanding reality, the style you want to have, and how you want to express it all.

After making your first film you really think about rhythm, the internal rhythm of a film. If you read a bad screenplay you soon understand that it's something in the rhythm that is off. You don't understand how much time has passed because first

there are three scenes that have some continuity, but then a montage sequence follows and then there's a scene that takes place five years later. It creates chaos in your head because the way time flows is not easy to perceive. I decided I wanted to tell a story that happens in twenty-four hours. I wouldn't use music and I wouldn't use editing. Once you decide that you won't cut the dead moments away, you know that the scenes will be longer. You can't really skip from one scene to another with long ellipses because this is not part of your system.

What also helps me with the films I want to make is to figure out the feelings I want to evoke before I even know the story. I knew I wanted to have a kind of thriller somehow. I wanted dramatic things to happen, but I wanted to see if it was possible to extract dramatic material from everyday life. It's easy to create high drama if you use extreme situations. It's easy to create tension with car chases and guns and stuff like that. But this is not the way we experience everyday life, at least not in this part of the world. I decided I wanted to create the same kinds of feelings that you would get from watching a mainstream film just by using material from people's everyday lives, with the small things that happen to us. I wanted to discover that interference between my personal experience and something that would talk to you, as well. This is what I still look for today. *[applause]*



Reception following Cristian Mungiu's Sources of Inspiration Lecture. (l to r) Gualberto Ferrari, Renate Gompfer (Sources 2)



Reception following Cristian Mungiu's Sources of Inspiration Lecture. (l to r) Miguel Machalski, Michael Seeber, Eric Collins

SOURCES 2 SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION, 12 – 20 APRIL 2018  
IN BERLIN-BRANDENBURG | GERMANY

DEVELOPMENT FEATURE FILM &  
CREATIVE DOCUMENTARY

Advisers

Michael Seeber | Austria  
Eric Collins | France  
Gualberto Ferrari | France, Argentina  
Miguel Machalski | Spain, Argentina

Participants

Arman T. Riahi | Austria  
Tonia Mishiali | Cyprus  
Artemio Benki | Czech Republic, France  
& Petra Oplatkova | Czech Republic  
Arkaitz Bastera Zalbide | Czech Republic, Spain  
& Eike Goreczka | Germany  
Erlend Hella Matre | Czech Republic, Norway  
& Andrea Shaffer | Czech Republic  
Nicola Piovesan | Estonia, Italy  
Mikko Kuparinen & Oskari Huttu | Finland  
Camila Gonzatto da Silva | Germany, Italy  
& Juan Zapata | Columbia & Peter Ketnath | Germany  
Carolina Hellsgård | Germany, Sweden  
Ira Tondowski | Germany  
Gabor Fabricius | Hungary  
Reinis Kalvins & Aldis Bukšs | Latvia  
Charlotte Bruneau & Marion Guth | Luxembourg  
Kristijan Risteski | Macedonia  
Eva Pauné Martinez | Spain  
& Mirjam Ziegler | Spain, Germany  
Saida Benzal Cedillo | Spain  
Stefanie Klemm & Olivier Zobrist | Switzerland

SUPPLEMENTARY PROGRAMME

Sources of Inspiration

Cristian Mungiu | Romania

Lectures

Karol Griffiths | United Kingdom, USA  
Ludger Pfan­z | Germany

PARTNERS

Support

Medienboard Berlin-Brandenburg GmbH  
MFG Filmförderung Baden-Württemberg

Cooperation

Filmtage Tübingen e.V.  
Creative Europe Desk Berlin-Brandenburg

medienboard  
BerlinBrandenburg



MFG  
BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG



# ILDIKÓ ENYEDI



Ildikó Enyedi

## ILDIKÓ ENYEDI | CURRICULUM VITAE

Born in Budapest, Hungary in 1955, Ildikó started her career as a concept and media artist before becoming a writer / director of short and feature films. She has received more than 40 international awards for her work. Her film *Az én XX. századom / My 20<sup>th</sup> Century* was chosen as one of the twelve best Hungarian films of all time; the film won the Golden Camera award at the 1989 Cannes Film Festival. In 1992, Ildikó was a member of the Berlinale's international jury. Her 1995 film *Magic Hunter* was entered into the main competition at the 51st edition of the Venice Film Festival. In 2007, she was a member of the jury at the 29<sup>th</sup> Moscow International Film Festival.

Ildikó teaches masterclasses in film at the University of Theatre and Film Arts, Budapest. She is a founding member of the European Cross Media Academy and a member of the European Film Academy.

Her recent feature film *On Body and Soul* premiered at the 67<sup>th</sup> Berlin International Film Festival where it won the Golden Bear for best film.

### Ildikó's credits include:

*Flirt* | 1981 | short film  
*The Viewer* | 1983 | short film  
*Invasion* | 1986  
*The Mole* | 1987  
*Will-o'-the-wisp* | 1988  
*My 20<sup>th</sup> Century* | 1989  
*Winter War* | 1991  
*Magic Hunter* | 1995  
*Tamás and Juli* | 1997  
*Simon Magus* | 1999  
*Geschichten in Gesichtern* | 2000  
*EUROPA* | 2004  
*First Love* | 2008  
*Terápia* | 2012-2014 | TV series  
*On Body and Soul / Testről és lélekről* | 2017

# YOUR BODY TELLS YOU IF YOU ARE ON THE RIGHT TRACK OR NOT.

MÅLSELV, NORWAY | 10 JUNE 2017

## ILDIKÓ ENYEDI

SOURCES OF INSPIRATION LECTURE  
ON THE OCCASION OF THE SOURCES 2 SCRIPT  
DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP AT FILMCAMP | NORWAY  
PRECEDED BY THE SCREENING  
OF *ON BODY AND SOUL* (2017).

With the support and cooperation of FilmCamp AS.

**ENYEDI** I often wonder if I came upon a freshly arrived Martian, where I would take him or her to show mankind at its best. For me, it would be a film set. Again and again, I am so deeply touched by the instinctive generosity of all those serious, hard-working people with families to feed, absolutely and totally focusing on something purely imaginary that, thanks to their talent, persistence and wisely used craftsmanship, will exist. It will influence, charm, and open up unknown people, the spectators. Somehow I am always amazed by the innocence of these people on set, very similar to that of

children have when they play. While focusing on doing your job well you are acting as an authentic person; you are fully there.

I know here at this workshop you are mostly focusing on the writing phase and as a scriptwriter myself, I know how incredibly difficult it is to achieve that complete presence when you are writing. You are all alone and sometimes it seems everything around you works against you. It's wonderful when it happens, but it is so much harder to *make* it happen than during the other phases of filmmaking. Or perhaps everybody here writes like angels? Perhaps you don't have this problem? I don't know...

I write the scripts for the films I direct. For me it's my one and only journey from the first moment of creation to the editing of the trailers. Recently I did my first job on commission. I directed an HBO series, working from a script written previously by other writers, stepping into the process later than usual. When I accepted the job, I was afraid I maybe wouldn't be able to find my place in such an environment. HBO is a huge corporate company with its own rules, hierarchy and so on. This was not my project, not my choice. But I had genuine enthusiasm for the format. It was the Hungarian version of *In Treatment*. My experience of writing for myself helped me to respect those writers who set the path for me. I knew how much love and passion and hard work were put into the process before I arrived. I was thankful that they gave me space, the same kind of space I try to give to my colleagues – cinematographer, actors, art director, editor, colourist. I try to let them in, let the film become their own.

For our meeting today I brought you a text of Kleist. Maybe some of you know it, "On the Marionette Theater". Read it, it's quite short! And read Kleist! He is incredibly powerful and unusually dense: there is a whole chapter another writer would write of just one of any of his sentences.

I brought it to you because it illustrates in such amazing simplicity, complexity and exactness what I experience again and again during my work in

## IT IS A VERY ELEMENTARY, PHYSICAL FEELING. AT EVERY CONCRETE STEP OF WORKING, YOU CAN SEE IF IT'S INSIDE YOU OR OUTSIDE YOU.

kids playing in the sandbox. I am aware that outside of the film set they are fighting for more money and that they have problems. They are not angels. But somehow they truly and totally forget themselves on a set. As filmmaking is really hard work with long hours, irregular working schedules, too cold or too hot weather, you really can't stay in this profession if you can't forget yourself and experience this completeness, this total presence





(l to r) Marion Gompfer (Sources 2), Gualberto Ferrari, Svein Andersen (FilmCamp), Arash T. Riahi, Vinca Wiedemann, Steye Haltema, Jülie Metzendorff

## TO ME, A GOOD SCRIPT IS NOT A SORT OF FORTRESS THAT YOU HAVE TO DEFEND...

film: the grace and incomparable beauty of people fully absorbed in their work. In this very bold text, in an imaginary dialogue between himself and a famous ballet dancer, Kleist is circling around the very sensitive question about what makes your presence on stage, on screen, facing your crew or in front of your laptop, fully present, totally consistent and authentic. This dancer, the first dancer of the local opera house, finds inspiration for his work in a very peculiar and humble place, watching the movements of puppets at the local puppet theatre on the marketplace. What a shocking idea! Don't you find?

