Dear Professor Ferguson,

Have I truly mastered the learning objectives for my English 110 class? What I really should be asking is whether or not I have created a path to mastery in my writing skills. This I believe is true. I can certainly walk away from “Reading Film” edified in new writing techniques. I still have a lot to learn about my style and how to execute it correctly but I have certainly improved and will continue to improve.

Let’s start with the first learning objective:

- Have I gained familiarity in a range of modes of communication?

In eighth grade I learned how to write academically, or so I thought. Having to write with such a narrow structure took away the pleasure in writing for me. If anything, it made me hate it. I only wrote when I had to and always last second. It may have been the fault of my teachers but I always used the repetitive structure they had taught me; I used it till the day I graduated high school.

I knew there were other forms of writing; a newspaper column won’t be written like a novel just as much as a letter to a superior won’t be written like a film critique. I knew all this but didn’t know how to write anything but the same dull structure I was taught, which didn’t really have much flexibility. During this semester, each essay had been written with a different
structure and with a different stance. I am confident in writing a persuasive letter to a superior, I can write an annotated bibliography, I know now how to speak from another’s voice, and I can successfully analyze someone else’s words and in some ways I have regained my own voice in my writing.

-Have I develop and used strategies for improving writing and critical thinking through recursive practice, self-reflection, and the process of revision?:

If I have improved anywhere, it’s here. In truth, I can’t remember ever getting a bad grade on an essay. This scares me for the mere fact I’ve gone about my life never considering literary elements. I have no idea how I even wrote an essay without this skeletal basis. If I will take anything at all from this class it is Gordon Harvey’s Elements and Zinsser’s essay on simplicity. I will most likely carry their words for the rest of my life and consider them with everything I ever write for college and even during my future career. Before this semester the only element that truly came to mind while writing was thesis. I knew fair-well what stance, key terms, motive, style, etc was but never thought about them while writing; this will never happen again. I reread my papers adding keyterms and making sure to orient my words the way I want them to be read. Writing this letter for example is spoken in a certain tone that is distinguishable from writing to the president of Queens College. It is possible that before this class I may have oriented both papers in the same way. I wonder why these elements aren’t taught in middle school. So many children would be better off with writing from the get-go. Though we didn’t really talk about Zinsser until the end of the semester, he has also made a large impact of my
writing. In a way, I wish we started with Zinsser. It seems obviously that one should take out meaningless fluff words from their paper but sometimes a person just has to hear someone else say the obvious; that’s what Zinsser’s “simplicity” paper did for me. I could probably still revise my paper more than I do but I most definitely see the importance of revision in a way I didn’t previously. I just wanted to get my essays over and done with. I’ll never be happy with any of my papers truly ever anyway. I’ve looked over sentences in my interview paper for example that seemed to just help fill up each page. Bazin does tend to use complex words and long sentences so it was hard for me to break it down but Zinsser’s essay helped me do so.

-Have I demonstrated a link between writing and critical thinking by showing how the analysis of ideas is dependent on the ability to communicate them successfully?

This objective may be the hardest one to answer. In class we discussed that critical thinking is a complicated term in itself. I understood what analyzing was but until this year I didn’t really know how to do so. I realize from this class that analyzing something should show my own independent opinion and thoughts on someone else’s writing/film/etc, not just elaboration. Analyzing shows that a person truly understands what they have seen/read and they can therefore form their own opinions and thoughts on the subject. I really like the structure you used in class and I will probably use that in my essays from now on when quoting other’s especially. I believe my annotated bibliography clearly shows use of analyzation as well as my interview essay through Bazin’s tone.
You mentioned how it is an excuse to say that a person can’t get what they want to say in their head out on paper because writing is a different language in itself and is independent of the person’s language in thought. I think it’s much more complicated than that. In all honestly I felt attacked. I have struggled with this issue for a long time. Getting words down on paper the way they are in your head isn’t so easy, believe me. The ability to communicate anything successfully has to come from the mind first. I’ll admit, I still struggle with this, a lot. This is something I’ll continue to work on through out college. I realize now I have grown though in my ability to communicate my words onto paper. Hopefully my cover letter better shows my written word in comparison to my previous papers. I also tried to revise my letter to the president so that it came from my own voice.

-Have I demonstrated a mastery over basic methods of research and documentation, including how to identify and evaluate appropriate secondary sources for an academic essay, to select quotation for use as evidence, to integrate quotation, and to properly cite quotation using MLA style?

