# The 15<sup>th</sup> ifva Asian New Force Category Jury Meeting Transcript

Jurors in Attendance: Mary Stephen (MARY), Winnie Fu (FU), Ho Yuhang (HO) Organizer Representatives: Teresa Kwong (KWONG)

FU: In the second round we each made a list of around 12 works. Some works get three votes, and automatically become a finalist. With the rest the judges try to persuade the others about their selections.

KWONG: The first work is Intoxicant.

HO: I think I understand it, but am not to sure.

MARY: At first I didn't understand it, but I was surprised towards the end, and I wanted to find out what happens at the end. Overall I felt the work is fresh and creative.

FU: The entries this year are of quite a high standard. *Intoxicant* talks about the contemporary cyber world, which few works deal with. It does not have a strong plot, but I appreciate its creativity. People who do not understand computers may not be able to follow the film, though.

MARY: I took me a while to understand it. I appreciate this film, because this type of subjects can turn out badly if it wasn't done well.

FU: It's a film that stays with you after it is over. It deals with computer viruses, and it is hard to depict the cyber world visually. To a certain extent the film succeeds, even though it is not technically refined.

MARY: The girl says that she can only find people to communicate with her in this world. This fools the lead character as well as the audience.

FU: At first I didn't know that the first guy who went into that world was the hacker. I only realized it when I thought back on the plot.

HO: Actually it was quite obvious.

KWONG: The Opposite Shore.

HO: The beginning is okay, but the director want to wrap everything up at the end. The narrative twist at the end is too perfect, and all the mystery is gone. The characters and background is good, but the two men are not realistic.

MARY: You can already guess the ending halfway.

HO: The set-up is quite good, but as it develops the plotline is too convenient.

FU: It is too obviously done by a film school student. The casting is good. If it wasn't for the two actors the film would have turned out differently. I think it successfully depicts the lives of Koreans in China, but the ending is too deliberate, and lacks the sense of innocence of the beginning part. On the whole it is quite a mature work.

KWONG: The next one is Jouissance.

MARY: I only understand the middle part.

KWONG: My understanding is that it is a story about two people who complement one another. This film is about the inter-dependable relationship between the two.

HO: I have mixed feelings about this film. Particular scenes are done well, but lack the sophistication of *The Opposite Shore*.

MARY: I feel it's a bit slow.

HO: It doesn't seem to have much to say, but it portrays some sentiments well.

FU: The film is not very outstanding. There is not much dialogue or plot development. It doesn't take the relationship to another level.

#### KWONG: A Piece of Cake.

FU: Quite enjoyable. It was not my top choice at the beginning, it probably ranked 11<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup>. I like the story because it is short and simple, and also because it is humorous. Does the filmmaker have the copyright to the music?

MARY: Obviously not. You can tell it is Morricone.

HO: That doesn't matter. I think it's okay.

KWONG: Shred of Hope.

HO: I like it, but the title is too obvious. It could have used the child's name as the title. I had forgotten about it as I was watching it, but when the title came on again at the end I thought, "Damn." It's like telling you what the film is about. The film would have been better with another title.

MARY: Not bad. The editing is good, and there are some surprises.

HO: I liked the ending. Not many films manage to portray a person's dignity.

FU: At first I thought this would be a hard topic to do well, but I was moved in the end.

HO: I felt it doesn't try to impress me, and as the film progressed I realized the film wants to move me with simple things. It doesn't try too hard, which is difficult to do.

FU: The scene involving the boss and the security guard is difficulty to do. The boss doesn't just fire him and ask him to leave immediately. The landlord, too, is reluctant to evict him, but is forced to. This sort of struggle is quite touching.

KWONG: The next one is *Energy Flow*.

HO: It is like a Godard or Vertov film, which is risky!

FU: It is hard to comment on this film because it obviously tries to combine different media in one work.

MARY: It doesn't move me.

HO: I think it is quite an unusual film, although I'm not sure what it's trying to say.

FU: I picked this film to be a finalist because I was touched by its passion about film.

However its structure makes it difficult to watch.

MARY: You are not sure whether it is flawed or just pretentious.

HO: The way he says things sounds heavy and serious, while with Godard you feel he is joking around.

FU: There are few entries that ask questions about the film medium, and this one makes use of different media.

HO: I feel such questions are unnecessary. If you're doing it already, why do you have to ask?

KWONG: On the Road to Tel-Aviv.

HO: It tackles a big subject, but one that is relevant because Israel faces such problems at the moment.

FU: I like the scene where a lot of people are arguing on the street. The mother's big speech to protect her daughter really creates a mood of tension and suspense. This scene is difficult to do.

MARY: Its intentions are good, and we really need films like this. In terms of editing this film could be tightened.

HO: Its whole design obviously just serves the last scene.

KWONG: Booths.

FU: This is the only documentary among the finalists, and it is an enjoyable film.

MARY: It's a bit long.

HO: It doesn't go deep enough, and stay on a superficial level. The filmmaker should have tried to probe his subjects more.

FU: The filmmaker has chosen a gimmicky topic. If it wasn't for that, this type of structure could easily become boring. However his treatment of the subject is a little flat.

HO: The first 10 minutes could be left out. He could have started the film at the point when you see that person. It would make for a stronger opening.

MARY: The structure is a bit repetitive.

KWONG: The last one is The Last Day off Bulkin I.S..

MARY: It's interesting, but kind of familiar.

HO: There are a lot of films like this in film school. This is quite a mature work. If the director were to use this film as a calling card to look for jobs, he should be able to find one.

FU: The script is quite good. I like the fact that it is short, the length feels just right. The actors are also good and nice to watch. If it were 30 minutes long it may not be as good.

MARY: It is actually a sketch.

KWONG: We can now nominate awards. One way is to eliminate films you won't consider, the

other way is to go straight to nominating award winners.

FU: I nominate **Shred of Hope** and **Intoxicant**.

HO: I don't mind, if it was *Energy Flow* I would mind a little bit. I also like *A Piece of Cake* because of its honesty. Few films are that honest and transparent. Its narrative is direct, unlike *Booth*, which is a bit smart ass.

MARY: Can we allow Shred of Hope and Intoxicant to share the Grand Prize?

HO: Yes, or we can have two Special Mentions and one Grand Prize winner.

FU: I would like to recognize The Last Day off Bulkin I.S..

MARY: It's editing is perfect.

KWONG: At the award ceremony, the jury members should explain why they choose to honor these works.

HO: The process of judging the works has been a pleasure. None of the ten works are awful.

KWONG: **Shred of Hope** and **Intoxicant** will share the Grand Prize, **A Piece of Cake** and **The Last Day off Bulkin I.S.** get Special Mention. Lastly I request that jury members keep the results of the competition a secret until the ceremony.

## **Asian New Force Category**

**Grand Prize** Intoxicant John HSU

## **Grand Prize**

Shred of Hope Tom SHOVAL

### Special Mention

The Last Day of Bulkin I.S. Aleksey ANDRIANOV

### **Special Mention**

A Piece of Cake
De-chuen WU, Li-hua CHEN, Jimmy JU, Ching-yun HSU