Well, the dancer explains himself in these two sentences from the text: *'Each marionette,' he said, 'has a focal point in movement, a center of gravity, and when the center is moved, the limbs follow without any additional handling. After all, the limbs are pendula, echoing automatically the movement of the center.'*

In their long, imaginary discussion Kleist tries to figure out the essence of this absolute amazement from the part of somebody who expresses everything by the movements of his body.

*"And what advantage would these marionettes of yours have over the human dancer?"*

*"Advantage . . .let's start by a negative one. The*

*marionette would never slip into affectation (if we think of affectation as appearing when the center of intention of a movement is separated from the center of gravity of the movement)."*

I think this is a key sentence. I'll repeat it: ...when the center of intention of a movement is separated from the center of gravity of the movement.

[She continues reading] *...“Since the puppeteer has no control over any point other than the center of gravity, and since this center is his only means of starting an intended movement, as the limbs follow the law of gravity and are what they ought to be... We look in vain for this quality in the majority of our dancers.”*

*“Look at Miss P—’ he continued, ‘when she plays Daphne, persecuted by Apollo, she looks back at him; the soul, the center of intention is located in the lumbar vertebra; she bends down as if she would break; and young F— when, as Paris, he stands among the goddesses and presents the apple to Venus, his soul is (oh painful to behold!) in his elbow.”*

I can see from some faces that you are wondering what the hell Ildikó wants with this text? Or does it make some sense? I was so happy when I found this essay by Kleist because when I tried to explain what we should hold on to throughout the whole



Audience listening to Ildikó Enyedi

## IT SHOULD BE LIKE AN OPEN, INVITING GATE THAT ASKS YOU TO COME IN...

process of filmmaking, from writing until post-production, I always make this instinctive gesture: I touch the centre of my body, here, at the diaphragm. The point of gravity should be inside you, here, and not somewhere outside. It seems fuzzy, perhaps, but it's a very, very practical test. Your body tells you if you are on the right track or not. It is a very elementary, physical feeling. At every concrete step of working, you can check in with this point of gravity to see if it's inside you or outside you. It can move to the outside so easily. You learn a lot about scriptwriting techniques, you take part in lots of discussions, consultations, tutoring, script doctoring while writing and if the point of gravity is outside, you will be so frightfully vulnerable, like a feather in a storm. Or, if you want to hang on desperately to your own ideas, you can become rigidly defensive. Both ways damage the supple, natural movement of your mind. There should be in you an inner knowledge that you can check by your own physical reactions. This is inside of the world I'm building; this is not. This is a truthful movement; this is not.

It works in you before you can clearly articulate the core, the heart of your project. And this sort of instinctive knowledge can be easily hurt if your centre of gravity moves from the centre of your body. I've had different experiences with writing. There were scripts that wrote themselves and ones where I struggled a lot. I struggled the most when

this point of gravity moved outside. And then, I had scripts where I rewrote a lot but all the way through I felt at home. The re-writing was not a struggle, but a phase of an exploration that ended only after the colour grading of the film. This sort of gravity can be very well called consistency. Not the consistency of the project, but of *you*, of your relation to the project. You can better answer questions such as: Is this dialogue right? Should I put one more character in this scene or not?

But if this point of gravity is not really inside you, it's like working randomly or working from a book. It can turn out well, but it can also turn out false. You can destroy the work by re-working, for example. By developing it, you can kill the grace, the charm, the beauty of it. Grace and beauty come from consistency. It's so easy to lose. Most of the tools we refer to are not helping to keep this consistency of your project. They are reinforcing an external perspective. Or do you have a completely different experience? Tell me!

**AUDIENCE** Can you elaborate a bit on this? By “centre of gravity” do you mean a gut feeling or what interested you in the project in the first place? How do you know when things are right or wrong?

**ENYEDI** I think the gut feeling is just a signal, but an important and surprisingly exact one. The sign of something you too often do not listen to. Again,

it is not about the project but about you and about your relationship to it. To explain, to better describe this “something” is why I thought it useful to bring you Kleist’s essay and observe this metaphor of the marionette.

We can look at an actor like a marionette. This is what Kleist is doing. If the thread attached to the centre of the marionette is set correctly, one single pull will result in a whole complex and effortlessly graceful set of movements of the limbs. Otherwise, you have to define the movements of each and every limb or body part one by one, to the last joint of the little finger. If an actor is put in a fully consistent situation, this will define his behaviour like the pull of a thread, making it complex and consistent without defining every bit of his performance, without the necessity to overtire him with all sorts of explanations and detailed instructions.

You can even think about a whole film crew the same way. This is not degrading, quite the contrary. Kleist uses this metaphor of the marionette not as an example of movements without a will of their own, but as an example of a complex moving system driven by one single defining force, by one thread. While communicating with your crew that

**AUDIENCE** Can you provide an example of your own?

**ENYEDI** Let’s speak a bit about set design, about something seemingly secondary for issues of dramaturgy, traditionally rather connected with aesthetics, with the style of a film. Let’s have a closer look at the two apartments of the two main characters in *On Body and Soul*. Both apartments were built in a studio. For the man’s, we used background projection and for the woman’s we used green screen. Why? Why the difference, why the complication of using and harmonising two different sets of tools? This technical decision was the result of wanting to express as much as possible with the fewest possible verbal tools about how these two people exist in the world, how they re-act to any situation. So, the choices had strictly dramaturgical reasons. Endre and Maria are lonely people and both of them are lonely by choice. But their reasons for it are different. They perceive the world around them in a very different way and this difference of perception is rooted in their characters and in both of their past lives, lives we do not show or directly refer to in the film. For Endre, we imagined a first floor apartment in the not too fancy inner part of the town, deep inside this big, buzzing net of two

*I THINK WHAT COULD HELP THE SCRIPTWRITER IS TO THINK OF HIS WORK NOT AS WRITING A SCRIPT, BUT WRITING A FILM.*

thread is represented by your script, and if it is a good, solid one, one pull puts the whole machinery in motion in a correct and consistent way without a need to define and check each and every little detail. Actually, it gives safety and autonomy simultaneously to the crew-members as the main thread of the marionette gives freedom to the movements of the limbs while defining the main direction. Well, the way you spin that thread, which then pulls the marionette, is very personal, even if tons of books and workshops have helped you to learn how to write a script. You can start by writing down your priorities in order to answer the question of why you started this project at all or use a different method. This can be very different from person to person and from project to project.

But if this is done consistently, it enables you all to be freer and more flexible during work, to make even considerable changes eventually. The limbs will move freely, describing a trajectory defined by the interference of the pull of the thread, the natural laws of gravity and the very nature (shape, length, joints) of the limb. And therefore the overall impression will not be forced, but natural and effortless.



Steve Hallema presented a VR case study



Vinca Wiedemann held a lecture:  
When writing, what happens beyond  
the writing itself?

million human beings. From the window we see the traffic, the lives of people in the windows of the house on the other side of the street. It is summer, the windows are open: in a first floor flat every single noise is heard separately – a car passes by, a drunken person is singing in the street, neighbours are watching TV, and so on. Everything is very present. Endre is alone, but he is part of this big chaos called society. His apartment is stuffed with objects coming from different layers of his past.

stiffness, the control of detail coming from a deep insecurity. First we tested the simpler and quick background projection for this apartment as well. We doubled the quantity of light by using four projectors, but it wasn’t enough for what we wanted. So, we changed to green screen making post production much more complicated and delicate, but this big depth of field was a priority even if the spectator hopefully doesn’t think about it as a stylistic element. We made a real effort to use these

*WHAT LENS YOU USE, WHAT IS LIT AND WHAT IS NOT IS A SILENT STATEMENT ABOUT THE PRIORITIES, ABOUT WHAT IS IMPORTANT AND WHAT IS NOT.*

There was probably a family there beforehand. We do not tell it but you can feel it. For his scenes at home we wanted to use a small depth of field. His face and his closest environment are sharp, but all the rest, the dark corners of his spacious, too-big-for-one-person apartment is blurred, uncertain, fluid. It is his retreat, his cave. For this purpose the background projection’s relatively low level of light is enough and we can check the ambience of the scene on set immediately.

**AUDIENCE** What was projected?

**ENYEDI** The view of the street outside the window. I also wanted to play with the sunset and morning light to show this sort of loneliness that is not isolated. It’s a chosen loneliness. This sort of exact use of the outside world’s ambience would have been impossible on a real location even if we had infinite amounts of money to shoot much longer.