Citing was a huge issue for me before this year. My high school was actually very meticulous about citing or they at least tried to be. We’d take time out of our English class to go to the library and learn how to cite though no one ever really took anything from it. We were given a packet, a database and then cryptically told what to do. I walked away learning nothing about MLA except that novels had to be written in italics. I walked into your class understanding the importance of citing, or at least I thought I did. I knew that citations were detrimental when
quoting others or using other’s work. I knew the penalty of plagiarizing in our society. I’m not really fond of people taking credit for how I influenced them either (though DJ spooky has seriously screwed up my view of plagiarism, mostly dealing with music; read *Sound Unbound*). I not only learn how to cite in your class and I mean truly cite without a citation website, but I also have found more importance in citation. Citing others can truly help any argument. I have learned how to find sources that will strengthen my views and how to analyze and elaborate on them.

— Have I learned to identify personal strengths and weaknesses in the process of composition, and to describe methods to achieve future success?

I have always been critical of myself in everything I do academically. I have no trouble identifying my weaknesses. If anything, I have had issues admitting to strengths. Now, instead of just identifying issues with my writing I have found ways to improve. I truly feel without Harvey’s academic elements specifically, I would still not know how exactly to improve in my writing. This alone makes me realize I have definitely walked away from this class enlightened for the rest of my college career. I may still have issues with procrastination and I’m definitely no Gabriel García Márquez but I feel I have the tools to become a better writer academically when I prior had no idea where to turn.

Have a wonderful vacation,

Regina Harsanyi
Dear Mr. Muyskens,

I personally feel all structures on Queens College campus have been built, planted and placed for good reason. Alumni and current students have put their time and money into donating art and architecture for a purpose as well as showing great dedication to our diverse academic programs. You may wonder what this means to a freshman attendant. It has come to my attention that the garden within the Cooperman Plaza will be taken down only to be replaced by a slew of vending machines. This concerns many faculty and students as well as myself. I personally feel the utility of this landscape is great and have taken liberty to save it. The garden is not only an attractive feature of the college but had been planted by elementary school children in dedication to those we have lost on 9/11. What baffles students about this decision even more so is why consumerism is more important than the aesthetics and ecology of the garden. Hopefully these words will help you see how important this garden is to all of us.
I remember walking onto the Queens College campus for the first time, during orientation. It was the end of spring so everything was fully in bloom. I went without my family so I was able to veer off and walk about campus alone. I personally enjoy natural settings so the quad was in turn very pleasurable to me. I initially figured I’d lie under a tree and read the pamphlets I was given at orientation but this idea was rattled once my eyes fixated on the Plaza garden. As an aspiring art history major I’d consider landscape an art in itself. To me, this landscape is what attracts students to the plaza. It’s lush, floral arrangement is colorful and inviting. The garden is filled with vibrant violets, daisies and dahlias among a variety of other flower breeds. The greenery is a deep healthy shade which shows that it continues to be taken care of. The large coniferous tree that sits in the very center of the plaza is arguably the most inviting feature of all. My roommate has spoken of it’s beauty in the winter while covered in snow. I am yet to see this site and would be quiet upset if I am never given the opportunity.

I often sit and eat my lunch on the plaza steps. Why do I choose to sit there instead of my dorm or the eatery seating available to me? I do not only enjoy staring out onto the quad but I truly love sitting among the foliage. Many feel the same. I see others sitting alone eating near me, admiring the garden. I couldn’t really admire a row of vending machines, could you? Natural settings like gardens are often tied to serenity while vending machines are tied to consumerist culture. What does this say to other universities and organizations? It seems silly to take down something beautiful and desecrate the area with calorie ridden snacks.

Even furthermore, children planted this garden. This garden to me is not just naturally beautiful but stands for community, cooperation and eco-friendliness. The nation is becoming greener. We are becoming more conscious about how we treat the world we live in. Taking down
this garden speaks against all these morals. It is unethical to replace an organic, unrefined setting with a cold, hard glass and metal case. What will this say to future generations or even to the children who originally planted the garden? I wouldn’t be so keen on being a member of a college that proves to go against an eco-friendly environment.

It’s not just about being eco-friendly either. What about it’s reason for being erected; 9/11? These children chose to dedicate the garden to those who lost their lives during the fall of the twin towers. As you may know, the towers had been visible from the plaza. The placement of the garden is very special because of this. Every spring the garden blooms; a common symbol of rebirth and growth. When the towers fell many men and women lost their lives but the garden is a symbol of growth and rebirth within the new york city community. We may not forget but we have grown together and have rebuilt our lives together. A vending machine cannot stand for rebirth and would be insulting if dedicated to 9/11. Taking down the plaque that adorns the garden is insulting alone.

