Free essay about what is the basic or essential quality of this topic

ASSIGN BUSTER

Invention Writing - Portfolio

With this prompt I plan to theorize that most people unfairly judge or criticize narrative media based on a concept of ' tactical realism.'

When consuming film, television or other media, many people judge the quality of a work based on a sense of ' tactical realism,' i. e. what they would do in that particular situation. People will judge movies based on real or perceived ' plot holes' in the story, which occur when a film either does not follow their own internal logic, or do not appropriately contextualize events or behaviors that would seem hard to believe in the real world.

How does the topic affect or influence thinking?

This influences the thinking of individuals who consume media from a thin, biased perspective, focusing on art as a failed simulation of reality rather than an expression of its own thoughts and ideas. When someone behaves in a selfish or uncomfortable way, or a character makes a mistake, the effect of that event on the film's overall themes and points are ignored in favor of looking down upon the film and its character for making a ' stupid decision.'

How does conventional thought or practice keep people from a radical perspective on this topic?

Conventional thought on film criticism, for example, is that people are attempting to escape their lives and absorb themselves in an alternate version of reality, robbing them of the radical perspective that the plot and characters are purposefully created in a certain way to achieve a certain effect on the viewer.

What is the origin of the topic?

The origin of the topic lies in the tenets of film criticism, wherein people judge the quality of a film based on what they see on screen and compare it against their own experiences.

What do people normally not consider about the topic?

The biggest thing people ignore about film and film criticism is that film is a visual medium as much as a narrative art; the purpose is to glean meaning from its images as much as the plot and characters. Often, perceived ' plot holes' are actually explainable or rendered meaningless by the style or themes of the film, which some film-watchers can find difficult to reconcile with their own tastes.

Can you think of any clichés related to your topic?

One particular cliché related to tactical realism is the idea cribbed from horror movies, and made fun of in films like Scream, that people in a horror movie should get out of that situation instead of walking slowly towards the danger. Another example is found in science-fiction movies, when liberties are taken with science and physics for the sake of drama (like the trajectories of characters' movements in Gravity, or the ' unscientific' behavior of characters in the film Prometheus).

How do they limit thinking? This perspective on film criticism limits thinking by presuming onto the characters the same kind of foresight, knowledge and instincts you have, as well as assuming that things you don't immediately understand in a film are mistakes, rather than an intentional move on the filmmakers to achieve an effect. ' Errors' in science in sci-fi movies are

misperceived as ' not knowing science' or ' being lazy,' instead of setting up a world's own internal logic for the sake of the narrative.

Might the opposite of the cliché be true?

Absolutely; when someone refuses to get out of a situation in a horror film, it may be because they do not think it is a horror film, they are frozen by fear, or the filmmaker purposefully keeps them there to make a point about the inevitability of death or simply to allow the drama to occur. The ' bad scientists' in Prometheus can be argued to do poor science because they are intentionally bad scientists for the sake of the story (in which mankind is shown to not be able to understand the nature of its creation).

What is conventional thought on the topic?

Conventional thought on the topic of ' plot holes' and tactical realism is that the more perceived ' plot holes' a film has, the worse it is; the perfect film is one which does not force you to think about how you think the story might not work. Films should reflect an alternate version of reality, in which science, plot and characters are completely plausible from a real-world context in order to enjoy or appreciate a film's quality.

What nonconventional claims have been made about the topic?

Film critics such as Slavoj Zizek, Ignatiy Vishnevetsky, and Pauline Kael will often focus on form or image over rote plot points, and indeed argue that a film is more important for its subtext (what it is saying about politics, gender, sex or culture under the surface of the story) than what is literally happening on screen.

What keeps people from understanding the thing/idea in nonconventional ways?

People are not used to thinking about films, whether through an anti-intellectual streak that occurs in mainstream Hollywood movies (though they have their own level of powerful images and points), or an animosity towards 'film snobs' who they feel are just performing mental masturbation based on what they see on screen. Many people subscribe to the idea of authorial intent, which means that, if they do not feel the filmmaker meant to do something they don't like, it is a mistake and the film is bad, or the director is a bad filmmaker.

How would a new understanding of the topic help people?