Maria lives on the top floor of a very high building, far from people. There is just the sky, the sun, the wind and the big mass of the city in the far distance. From that height the noise of the big city is just a murmur. The apartment is minimalistic but not in a cool way. It is rather naked, vulnerable. The light comes in through huge windowpanes and there are no objects in the way of the light (as it is in Endre’s apartment) to break its power. For Maria we wanted to use a really big depth of field. Just remember your gut feelings when you look at a hyper-realistic painting. It looks like reality. But you have a weird, uncanny feeling, you don’t know exactly why. Well, the reason is the missing air perspective. Everything is sharp, not only the objects close to you, but every little detail, even in the far distance. The layers of air between you and the distant objects are missing; it doesn’t blur the view. It is as if the oxygen was sucked out from the whole world. It is a dead world. This weird, uneasy feeling is what I wanted for Maria to help the spectator be in her world the same way she is perceiving it, the

visual tools not too explicitly. I didn’t want it to be a self-conscious style so that people watching the film would say, “Aha! The author wants to tell us this.” Without these consistent decisions the film will mean something different, and Endre and Maria would be different people and our relationship to them would also be different.

**AUDIENCE** It’s like the DNA of the film and everybody understands it.

**ENYEDI** Yes. You can call it that. But again, I think it is not the nature of the film but the nature of your relationship to it. It’s like a dance when your partner makes an unexpected move, but if you are moving in harmony, you can follow it because you feel each other’s energies. To me, a good script is not a sort of fortress that you have to defend during the whole process when, for instance, a bad producer comes in and misunderstands or misinterprets things, or when the weather is not what you need, or an actor breaks a leg, and so on. It should be like an open, inviting gate that asks you to come in and pour your wonderful energy into it. You are welcome. I’m strong enough to bear your creative energy and craftsmanship.

I had the idea to talk about this aspect of scriptwriting here with you because I will start a new class at the film school in Budapest in September. The biggest fights, in our school at least, are between the teachers of the writing class and the teachers of the directing class. Otherwise great people become oversensitive, somehow hurt and suspicious towards each other. Therefore, they don’t allow themselves to be generous with each other. Directors are afraid to admit admiration for all the wonderful inspiration the writers propose; and the writers are very hurt at every little change. Have you ever experienced that?

**AUDIENCE** Of course! It’s all over the university. In our class, it was super hard because there were





Miguel Machalski's group:  
(l to r) Kírsi Saivosalmi, Jacqueline van Vugt,  
Lai Kin Chang, Peter Speyer, Miguel Machalski,  
Bartosz Wierzbicka, Fanni Szilágyi, Zsófia Lányi



Gualberto Ferrari's group:  
(l to r) Ralph Etter, Ellen De Waele,  
Bart Van den Bempt, Gualberto Ferrari,  
Anna M. Bofarull, Maria Balabas, Ivo Briedis

directors and writers who got into a phase where the relationships were so bad that one of them had to quit and it was obviously always the writer.

**ENYEDI** Yeah, there are nearly fistfights. I feel it's worthwhile to speak about this so that we can really cherish and respect each other's involvement, but if it's just a Budapest illness, then we can change the subject. *[laughter]*

**AUDIENCE** So was there any improvisation at all in the shooting? You said you embrace that partnership from everyone. The film looks perfect and very controlled in all its elements.

**ENYEDI** It is. To compare it to my other scripts, this one wrote itself. I followed my main characters and just wrote down what they were doing and I barely touched the script during the shooting. But this control on the details doesn't mean that it excludes the creative energy of the team. We worked in a symbiotic way, all of us very focused and protective about the inner needs of this project. There is tremendous input from every single team member but – because of the nature of the project – it never manifested in improvisations but rather in a common, shared exactness.

Practically speaking, when you look at this film, there are two weirdos who are not doing or making much. They have all sorts of difficulties in making contact with each other. At the end, they do make contact but who really knows how that will end?

You can describe the story of the film like this as well. If my colleagues had not been such perfect “dancing partners”, if they had just used their craftsmanship and professional knowledge, if they, together with me, hadn't let themselves become different limbs of the same marionette, if the deeper currents of the film hadn't come through to them, this film wouldn't exist. Each idea, each gesture made, each exact solution needed the whole person, the whole mind and soul of the team member. It was never just about a professional solution. When the wardrobe mistress offered a blouse for Maria, she thought about the actual state of Maria's soul, her whole life, and her place in the world. And she was thinking about the same person that I was thinking about.

There was a salt-and-pepper shaker casting. There was a huge table with twenty different examples. Naturally, the art director and the prop master had already done a selection for these twenty and not the other sixty they probably looked at. *[laughing]* I overheard the arguments as the prop masters were discussing among them-selves: “No! It can't be plastic. Are you kidding? Maria wouldn't touch it...” When I heard this, I knew they were fully and deeply inside the essence of the film, not in the story. We were not speaking about characters, about situations, about conflicts. We were creating this world together.

Or, let's take the example of simple visual effects. I've known these people with whom I worked on



Arash T. Riahi's group:  
(l to r) Patrick Comer, Alexandra Jans,  
Aleksandar Nikolic, Jan Van Dyck,  
Jana Nemčuková, Tami Ravid, Arash T. Riahi

this film for a long time and I trust them completely because they don't want something perfect, but something much better: they go for something alive. There is a small scene where Maria, as part of her daily routine, goes into the supermarket to buy her frozen peas. We saw her buy the same sort of peas at the beginning of the film. It's summer and she opens the door of the freezer and leaves it open a bit longer than normal because she is emotionally shaken and a mist appears on the door. That's VFX. You could spend hours to explain to a technician what you want to see exactly. The speed, the thickness, the form of the patch of mist, how much her face should be visible, what parts can be covered completely and what just partly. If this technician doesn't have the sensibility to understand what this moment means, then we would have had to correct it probably twenty different times. I just gave them the task explaining which scene was beforehand (which affected Maria). The first try was already perfect. Or, a bit better than perfect: fully realistic but with a hidden poetic strength since this was made by a sensitive, caring, creative person who understood deeply what we were trying to tell with this film. So, you do not need to have improvisation to find strong, powerful personal input from the team members of a film.

**AUDIENCE** What about the first time Maria is looked at by the male protagonist when the sun is shining on her shoe and then she pulls it away? Was that in the script? Or was it created during the lighting set-up?

**ENYEDI** It was in the script. We knew that only from 11:00 to 11:20 that line of sunshine was in the right place and strong enough. We started to shoot in the morning and then at half past ten we just dropped everything and went to the place to wait for the shadow to arrive at the right place to make that shot. That was real sunshine, not lighting. But we also had a mirror because it was a narrow court. We didn't have the distance we needed. But even if this small scene was in the script, the way all these people worked to have it right, to understand why such a detail is important, is where their personalities and creativity appear in the film.

**AUDIENCE** There was one shot I remember because of the point of view. There is one shot from under her bed when she takes off her slippers. I thought that didn't fit somehow. It was an effect shot more than something that fit the rest of the film.

**ENYEDI** I can only tell you what my intention was and my connection to it. It's one of my favourite shots. After the film was released, on my Facebook page, I received a mini-essay on this shot. *[laughter]* The person who wrote it understood the whole film through that shot and understood it fully, very much the same way I intended it.

**AUDIENCE** It really caught my attention. I thought that it didn't fit.

**ENYEDI** Well, it fits for me. It even returns the moment before her suicide when she slips out of them very much the same way, not for a second touching the floor. A shoe or slipper protects you from the direct contact of the environment. For example, it is a very accentuated moment when Maria during her sensual self-education steps out of her shoes in the park and starts to walk in the grass barefoot. We nearly feel every single blade of grass touching her skin. The choice of these slippers represents Maria's total lack of eroticism and total ignorance of that dimension of her life. For me, it's a heart-breakingly practical and impersonal object. It's not by chance that with her feet fly-ing up from the slippers and then the light being switched off, there is a feeling of immense relief after the whole



(l to r) Marion Gompfer (Sources 2),  
Idikó Enyedi, Arash T. Riahi





(l to r) Steye Hallema, Marion Gompfer (Sources 2),  
Arash T. Riahi, Julie Metzdorff

## KLEIST IS CIRCLING AROUND THE VERY SENSITIVE QUESTION ABOUT WHAT MAKES YOUR PRESENCE ON STAGE, ON SCREEN...

day's work of this poor slipper. This small detail was also in the script. But the input my colleagues brought in was elementary and decisive for the outcome of the film even if the script was not changed.

The composer did not receive a very easy briefing. He had to make a thin, barely perceivable musical texture that would make the spectator hungry for real, melodic music. You have to pull the spectator through a musical desert before the time you get to the Laura Marling song. After more than an hour of austerity that song is overwhelming for everybody. You don't just watch a weird young woman who is touched by this music; you yourself are touched the same way as well. I told the composer that he needed to create something in the first part of the film that has this sense of deprivation, even more acute than if there had been no music at all. Not an easy thing for a composer to do. These kinds of discussions are behind every detail.

