

Anna Warner

Miller Arts Scholars

Professor Rasbury

3/8/19

### Images, Still and Moving

Stepping from still images to moving images seems an easy transition - and it's true, many similarities exist between the two types of cameras and processes. They are both visual art forms that expose film to light under similar principles of exposure, and they both rely tangentially on reality (as opposed to other arts like writing or painting that can be pulled directly from the imagination.) However, with Photography being my concentration, the differences between doing cinematography versus taking still photographs is glaringly apparent, and my proposal for this grant is grounded in how cinematography's differences are stretching me out of my photographic comfort zone.

The verbs themselves indicate one very significant difference: one *makes* cinematography, the other *takes* photographs. Cinematography is an additive process, requiring possibly a script, costumes, actors, built sets, and sound. Photography is more like plucking, or stealing, or killing. Street photography for example steals slices of visual reality, typically of pedestrians whose pictures are taken before being given the chance to approve the photographer's act. Their likenesses are snatched from them via the photograph. When I photograph, I may take myself to a particular place, walk around, and take photos of whatever interests me. Cinematography is forcing me to flesh out my ideas concretely *before* the recording process begins, which is a structure I can learn to apply to my photographic process.

Another difference is the way both mediums deal with time. A photograph is often called a *still*; it is often thought to freeze time and capture moments. David Hockney argued that "all photographs share the same flaw. Lack of time." Cinematography, on the other hand, typically considers *time* to be one of its most medium-specific qualities. Literally, what a 'film' shows is not static like a photograph, but I've realized that a photograph is surely still capable of expressing time through aspects like blur, juxtaposition of a sharp isolated moment, long

exposures, time-specific subject matter, and archival photographs. What cinematography literally shows, more so than *time*, might be motion or cause-and-effect. While a photograph is *still*, it too has the capability to express the concept of time.

These crucial differences, among others that I will continue to discover this semester, are helping me reconceptualize what photography is capable of, and I also think it's very helpful for me to grow as an artist by trying out different mediums. In this case, cinematography is close enough to photography that skills I learn from making films can be translatable into photography, but it's different enough that I'm still seeing the benefits of doing specific projects in cinematography instead of photography. The project I am proposing is three short films in cinematography by the end of the semester through which I can explore the medium specificity of film. My three films will be shot on color negative 16mm film using Bolexes, and they will be scanned and edited digitally. Through a semester of planning, writing, buying costumes, constructing sets, filming, recording sound, and editing, I hope to learn more about this medium and also how I can also apply it to strengthen my Studio Art major concentration of photography. The Miller Arts Scholar minigrant would be invaluable for helping me afford this multifaceted process, especially with buying and developing film, but also with purchasing any necessary props. At the end of the semester in my outcome report, I would include links to my three films and explain how my artistic practice grew from creating them. Thank you for your time and consideration!

#### Budget

Item	Cost
Film (6 100-foot rolls)	\$217
Shipping & Developing	\$133
Props and Costumes	\$150

Total = \$500