

The 11th ifva Youth Category Jury Panel Meeting (Excerpt)

Jurors in Attendance: Pikyu Chan (CHAN), Dr. Ng Chun-hung (NG), Vincci Cheuk (CHEUK),
Pang Ho-cheung (PANG), Simon Shen (SHEN)

Organizer Representatives: Teresa Kwong (KWONG), Chelsea Man (MAN)

KWONG: Thank you very much for joining our Youth Category Jury Panel Meeting. We suggest discussing the works in regard of the following aspects: creativity, content, form, techniques, structure and the use of medium. This year, we have ten finalists in the Youth Category. So, shall we start with *Trapped*?

CHEUK: It is very well-made, a work after Korean films. It depicts the struggles inside a man. I like the work because I understand it thoroughly.

CHAN: I like *Trapped*, too, though it doesn't seem to have a well-written script at all.

PANG: *Trapped* is the most mature work among the finalists.

SHEN: I think it's mature only in terms of techniques. Its idea is good but it is not good enough to depict the feeling of "being trapped".

PANG: The actor is weak at presenting his characters. It just makes people feel that he's really "acting".

CHAN: It lacks of creativity.

PANG: To be frank, all the ten works are so-so. Not even one of them is outstanding.

NG: Especially when you refer to Objective 2 - "be creative and challenge the existing form of expression..." - none of them can accomplish this purpose.

CHEUK: I like *Shit* and I think we should grant it an award.

KWONG: What do you think the merits of *Shit* are?

CHEUK: I think it's rather a statement from the Jury. We grant it an award so as to deliver a message that filmmaking is not necessarily serious and it does not require us to have very good techniques.

SHEN: Yeah, he's smart but...

CHEUK: The work is not playful enough?

NG: He has a point but the work doesn't really deserve an award.

CHEUK: But I think if we give him some encouragement, he may become a successful filmmaker, like Spike Jonze.

PANG: I have reservations about your suggestion. He deserves encouragement, but not with the Gold Award or the Silver.

CHEUK: **Shit** has a point but it sounds too simple...

SHEN: Quite a few people have done similar things before...

NG: I think **Shit** is interesting but it doesn't deserve an award.

PANG: It has only one gimmick.

CHEUK: How about **First Second Third Fourth**? I like it. They have an idea, though it's not very clear.

NG: In fact, we can compare **First Second Third Fourth** with **Trapped**. What do you think about these two works?

CHAN: I think the filmmaker's idea is well delivered in **Trapped** while very often, the idea of **First Second Third Fourth** couldn't be expressed very clearly. They have tried to use many different ways to express it, though.

SHEN: I have watched **First Second Third Fourth** three times but still couldn't get its idea.

NG: It has some good shots but there are many flaws in regard of techniques, for example, the use of zoom lens. Languages are used in a rather confusing way. But some scenes are good, for example, the ice-melting scene and the balloon scene, etc.

CHAN: They have tried various means and I think this spirit is worth commending.

NG: How about **Anybody Here**? I think it was a drag.

CHEUK: It should be re-edited.

PANG: Actually, the second half of the work is meaningless at all. Using illusion and hallucination to express the psychological state of the character is kind of cliché. For example, there were scenes that the actor smoked and fixed his eyes upon the far side...

KWONG: How about **Seek**?

CHEUK: I like **Seek** a lot.

NG: I couldn't figure out if he's really camp or not.

CHEUK: Neither could I. He does have a good idea. The last shot is a master-stroke. The acting is also natural.

NG: But I think the director blew hot and cold about the subject matter because the work is not consistent in its presentation at all. Sometimes it's really camp but sometimes it's just kind of crazy; and sometimes it's not even either of them. And that's why the work looks odd.

PANG: **Here** is interesting but it does not deserve an award. It doesn't have an idea inside; it's just a piece of homework to me. There's no reason for us to choose a promotional video of the Cheung Sha Wan Catholic Secondary School.

KWONG: How about **Cheung Tin Shaolin Temple**?

PANG: I think **Cheung Tin Shaolin Temple** gains the upper hand. It makes good use of the elements of Hong Kong films while **Here** is only playful in the visual.

NG: I also prefer **Cheung Tin Shaolin Temple** to **Here**.

KWONG: And **Angels' Trumpets**?

CHAN: **Angels' Trumpets** is a more completed work.

PANG: It's well-finished. The directors know exactly what kind of genre the film is and they execute it in that way. The atmosphere they create is quite good and effective, though the acting is very bad.

CHAN: Agree.

SHEN: They said in the directors' notes that the plot is inspired by American campus shooting. 'Angels' trumpets' comes from the Bible. The trumpet calls of the Seven Angels ushers in the Apocalypses. But I couldn't see this kind of messages in the work.

CHAN: I believe they enjoyed very much when making this film.

NG: As for *0 Budget*, I found the actress is more interesting than the work itself.

SHEN: I don't think it's appropriate for her age to make such a work.

CHEUK: It's nostalgia for the past times of other people.

PANG: Yes, it is. But it's not even nostalgia for the seventies; it's kind of "Old Time Buddy", a 1997-TVB-drama-remake of a popular old film.

CHAN: I like *Little Shoes* a lot because it is simple and can exude emotion and feeling.

NG: Compared with other finalists, its subject matter is more special.

KWONG: Shall we enter the second round discussion and make some nominations for the awards? How about nominate five works for further discussion?

NG: I would say *Trapped, First Second Third Fourth, Angels' Trumpets, 0 Budget* and *Little Shoes*.

CHAN: The same.

PANG: The same.

SHEN: Me too. But instead of *0 Budget*, I choose *Cheung Tin Shaolin Temple*.