I needed complete involvement from everybody. So before starting I wrote a personal letter along with a brief synopsis for those who had not read the script. Even the drivers knew and understood what we were doing. This film is not about egos, even my own even though I am the writer and the director. I needed to pull myself back and just serve the film,

just as everyone else with his or her post had to do the same. We all had to put in the work and then disappear behind the results. Well, we can continue with examples from this film...

**AUDIENCE** I am curious about certain decisions you made. For example, in a lot of scenes when you change the place or the room, you had only one shot or one fragment of a room. There was no wide shot for orientation so we know where we are. Did you shoot other things and then decide in the editing that that fragment tells us enough?

**ENYEDI** No. We reworked the storyboard several times trying to give every composition a dramaturgical function. Where you put the camera, what lens you use, what is lit and what is not is a silent statement about the priorities, about what is important for us in that moment and what is not. The framing is perhaps the most efficient tool – after the face of an actor – to express anything.

But, in fact the same goes for everything, for props for example, as well. There is a little red lamp hanging in Maria's bedroom. When my wonderful, wonderful art director found it, she was so happy and said to me, "I think this is Maria!" I knew it wouldn't be just a prop hanging from the ceiling. It has to speak instead of Maria. I wanted to condense as

Excursion to Målselvossen, Norway's national waterfall



## ... FACING YOUR CREW OR IN FRONT OF YOUR LAPTOP, FULLY PRESENT, TOTALLY CONSISTENT AND AUTHENTIC.

much as possible in these details instead of in the dialogues. So no, not much was left out.

**AUDIENCE** How did you write that?

**ENYEDI** Because words function so differently, the script was a bit poetic. It's not a technical but a very visual one. First of all, I want to make sure that the reason why a certain scene or detail is there is understood. I want to communicate and in a script you use the tools of language, of literature. This is different from the tools of the cinema. When I communicate in writing, I use every possibility writing offers me. Let's give you an example. We show an empty bed. We show Maria watching TV. We see another empty bed with different bed sheets that fit more for a man. We show Endre in front of the TV set asleep on the couch. This was an attempt to show the quarters where these people lived. In the script, I had written, "The beds are waiting." When the DoP or the art director or the sound designer read this simple sentence, they knew that somehow they have to find a way to express this "waiting" within the frames of their own profession. The beds in our story where these two people meet when they are asleep and dreaming is like the launching pad for a spaceship. So, it was in the script that we show two people in front of the TV and two empty beds but we had to find a way to

show it that expresses everything that is underneath the surface of this simple scene. The whole film is a series of very simple scenes, by the way.

But I also am curious about *your* working experiences and how you keep focus during your working process. Preparing for this lecture I really was counting on also getting your feedback about how you cope with this sometimes very painful point when you hand over a script you've worked on for years. I would like to hear from you about this very complex feeling when your child is taken away and raised by someone else. How can you manage to survive it and to use the complexity of our profession for the best sake of the film? How should we behave as directors to writers? How could writers be less fearful about a director's work? It interests me deeply as a teacher as well.

**AUDIENCE** With the process you described, I would be extremely happy to have the director raise my child, if I can use the expression, in the way you were raising yours. What I fear the most when giving over my script is that there will be no attention to this kind of detail and no reflection about where the point of gravity is. I've had this experience more than once. Basically the craftsmanship may have been there but the understanding that you speak of was not.



**ENYEDI** Were you developing the project together?

**AUDIENCE** No.

**ENYEDI** So you wrote it and somebody grabbed it and killed it.

**AUDIENCE** I would like to put that in a better way, but yeah. It was an animated project and it was a very simple story, but I would say that the simpler it is, the trickier it can be. The general theme of it was love between a parent and a child, but apparently there was no love involved from the director. The end result was there but it was kind of fuzzy.

**AUDIENCE** Do you write for other directors? You have directed things you didn't write.

**ENYEDI** No, I don't write for other directors and yes, I have directed things that I didn't write. By the way, I made several attempts to find a co-writer. My best script doctor was a painter...

When I realise a script written by somebody else, as in the HBO project, I know from my own writing experience what an immense amount of work has been done before I even enter a project. I can intuit the involvement and the depth behind every decision that was made. It made the work much easier for me to find my place in this new situation because I had respect for that work made by the writers. I also was lucky because they stayed with me. They were certainly a bit defensive at the beginning, yes. But then you have to communicate very clearly that you are not the enemy. It became a joyful sort of dance, and they were happy that what they wrote came alive. It's about egos. It's about inner freedom. But it is also about mutual respect. I know it's not realistic in every situation to choose your partner, to choose the director with whom you work, but ideally it is best to go through the whole process together. I show my script to my editor way before his moment to start to work arrives. If you open a channel of direct communication and bring your colleagues into a state where they can be fully present in this task, it will be coherent and it will be a wonderful experience.

It's not by chance that Kleist uses the example of the bear, an animal. You saw in my film how these "animal actors" perform. Their every moment was truthful. They can't be fake. They are not able to be. If you work with an amateur and you ask anything of him inside his nature or drive, he can't be fake. An actor can very easily be fake. Because quite often he wants to control his "limbs" (returning to the marionette metaphor) one by one. With an amateur, you need to understand his own personal point of gravity. If you don't go against it he can do anything the best actors can do. This quality can appear with a purity that either has no consciousness or consciousness without limit. This can happen with a child, a dog, the amateur, or the

exceptionally great artist. We spend so much time making a film. Why not make it intense? Why not go for this quality? It's there; it's approachable.

**AUDIENCE** It's very interesting this concept of point of gravity because making a film is such a long process that it's so easy to get lost at any point. It's important to keep going back to the origins, the reasons why you need to tell that story and not another one. And why it should be you that tells it and not someone else.

**ENYEDI** I think what could help the scriptwriter is to think of his work not as writing a script, but writing a film. I'm not sure I can articulate what the difference is exactly. Somehow when you write, you need to make space in the writing. A home should

# IF YOU GET INTO A COMMUNICATIVE RELATIONSHIP WITH THE DIRECTOR, HE WILL BE THE BIGGEST DEFENDER OF YOUR SCRIPT AND THE DETAILS IN IT. HE WILL FIGHT FOR IT.



Julie Metzdorff (Sources 2),  
Ellen Charlotte Sørheim



(l to r) Jana Nemčková, Kirsí SalvosaImi,  
Arash T. Riahi

be created for everyone with a role for the crew, for all those people who come later and feel the film is theirs as well. Whoever they are, they would feel at home and be able to feel the nature of that world and would be very happy to move into it. In that case, they won't be able to work against it. But I know that all sorts of shit happens, so I'm not contradicting you. I'm just saying you really have to try to choose your partners well.

So here's maybe another useless or impractical example – board games. The simplest board games are the most enjoyable ones to play. There is *Mensch ärgere dich nicht*. It's just a simple circle: you throw the dice and move in one direction. If someone else steps on the same place, he has the possibility of throwing you out – or not. Oh my god, the dramas resulting from this simple set of rules! How deeply you get to know a person with whom you play one evening, all the secrets of character and weaknesses come to surface. [laughter] A board game, like a marionette, has rules such as the point of gravity. All the limbs can make very complex and wonderful movements to make a dance. If you make the rules of the game, if the rules of your world function, then anybody who enters into it won't destroy it. They will enrich it and surprise you with wonderful outcomes – as a marionette's dance does with the movements of its limbs.

In my directing classes we used to make board games, and we would analyse why it was working or not working. A script has more chance, perhaps, to not be destroyed so easily or to be misinterpreted or go in the wrong direction. Directors can be

selfish, narcissistic or egocentric and go against a script's inner meaning. Well, again, the key is to find great partners.

Here's one more example explaining what I call point of gravity: We worked in a real slaughterhouse, and I think for us all it was an experience we will remember all our lives. They don't slaughter every day. In the middle of the week they process the meat. We were there for one week. At the beginning of the film we see these cows waiting on the transport truck, it is very early morning. For me, it was very important to enter into the film with them, through their point of view. We built a small island among them for the camera and DoP to be able to be inside the truck, so that the camera could be one of them. There is a black bull peeking out watching the workers chit-chatting and then he looks up towards the sun, the same way our cleaning lady does, and as our two main characters do – a new morning. They all watch the same sunrise. It's the bull's last morning but he contemplates the sun the same way the humans do. We planned to shoot this moment at the end of the week, when a new transport was planned to arrive but no animals came. We did a re-shoot near Budapest only for this single close-up. We had to find a similar animal, a similar pen, pay for the whole crew. Everyone in the production understood the necessity of this single take. They all knew it is not the caprice of an egomaniac director. We had to have this shot otherwise our film would not be the film we wanted to make. I don't know why I told you this story. [laughter]

**AUDIENCE** It's very frustrating working with people in a workshop and you want to work on details like this. For me, they are the most important things when you write them into the script. They are the first things to be cut in production. It's that small scene where you write that the sun is shining and the rays of the sun are going through the woods. But then it's decided that it's not needed.

**ENYEDI** It's needed.

**AUDIENCE** Everyone is so obsessed with the story. But what we see in your film is that the details of the atmosphere had at least the same amount of importance as the story. It wasn't some add-on; it made the film special. My question is how, as writers, can we put this in our screenplays, something that tells the director and everyone else how important they are to have? Maybe in the beginning, there should be half a page to say that this film cannot be made without these details. The sunshine must come from right to left because it means this and that. [laughter] Maybe it would be taken more seriously.

**ENYEDI** I do think people want to take things seriously. If you get into a communicative relationship with the director, he will be the biggest defender of

(l to r) Peter Speyer, Jacqueline van Vugt,  
Bartosz Wierzbietka, Fanni Szilágyi



Birthday cakes for Lai Kin Chang  
and Zsófia Lányi



your script and the details in it. He will fight for it. He would kill anybody who would not let it happen because he would deeply understand it because it's not something you're imposing on him. He will desperately want to have it. And he will find a way.

**AUDIENCE** How would you start this conversation, other than saying, did you really understand the script?

**AUDIENCE** That's a very bad start. *[laughter]*

**ENYEDI** I can't really speak about that since it's not my experience, but let's take the example of working with an actor. If I impose something on him, he will tell me, "Yeah, sure. I can do that." But it won't be coming from the heart. Before even starting to work, you have to be truly curious about this guy. If you do not like what you find, walk away. If you like it, help him to be himself. Try to understand what sort of person he is, what makes him tick, what his fears are. Sometimes when someone is losing focus it's because of inner fears. Yes, there are always time pressures and money pressures but that can also help us to focus, to squeeze out the very best solutions. But there are also other fears, personal fears: Am I good enough? Did I make the right choice? Where am I in my career? People are always apt to logically explain their solutions of why they are not doing certain things. Most of the time behind that there are fears and expectations that have nothing to do with what they're telling you. Try to peek behind the surface and understand these deeper motivations of your working partner.

There's this Hungarian psychologist who lives in America, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, best known as the architect of the notion of *flow*. This is the idea of not focusing on outcomes, success, expectation, but to focus with the same concentration as a child building a sandcastle would, not really focusing on the resolution. This is what I'm trying to explain. If in the communication you have to defend the script or explain it or take care to protect its integrity, it will always be a broken, very vulnerable and dangerous process. Perhaps it will turn out well, but it will be in danger every step of the way. You must do everything you can to be allied before even speaking about what the hell the whole film is about. First, make this alliance with this other person. That is what the director is doing with all the rest of the team. In some cases, you can write together and it's wonderful. I admire all of you who are working together. But many times it is not the case. A newcomer enters – a director. You have to be the wise one. You are far more knowledgeable about the project. Make a personal alliance and start the common development of the project together. This communication can go astray very easily at the very beginning, if you are not careful. Once that happens, the following months will consist of people reacting to an initial misunderstanding of the other's character or intentions.

**AUDIENCE** If you are the writer, you have one point of view or approach to your story and the director has a different one. When you are directing and working with actors, you need to be working exactly with the same approach – the story, the characters, all of it. I think it's very important also that the writer and the director see the story from the same point of view. When we are talking about five projects, everyone would write the same story from a different point of view maybe, or someone would be more interested in one character than another. You have to try to be very close.

**ENYEDI** Yes. So before the dramaturgical questions arise, this communication channel has to be cleared and really analysed between the two of you. Then you are freer to have even sharp discussions without the danger of causing damage to the communication.

**AUDIENCE** As you say, as a writer, if you think these details are important then the director should find them important, as well.

**ENYEDI** Much goodwill goes away because this sort of basic human communication is not established first. It's quite hard to formally speak about it, but I think it's essential. If you can see that all the tools you use are serving the film with equal importance, this is key. We are not making a story. We are making a film.

If the director becomes your ally, then he's not alone anymore. Not just you, but he or she as well feels less alone and he or she will be thankful for it. It's a very lonely profession. After a shooting day, everyone goes home to relax but as the director, you cannot. You have to start to prepare for the next day. It's an immense comfort and feeling of security not to be alone in this, to have a real, close partner for thinking aloud, to share ideas or fears, pose questions, listen to opinions.

**AUDIENCE** I think creating this respect and friendship with even the smallest person on the crew is very important. They need to understand that they are not unimportant.

**AUDIENCE** I know this doesn't happen very often, but I think it's helpful if the writers do some of the stuff the directors do. For example, while you're writing, you go look at locations.

**ENYEDI** Yes. Exactly. Writers shouldn't be left out of this huge inspiration of location, space, or the actor's presence.

Thank you so much, all of you. *[applause]*

My advice to everybody is to read Kleist!  
Everybody read Kleist! *[laughter]*

## SOURCES 2 SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

**1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION, 8 – 16 JUNE 2017**  
**AT FILMCAMP IN MÅLSELV | NORWAY**

### DEVELOPMENT FEATURE FILM & CREATIVE DOCUMENTARY

#### Advisers

Arash T. Riahi | Austria, Iran  
Gualberto Ferrari | France, Argentina  
Miguel Machalski | Spain, Argentina

#### Participants

Bart Van den Bempt & Ellen De Waele | Belgium  
Jan Van Dyck & Alexandra Jans | Belgium  
Lai Kin Chang | Belgium  
Zsófia Lányi & Fanni Szilágyi | Hungary  
Patrick Comer | Ireland  
Ivo Briedis | Latvia  
Jacqueline van Vugt | Netherlands  
& Kirsi Saivosalmi | Netherlands, Finland  
Tami Ravid | Netherlands  
Bartosz Wierzbietka | Poland  
Maria Balabas | Romania  
Jana Nemčeková | Slovakia  
Anna M. Bofarull | Spain  
Ralph Etter | Switzerland  
Aleksandar Nikolic | United Kingdom  
Peter Speyer | United Kingdom, Germany

### SUPPLEMENTARY PROGRAMME

#### Sources of Inspiration

Ildikó Enyedi | Hungary

#### Lectures

Vinca Wiedemann | Denmark  
Steye Hallema | Netherlands

#### Special Advice

Paul Tyler | Denmark, United Kingdom

### PARTNERS

#### Support

FilmCamp AS

**FilmCamp**



# THOMAS ARSLAN

## THOMAS ARSLAN | CURRICULUM VITAE

Thomas Arslan was born in 1962 in Braunschweig, Germany. Between 1963 and 1967, he lived in Essen, and from 1967 to 1971 in Ankara, Turkey where he attended elementary school.

In 1972, he returned to Essen, graduating from high school at Abitur in 1982. Subsequently, he did his military substitute service in Hamburg. After studying German and History in Munich for two semesters, he enrolled at the German Film and Television Academy in Berlin (DFFB) from 1986 to 1992. He has worked as a film director and screenwriter since 1992 and has been the Professor of Narrative Film at the University of the Arts Berlin (UDK) since 2007.

### Thomas' credits include:

*Helle Nächte / Bright Nights*  
2017 | director & screenwriter

*Gold*  
2013 | director & screenwriter

*Im Schatten / In the Shadows*  
2010 | director & screenwriter

*Ferien / Vacation*  
2007 | director, screenwriter & producer

*Aus der Ferne / From Far Away*  
2005 | director, screenwriter & producer

*Der schöne Tag / A Fine Day*  
2001 | director, screenwriter & producer

*Dealer*  
1998 | director & screenwriter

*Geschwister / Brothers and Sisters*  
1996 | director & screenwriter

*Mach die Musik leiser / Turn Down the Music*  
1993 | director & screenwriter

Thomas Arslan

# THE SHOOT IS THE CRITICISM OF WHAT YOU WROTE BEFORE

LUXEMBOURG | 1 APRIL 2017

## THOMAS ARSLAN

SOURCES OF INSPIRATION LECTURE ON THE OCCASION OF THE SOURCES 2 SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP IN LUXEMBOURG PRECEDED BY THE SCREENING OF *BRIGHT NIGHTS* (2017).

With the support of Film Fund Luxembourg.

**ARSLAN** When I'm beginning a new project, I never start with a topic, or any journalistic daily news item.

The period in which I'm trying to decide on a new project sometimes is quite long, sometimes longer than working on the script itself. During this period, I must always remember to have some patience. I walk around a lot aimlessly in these days. Walking helps me free my head. I listen to a lot of music (something I do not do when I work on the

## ... AND THE EDITING IS THE CRITICISM OF WHAT YOU SHOT.

script), look at my photo books, and look at the photos I take during my walks. These photos are not purposeful. They are simply snapshots of situations, a particular light, or places that strike me when I'm walking around. I make notes, mostly loose scenes, which do not have a superordinate connection. Gradually, something emerges, which forms into the sketch of a story or an idea. This idea must come to me, rather than generate from me. Otherwise, I do not trust it.