CHEUK: For me, *Trapped, Shit, First Second Third Fourth*, and *Seek*.

SHEN: I give up *Cheung Tin Shaolin Temple* and pick *Seek*.

KWONG: OK, then it's time for nomination of the awards.

CHAN: I nominate *Little Shoes* for the Silver Award.

NG: I nominate ***First Second Third Fourth***.

CHEUK: I think both ***First Second Third Fourth*** and ***Trapped*** deserve it.

SHEN: If there are two Silver Awards, I'll nominate ***Angels' Trumpets***.

PANG: I choose ***Angels' Trumpets*** and ***Trapped***.

KWONG: We have now four nominees for the Silver Award. Let's further discuss about this.

NG: All of them are well-made works. Two of them have a very clear message to deliver and are relatively mature in terms of techniques. For example, ***Little Shoes*** is a touching work but it's too short. ***First Second Third Fourth*** has some sounding points but not well rounded. And I think both ***First Second Third Fourth*** and ***Trapped*** have their outstanding points.

SHEN: I think ***Trapped*** is better than ***First Second Third Fourth*** in the sense of presentation.

NG: It's because it's not ambitious. ***Trapped*** deals with only one idea, one subject matter. On the other hand, ***First Second Third Fourth*** challenges form and audience's feelings by using various kinds of imagery. So, it's more difficult to make.

CHEUK: I choose both ***Trapped*** and ***First Second Third Fourth*** because these are two different kinds of encouragement. ***Trapped*** is a more refined work while ***First Second Third Fourth*** is a work of other attempts. If we give out two Silver Awards to ***Trapped*** and ***Angels' Trumpets***, then we cannot encourage those who make more edgy works, like ***First Second Third Fourth***.

PANG: We hold the Gold Award this year because all these ten finalists are only works that resemble the existing ones. For example, ***Trapped*** is after the fashion of recent Korean films. ***Angels' Trumpets*** imitates American B-grade horror movies. ***First Second Third Fourth*** looks like the form of a European film. I found both ***Trapped*** and ***Angels' Trumpets*** are mature works. But ***First Second Third Fourth*** is too ambitious and becomes out of control. Anyway, I still think it deserves a Special Mention.

SHEN: Can the Organizer advise us about the meaning behind Special Mention? Is it set up to encourage edgy works, or is it just a distinguished award in general?

KWONG: We'd like to emphasize quality. So, we only give out the Gold and the Silver Awards. Special Mention is up to the Jury's interpretation. It can be presented to the works which you think some of its elements should be highlighted; or it can be only a kind of encouragement. It's because Special Mention is not a cash award. Shall we start voting? Every juror can choose two out of the four nominees.

(Result of the voting: **Trapped** got 5 votes; **Angels' Trumpets** got 5 votes; **First Second Third Fourth** got 0 votes; **Little Shoes** got 0 votes.)

KWONG: We now start another round discussion about the Special Mention. The jurors have mentioned **First Second Third Fourth**. Will you consider any other works?

CHEUK: We may consider **Seek** as well.

PANG: The songs selected in **Seek** are very impressive and I think the director did put efforts on it.

KWONG: Now we have **Shit**, **First Second Third Fourth**, **Seek** and **Little Shoes** to compete for the Special Mention. You may do the nomination.

CHAN: I choose **First Second Third Fourth**, **0 Budget** and **Little Shoes**.

NG: The same.

SHEN: Me too.

PANG: I would put one more, **Seek**.

CHEUK: I pick **First Second Third Fourth**, **Little Shoes** and **Seek**.

KWONG: In conclusion, all of you agree to grant the Special Mention to **First Second Third Fourth** and **Little Shoe**. And we can take out **Shit**. Now, we have **0 Budget** and **Seek** left for further discussion.

CHEUK: **0 Budget** is like an internet short film.

NG: I choose neither of them. **Seek** has too many flaws.

PANG: Both works have their own flaws. But **Seek** has a message at the end of the film.

CHEUK: The best thing about **0 Budget** is its use of colour.

PANG: It's only a remaking of the old works.

NG: **Seek** is no good at all, even the caption is wrongly written.

CHAN: I think **0 Budget** is not a work without meaning.

PANG: But what she said is not something personal. She's not in the industry and it's not her own experience.

KWONG: I think we have now two options: 1) to give out only one more Special Mention, which means choosing between **Seek** and **0 Budget**; 2) to grant the Special Mention to both works.

CHAN: If I have to choose, I will pick **0 Budget**. But I don't insist on it.

NG: I'd rather not grant to either of them.

CHEUK: For me, of course, it's **Seek**.

SHEN: My bottom line is: 1) both are not awarded; 2) only **Seek** get awarded.

PANG: Perhaps, let both of them get the Special Mention.

CHAN: I can accept this.

KWONG: I suggest voting again. We now have three motions: 1) choose only ONE work; 2. choose NEITHER of them; 3. choose BOTH of them, for Special Mention.

(Result: Motion 1: One vote; Motion 2: One vote; Motion 3: Three votes.)

KWONG: Majority rule. So, we also grant Special Mention to **Seek** and **0 Budget**.

PANG: I think it's good to have both of them for the Special Mention because we hold the Gold Award this year. Our rationale behind is: The works are far from mature, but we encourage all of them to keep on creating their own works.

Youth Category

Gold Award

Withhold

Silver Awards

Trapped

CHEUNG Tung-cheuk

Angels' Trumpets

LAI Pak-hei, YEUNG Mei-fung, KWAN Yik-chung,

Special Mention

First Second Third Fourth

Helen NG, YUNG Cho-yan, LAU Wing-ying

Seek

WU Kong-tung

0 Budget

WOO Ling-chi

Little Shoes

CHOW Hong-ching