Then I start writing continuously. Later I re-work the complete first draft of the exposé several times. I try to make sure that even if many things are still sketchy, the basic pillars of history no longer "float" or "wobble". Even if there are a lot of changes during the development of the screenplay, it helps me to orient myself to these basic pillars.

Sometimes a new project also comes from certain "blind spots" of the previous film, something that was at the edge of the story or had not been developed enough. That's how I felt after *Brothers and Sisters*. During the long casting we looked at young actors and through the many interviews with these young people so many stories and impressions accumulated that it would have been impossible to put all of them in one movie. Thus after *Brothers and Sisters* emerged *Dealer* and *A Fine Day*. In retrospect, these films could be considered a trilogy. However, this was not planned from the outset. Here, one film guided me to the other.

And sometimes coincidence guides me. When I'm writing, the Internet is a blessing and a curse at the same time. You can quickly research something and there are many interesting sources. But you can also lose yourself very fast while surfing the Web. It can disturb your concentration. Friends of mine write on a second computer without an Internet connection. Others work with a program that blocks the Internet for a fixed time. I still hope to be able to discipline myself without such aids. Back to coincidence: during an aimless search, I came across diaries of German-American emigrants who tried to make their way to the Klondike hoping to find gold there. It didn't let me go. This was the starting point for my film *Gold*.

I'd like to switch back to the film you've seen, *Bright Nights*. Before this film, I made *Gold*, which is a period piece, taking place in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century during the Klondike Gold Rush. We shot the film in British Columbia, Canada. In terms of logistics, it was very complicated because we had to handle horses and chuck wagons, and so on. It was somehow a painful process to shoot because it was very difficult to start a new scene with fifteen horses and a chuck wagon when you have to go back to the beginning because you have to take care of so many logistics, as well as the work with the actors. I'm satisfied with the film, but I didn't want to shoot the next film the same way. I felt the need to do a film where I had the freedom and more possibilities to work closely with the actors. I tried to find something that could be the basis for a different



Audience listening to Thomas Arslan

## SOMETIMES A NEW PROJECT ALSO COMES FROM CERTAIN “BLIND SPOTS” OF THE PREVIOUS FILM...

kind of film shoot, something closer to my everyday life. This was a kind of starting point. After a while a storyline emerged. I wanted to tell a story about family relations and how it happens that important family or personal connections tear apart so easily, a story about how mistakes are repeated from one generation to the next, and how this circle can be broken so you can lead your own life.

I started working concretely on this in early 2014. First I wrote an exposé of about four to six pages only for myself to find the structure and the main threads of the action. Afterwards I elaborated in a more precise way and came up with the first treatment of twelve pages. The story-outline is very different from the film you saw. It had a much longer piece set in Berlin, a third of the film at least. The father, who in the film lives and dies in Norway, dies in Berlin. This was the reason for the whole family to come together after his funeral. There had been a lot more characters and so on. Even the decision to make this journey through Norway was totally different because it was more or less a free decision of the father and son. It was the father's suggestion as well, but they decided to take the trip together and chose Norway. Even the end was very different. The story ended in this small town where the son lives. It was the last scene where we see the son in his everyday surroundings.



Virgil Widrich presented a case study on his film *Night of a 1000 Hours*

At this point in the writing I felt a bit like Karl May who wrote about Indians and Kurds and had never been to the locations where his stories take place. I wanted to have a more concrete base for the further development of the story. So we took a longer research trip to look for locations, to get some concrete impressions about the geography, the cities, the light. This location-scouting trip was a big inspiration for the further writing that was necessary to develop the story.

All in all, I made a total of seven drafts of the script. I never write technical instructions into my scripts. I try to find a way to make it easier for the actors to read. I don't make extra numbers for every single action because I think it's too technical and it



Participants, guests and Sources 2 team

## ... A STORY ABOUT HOW MISTAKES ARE REPEATED FROM ONE GENERATION TO THE NEXT, AND HOW THIS CIRCLE CAN BE BROKEN SO YOU CAN LEAD YOUR OWN LIFE.

disturbs the reading. I prefer to postpone this until the actual shooting when you need it to have a better overview of the shooting schedule and so on.

Afterwards we applied to film funds with the finished script. Initially we planned to shoot this film for € 1,6 million. But finally we had to shoot the film for around € 900.000. This had a huge effect on the number of shooting days. We had planned for thirty-two days but had to do it in twenty-four, which is a big difference. I checked my script again.

It was pretty clear that I had to change something. I needed to have a kind of inspiration to react to these new hard facts. At this point, I dropped a lot of scenes and changed the whole structure. I threw out the whole Berlin part at the beginning, and changed the detail of the father living and dying in Berlin. He now emigrated and left the family and lived in Norway. The father and son's decision to make this journey together now developed after the funeral in Norway. It changed a lot in some other details as well. But I'm satisfied with this kind of decision. Still I would have liked to have had more shooting days, but for me at least the story was now more clear than in the previous version. When you work on a film you have to react to so many hard facts and logistical problems. You have to find new solutions and you have to react to these in a creative way. For me, filmmaking is a mixture of these two elements – things that you'd like to do and things that are possible.

As we were preparing the shooting, Reinhold Vorschneider and I watched a lot of films together and explored the photos I'd taken in Norway. Some films had been important inspirations, especially *Two-Lane Blacktop* by Monte Hellman. I love this

Hrund Gunnsteinsdóttir gave a lecture: *The greatest weapon of storytellers is not a 'pink and fluffy' feeling*





film. It's a perfect road movie. We thought a lot about how we could shoot the driving scenes in *Bright Nights* and talked about how to give a rhythm and visual structure to this kind of movie with a stop and go structure. We watched another film I like several times, *Taste of Cherry* by Abbas Kiarostami. It's another important inspiration, especially concerning the driving and dialogue scenes in the car.

During the editing we cut a lot of scenes that had been written and shot. Perhaps you might have noticed that there are some scenes that are cut in the middle. I found out later that these scenes had a beginning, middle, and end. When you have too many scenes like this, it gets schematic. They shouldn't have been written this way. The shoot is the criticism of what you wrote before, and the editing is the criticism of what you shot. It's a step-by-step process.

We had been well prepared for the shoot, but at the same time I like to leave things open and change them a lot during the process. This is the way I prefer to work. I don't really believe in any big rules about how to write a script or make a film because there are so many different possibilities.

**AUDIENCE** I'd like to ask about the burning house.

**ARSLAN** It has no symbolic meaning. Of course, it's a special moment. But it's just something they explore together while driving by. It was clear to me that it's the kind of scene that's loaded with some kind of tension, but it was not meant to be a symbol for something.

**AUDIENCE** You said you like to change many things during the shoot. Can you give us an example?

**ARSLAN** Sometimes we would just see something that had not been planned, especially this long car ride into the fog. It was not planned this way. When we shot in this location the first time it was planned as a much shorter transitory shot. The weather was clear and we had bright sunshine. We passed by the same spot a few days later. The area was covered with fog. It looked totally different and much more interesting. So we shot it again. It was a special moment during the shooting and it is a special moment in the film.

Another example is the dialogue. After the casting of the actors, I always do readings with them. This is really helpful for me to see which lines are working and which aren't. The dialogue changed a lot after this reading. The next step is the shooting. It's the first time you have everything together – the locations and the actors and your dialogue – and sometimes you feel it doesn't fit perfectly. You tried your best writing at your desk, but when you're on location, it sometimes doesn't sound right or doesn't really fit. Then I try to change some lines as well. I don't ask the actors to improvise.



(l to r) Nicolas Neuhold, Anne Schiltz, Chantal Schaul, Élodie Malanda, Eric Collins, Eileen Byrne, Karin Schockweiler (Film Fund Luxembourg), Guy Daleiden (Film Fund Luxembourg), Marion Gompfer (Sources 2), Michel Seeber, Virgil Widrich, Bady Minck, Miguel Machalski, Julie Metzdriff (Sources 2), Caroline Kox, Carole Kremer (Creative Europe Media Desk Luxembourg)

I change the lines the day before or on set. Sometimes I give them a totally different dialogue. The scene at the seaside where he talks about how the mountains look like the ones in *Lord of the Rings* is an example of something I re-wrote during the shoot.

**AUDIENCE** He found this book in the father's house. I think the father had written it. Does this have any meaning? Is it symbolic of something?

**ARSLAN** It's a concrete detail of the story and a symbol of the alienation between father and son. This book is a part of the life of his father that he didn't know about because he had no contact with him. It's astonishing for him and sad at the same time because he had no idea about the life of his father.

Thank you. [applause]



Handling Ideas session with Paul Tyler



(l to r) Karin Schockweiler (Film Fund Luxembourg), Guy Daleiden (Film Fund Luxembourg), Marion Gompfer (Sources 2), Carole Kremer (Creative Europe Media Desk Luxembourg)

SOURCES 2 SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION, 30 MARCH – 7 APRIL 2017  
IN LUXEMBOURG

DEVELOPMENT FEATURE FILM &  
CREATIVE DOCUMENTARY

Advisers

Michael Seeber | Austria  
Eric Collins | France  
Miguel Machalski | Spain, Argentina

Participants

Robert Herzl | Austria  
Eva Tomanová, Jiří Konečný | Czech Republic  
Milica Zivanović | Germany, Serbia, Croatia  
& Matthias Nerlich | Germany  
Renars Vimba & Aija Berzina | Latvia  
Chantal Schaul | Luxembourg  
Tullio Forgiarini | Luxembourg  
Nicolas Neuhold | Luxembourg, Austria  
Caroline Kox | Luxembourg, Germany  
& Bady Minck | Luxembourg  
Eileen Byrne | Luxembourg, United Kingdom  
& Élodie Malanda | Luxembourg  
Stephen Hutton | Norway, Ireland  
Nina Blažin & Jani Sever | Slovenia  
Miguel Gómez-Tejedor | Spain  
Sébastien Kühne | Switzerland  
Dodo Hunziker | Switzerland  
& Yared Zeleke | United States, Ethiopia

SUPPLEMENTARY PROGRAMME

Sources of Inspiration

Thomas Arslan | Germany

Lectures

Virgil Widrich | Austria  
Hrund Gunnsteinsdóttir | Iceland

Special Advice

Paul Tyler | Denmark, United Kingdom

PARTNERS

Support

Film Fund Luxembourg

Cooperation

Creative Europe Desk Luxembourg

FILM FUND  
LUXEMBOURG

# 167 SOURCES FILMS MADE!

## JOURNEY TO A MOTHER'S ROOM

Spain, 2018 | Celia Rico,  
Josep Amorós

## FOR WHAT THE FATHERS FOUGHT

Norway, 2018 | doc  
Hilde Korsæth

## CLEO

Belgium, 2018 | Eva Cools

## GIRL

Belgium, 2018 | Lukas Dhont

## VADIO – I AM NOT A POET

Austria, 2018 | doc  
Stefan Lechner

## PHOENIX

Norway, 2018  
Anne-Regine Klovholt,  
Camilla Strøm Henriksen

## FAMILY PRACTICE

Switzerland, 2018  
Jeshua Dreyfus, Kaspar  
Winkler, Sabine Girsberger

## SAF

Turkey, Germany, Romania,  
2018 | Ali Vatansever

## COMIC SANS

Croatia, 2018  
Nevio Marasovic

## THE MOVER

Latvia, 2018 | Dāvis Sīmanis,  
Matīss Gricmanis

## HEAVY TRIP

Finland 2018 | Aleksu Puranen,  
Jukka Vidgren, Juuso Laatio

## LAJKÓ, THE GIPSY WHO WENT TO SPACE

Hungary, Russia 2017  
Balázs Lengyel, Balázs Lovas

## BORN IN EVIN

Austria, Germany 2017  
doc | Maryam Zaree

## FACING THE WIND

Spain, 2018 | Meritxell Collé

## COPS

Austria, 2018  
Stefan A. Lukacs

## THE ONLY ONES

Switzerland, 2017  
Martina Clavadetscher,  
Sabine Girsberger

## BREATHING INTO MARBLE

Lithuania 2017  
Giedre Beinoriute

## SMALL PLANETS – DISCONNECTED

Germany 2017 | doc  
Dirk Manthey

## THE INFINITE GARDEN

Bulgaria 2017| Galin Stoev,  
Yana Borissova

## FUCK FAME

Germany 2017  
Lilian Franck, Jette Miller

## BRAVA

Spain 2017 | Roser Aguilar

## FINDING A FATHER

Switzerland 2017 | doc  
Walo Deuber,  
Rosé-Marie Schneider

## CLOUDBOY

Belgium, Netherlands,  
Sweden, Norway 2017  
Meikeminne Clinckspoor

## FREE LUNCH SOCIETY

Austria, Germany 2017  
Christian Tod

## SUMMER 93

Spain 2017 | Carla Simón

## THE MIGRUMPIES

Austria 2017| Arman T. Riahi,  
Faris Endris Rahoma,  
Aleksandar Petrovic

## GUARDIANS OF THE EARTH

Austria 2017  
Filip Antoni Malinowski

## STAR BOYS

Finland 2017  
Visa Koiso-Kanttila

## THE INERTIA VARIATIONS

Sweden 2017 | Karin Blixt,  
Johanna St. Michaels

## CAUSE OF DEATH: UNKNOWN

Norway 2016 | doc  
Anniken Hoel

## BUTTERFLY CITY

Ireland 2016 | doc  
Olga Černovaitė,  
Jeremiah Cullinane

## THE TRAMPOLINE

Croatia 2016  
Katarina Zrinka Matijević,  
Pavlica Bajsić

## NIGHT OF A 1000 HOURS

Luxembourg, Austria,  
Netherlands 2016  
Virgil Widrich, Alexander  
Dumreicher-Ivanceanu

## THE INVISIBLE CITY KAKUMA

Belgium 2016 | doc | cross-  
media | Lieven Corthouts,  
Emmy Oost

## KING OF THE AIRS – NOTES OF A FRIENDSHIP

Switzerland 2016 | doc  
Ivo Zen, Hercli Bundi

## LOU ANDREAS SALOMÉ

Austria, Germany, Italy 2016  
Cordula Kablitz-Post

## ONE OF US

Austria 2015  
Stephan Richter

## MASTER AND TATYANA

Lithuania 2015 | doc  
Giedre Zickyte,  
Dagne Vildziunaite

## GRANNY'S DANCING ON THE TABLE

Sweden 2015 | transmedia  
Hanna Sköld,  
Helene Gramqvist

## SEVEN SONGS FOR A LONG LIFE

United Kingdom 2015 | doc  
Amy Hardie, Sonja Henrici

## WILD WOMEN – GENTLE BEASTS

Switzerland 2015 | doc  
Anka Schmid

## THE CLOSER WE GET

United Kingdom 2015 | doc  
Karen Guthrie, Nina Pope

## GAME OVER

Spain 2015 | doc  
Alba Sotorra Clua

## MONSTERMAN

Finland 2014 | doc  
Antti Haase, Venla Hellstadt

## SOUTH TO NORTH

France 2014 | doc  
Antoine Boutet,  
Patrice Nézan

## MARIENBORN

Netherlands 2014 | doc  
Sabine König

## AFTERLIFE

Hungary 2014  
Virág Zomborác

## JE TE SURVIVRAI

France 2014 | André Logie  
Sylvestre Sбилle

## TOUGH COOKIES

Austria 2014 | doc  
Ruth Kaaserer

## TIME AND TIME AND AGAIN

Iceland 2013 | doc  
Ragnheiður Gestsdóttir,  
Markús Þór Andrésson

## MACONDO

Austria 2013  
Oliver Neumann,  
Sudabeh Mortezaei

## FREAK OUT! THE ALTERNATIVE MOVEMENT BEGINS

Sweden 2013 | doc  
Fredrik Lange

## BITTER LEMONS

Switzerland 2013 | doc  
Adnan Hadzi

## THE DREAM OF BRITANNIA

Norway 2013 | doc  
Ann Coates

## FLOWERS FROM THE MOUNT OF OLIVES

Estonia 2013 | doc  
Heilika Pikkov

## LIVING IMAGES

Estonia 2013  
Peep Pedmanson

## THE 727 DAYS WITHOUT KARAMO

Austria 2012 | doc  
Anja Salomonowitz

## CELLO TALES

Luxembourg 2013 | doc  
Anne Schiltz,  
Anne Schroeder

## DOMESTIC

Romania 2012 | Adrian  
Sitaru, Mete Gümürhan

## CONGO 1961

Ireland 2012 | TV doc  
Brendan Culleton

## L'AMOUR DES MOULES

Netherlands 2012 | doc  
Willemiek Kluijfhout,  
Reinette van de Stadt

## EL REY

Austria 2012 | doc  
Stefan Lechner

## MISS BLUE JEANS

Finland 2012  
Matti Kinnunen,  
Sanna Sorvoja, Outi Rousu

## FORGOTTEN

Germany 2012  
Alex Schmidt,  
Yildiz Özcan

## DEMONS

Estonia 2012  
Ain Mäeots, Toomas Tilk

## VANISHING WAVES

Lithuania 2012  
Kristina Buozyte,  
Bruno Samper

## A LADY IN PARIS

Estonia 2012 | Ilmar Raag

## THE CONGO: AN IRISH AFFAIR

Ireland 2011  
Brendan Culleton

## THE TRIAL

Austria 2011 | doc  
Igor Hauzenberger

## EARTHBOUND

Ireland, Denmark 2011  
Alan Brennan,  
Heidi Karin Madsen

## OPERATION BIKINI – BATTLEFIELDS OF BEAUTY

Germany 2011 | doc  
Tatjana Turanskyj,  
Irene Höfer

## LITTLE HEAVEN

Belgium 2011 | doc  
Lieven Corthouts

## COLOMBIANOS

Sweden 2011 | doc  
Tora Mårtens

## MY BELOVED

Norway 2010 | doc  
Hilde Korsæth,  
John Arvid Berger

## MY QUEEN KARO

Belgium 2010  
Dorothee van den Berghe

## NIGHT SHIFTS

Austria 2010 | doc  
Ivette Löcker

## OXYGEN

Belgium 2010  
Hans van Nuffel

## ADRIENN PÁL

Hungary 2010  
Andrea Roberti,  
Ágnes Kocsis

## ANARCHY IN ŽIRMUNAI

Lithuania 2010  
Saulius Drunga

## DEAR ALICE

Sweden 2010  
Othman Karim,  
Malin Holmberg-Karim

## FEATURE FILMS AND CREATIVE DOCUMENTARIES DEVELOPED THROUGH SOURCES SINCE 1993

Sources 1  
Sources 2

## OFF THE BEATEN TRACK

Ireland, Romania 2010 | doc  
Dieter Auner

## THE SNOW QUEEN

Estonia 2010 | Marko Raat

## INDIAN SUMMER

Norway 2010 | doc  
Ellen Ugelstad

## AFTERMATH, THE SECOND FLOOD

Austria, Germany, Ireland  
2009-2014 | doc | Raphael Barth

## THE HOUSE IN THE PARK

Switzerland 2009 | doc  
Hercli Bundi

## HOME IS NOT AT HOME

Austria 2009 | doc  
Julia Laggnér

## MADLY IN LOVE

Switzerland 2009  
Eva Vitija, Anna Luif

## THE GOOD CAPITALIST

Norway 2009 | doc  
Line Hatland, KriStine Ann  
Skaret

## ARCTIC FENCE

Norway 2009 | doc  
Karl-Emil Rikardsen

## DIRTY MIND

Belgium 2009 | Pieter van Hees

## THE HUNT

Latvia 2009  
Elvita Ruka, Guntis Trekteris

## 9 MINUTES BANANAS

Sweden 2008 | doc  
Staffan Nygren

## PARADISO

United Kingdom 2008 | doc  
Alessandro Negrini

## SISTERS APART INDIGO

Finland 2008  
Hanna Maylett, Tarja Kylmä

## MY FUTURE

Belgium 2008 | doc  
Lieven Corthouts

## BIG JOHN

Norway 2008 | doc  
Bjørn-Erik Hanssen

## FOR A MOMENT FREEDOM

Austria 2008 | Arash T. Riahi

## BETTER THINGS

United Kingdom 2008  
Duane Hopkins, Samm Hailay

## LEFT BANK

Belgium 2008 | Pieter van Hees

## THE TOWER

Sweden 2008 | doc  
Maria Söderberg

## GIRLS

Norway 2007 | doc  
Hanne Myren

## CORRIDOR #8

Bulgaria 2007 | doc  
Boris Despodov

## MADE UP MEMORIES

Argentina, Spain 2007  
Diego Sabanés

## MEGUMI

Netherlands 2007 | doc  
Mirjam van Veelen

## ABSURDISTAN

Germany 2007 | Veit Helmer

## MICHA KLEIN, SPEEDING ON THE VIRTUAL HIGHWAY

Netherlands 2007 | doc  
Corinne van Egeraat

## TRES PESOS

United Kingdom 2007 | doc  
Ruth Cross, Michael David  
Clements

## THE OTHER POSSIBILITY

United Kingdom 2007  
Peter Dillon, Ashley Horner

## THE BEAST WITHIN

Switzerland 2007 | doc  
Yves Scagliola

## VANISHED

Norway 2007 | doc  
Tor Arne Bjerke

## ALONE, TOGETHER

Finland 2007 | doc  
Annika Grof, Janina Kokkonen

## FROM VARDØ, WITH LOVE

Norway 2007 | doc  
Hilde Korsæth, Dmitry Ischenko

## ARTSCAPE NORDLAND

Norway 2007 | doc  
Eva Charlotte Nielsen

## DARK DEER

Latvia 2006 | Viesturs Kairiss

## THE MOON ON THE SNOW

Switzerland 2006  
Pilar Anguita-Mackay

## PORNO!MELO!DRAMA!

Germany 2006 | Heesook Sohn

## EXILE FAMILY MOVIE

Austria 2006 | doc  
Arash T. Riahi

## SHORT ORDER

Ireland, Germany 2005  
Anthony Byrne, Brian Willis

## FEEL FREE

Norway 2005 | doc  
Knut Klæbo

## THE LAST TRIP

Sweden 2005 | Henrik Wallgren

## NOBODY MINGLES WITH NOTHINGNESS

Austria 2004 | doc  
Johanna Tschautscher,  
Géza Horvát

## WELCOME HOME

Austria, Germany 2004  
Andreas Gruber

## FOR THE LIVING AND THE DEAD

Finland 2004 | Kari Paljakka

## WHO THE HELL'S BONNIE & CLYDE?

Hungary 2004  
Krisztina Esztergalyos

## FALLING BEAUTY

Sweden, Norway 2004  
Lena Hanno Clyne,  
Anne-Marie Söhrman Fermelin

## MELA

United Kingdom 2004  
Dwynwen Berry

## MOJAVE

Netherlands 2004 | doc  
Chris Teerink

## THE REVOLUTION OF PIGS

Estonia 2004  
Jaak Kilmi, René Reinumägi

## MAKING WAVES

Netherlands 2004  
Jetske Spanjer

## THE SOUVENIRS OF MR X

Austria, Germany 2003 | doc  
Arash T. Riahi

## OUR SUMMER

Finland 2003 | doc  
Mika Ronkainen

## LADIES' CHO



# SOURCES 2

## BOARD MEMBERS

Rolf Orthel, chairman, Netherlands  
Caterina d'Amico, Italy  
Willem Capteyn, Netherlands  
Louise Gough, Australia  
Igor Koršič, Slovenia  
Dick Ross, United Kingdom  
Dr. Stanislav Semerdjiev, Bulgaria

## OFFICE AMSTERDAM

Rolf Orthel, chairman, Netherlands  
Evelyn Voortman, administrator, Netherlands

## OFFICE BERLIN

Dr. Renate Gompper, programme director, Germany  
Marion Gompper, associate director, Germany  
Julie Metzdorff, workshop coordinator, Germany, Luxembourg

Sources 2 is an advanced training programme for European film professionals working in the field of script and story development. Since 1992 the Dutch foundation has been working with the support of the MEDIA Programme of the European Community and its national partners representing public and private organisations throughout Europe. 167 films developed through Sources 2 have been made to date, workshops and events have been held in 22 European countries and a network of film professionals from more than 30 countries has been built.

## SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Our Script Development Workshops are high-powered work units including professional script development and advanced training for professionals working on a specific feature or creative documentary film project.

Experienced script advisers provide a range of tools to improve the participants' writing skills and to develop their projects to their utmost potential.

The programme is tailored to European screenwriters, teams of writers and co-writers, directors or producers developing a film project together. Team participation is encouraged to strengthen creative partnerships and increase the efficiency of the development process.

Participants are coached in developing their projects, considering the process of evolution from page to screen, visual style, acting, target audiences, production aspects, financing and distribution strategies, cross-platform possibilities and presenting the project within the industry. Individual sessions with film industry representatives are occasionally included.

A supplementary programme offers film screenings, seminars, lectures, keynotes, discussions, and the Sources of Inspiration Lecture.

Training through professional development in a non-competitive atmosphere is the outstanding characteristic of Sources 2.

## MENTORING AND DEVELOPMENT

Sources 2 Projects & Process – Training Mentors for European Screenwriters and Documentary Filmmakers shares the Sources 2 project and process philosophy, its mentoring approach and methodology.

The training programme enhances professionals' skills in transferring knowledge, developing human resources, mentoring, and encouraging creative processes, all of which ultimately leads to efficient and productive collaborations. In addition, the workshop offers a forum for exchange of experience and networking with international colleagues.

This workshop format is specifically geared towards professionals working as mentors for screenwriters and documentary filmmakers in the field of script and story development, such as screenwriters, developers, script editors, producers, commissioning editors, trainers, and decision makers.

## CONTACT

Sources 2 | Köthener Straße 44 | 10963 Berlin, Germany  
phone +49 30 886 02 11 | fax +49 30 886 02 13  
info@sources2.de | www.sources2.de

***THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR  
ATTENTION – WISHING YOU A LOT OF  
INSPIRATION AND SUCCESS!***

*NOTES:*





---

## CONTACT

### Stichting Sources

J.M. Coenenstraat 6K  
1071 WG Amsterdam, Netherlands

### Sources 2

Köthener Straße 44  
10963 Berlin, Germany  
phone + 49 30 886 02 11  
info@sources2.de | www.sources2.de

---