Even if the garden did not have obvious emotional ties to it’s dedication it remains aesthetically pleasing the the Queens College community. Yesterday I overheard a department head speak of how important it is to beautify our campus. I have personally never seen a beautiful vending machine. When I was in high school, I had been part of a comity to maintain the natural beauty of my town. My high school would never even dream to resurrect a machine that pumps out brand name junk over cleaning up the nearby pond. Beautifying is ridding of objects like vending machines, not adding them!

Your decision to demolish the garden reminds me of Joni Mitchell’s famed song “Big Yellow Taxi.” If you are unfamiliar with the song, it’s about destroying something beautiful to
build cities that lack aesthetic value and instead are just for utility. The famous lyric that comes to mind is “Don't it always seem to go, that you don't know what you've got till it's gone. They paved paradise and put up a parking lot.” It may be a stretch to call the plaza garden paradise but it is an inviting area for social interaction and beauty that vending machines could never replace.

These are only a few of the many reasons to keep the plaza garden. As the president of Queens College it is clear that you care about the beautification of our campus. Adding vending machines to help fund our school may seem practical, but it does not seem so to many of the faculty, staff and most importantly students to destroy such a lovely staple. I urge you to rethink your plans and remember the importance of the garden, what it symbolizes and who it’s dedicated to.

Regina Harsanyi
Peer Interview

Regina Harsanyi: Hi, my name is Regina Harsanyi and I’m interviewing Andrien Lasaru[sic]. (Points camera at Adrien). This is Andrien:

AL: Hello

RH: Uh, what’s your favorite movie and why?

AL: My favorite movie would have to be the Lord of the Rings trilogy because I like the combination… how they use good story with a nice location and also uh, good action to keep you into it.

RH: I have to ask you this, uh, did you like the book or movie better?
AL: Umm, I don’t know. In my opinion they’re both, it both depends on what you want. The books tell you the story in more detail but the movies kind of, uh, keep you entertained better with more action.

RH: Okay, um, what’s your desired major and why?

AL: Uh, my desired major is going to be computer science because I like learning how to use computers and I want to know how to program.

RH: Uh, what are some things you do in your spare time?

AL: Um, in my spare time I mainly like to go outside, read sometimes, hang out with friends, play video games…

RH: (cutting him off) You like to read?

AL: Yeah, a little bit

RH: Um, what’s your favorite book? Is it -Lord of the Rings- or…

AL: Uh, I don’t know. It would have to… I can’t really decide. It would have to be either -Lord of the Rings-, um, -The Three Musketeers- or the -Chronicles of Narnia-.

RH: Um, now I have to ask you this. This is a generic question. If you were stuck on a desert island, what three items would you have to bring with you?

AL: Um, let’s see. Probably a t.v. with my x-box…

RH: How would you plug that in?

AL: I was going to say a generator…

RH: Oh-ho!

AL: So, mainly because that’s the easiest way I communicate with my friends so.

Reflection:

When we were first informed about the interview project I assumed we could pick our own partners so I quickly jotted down ideas with Beatrice, my roommate, on how we could make this work. I was caught off guard when it was made known that the partners would be picked for us. I am sometimes awkward, even a little cold when it comes to meeting people so I was a little freaked out to say the least. Interviewing others isn’t something I’m all that experienced with,
a.k.a not at all. Originally I planned on making it seem as formal as possible and didn’t think to make it laid back or casual. I regret it not being more fluid. I was glad to work with Adrien because he was interesting and easy to work with. I wish it was more candid. I now think the questions shouldn’t have been written down beforehand. I think I felt pressured by the two minute time limit. My biggest problem was cutting off Adrien. It wasn’t professional and downright rude in my opinion. At this same time, I did listen to everything he said intently. I have an idea of who Adrien is even if it’s not on a completely personal level which would have been more appropriate. There’s nothing wrong with making mistakes unless you do not learn from them. I have learned from mine.

Regina Harsanyi
Reading response to Barthes

In film, is it necessary to dress actors in stereotypical garb to give the illusion that they are their character? Why do we associate and believe an actor is truly who they’re portraying based on their physical dress, and even further, is it fair to use physical appearance as metaphor for something deeper? Roland Barthes tries to answer such inquisitions in his essay, “Romans in Film.” Barthes uses Joseph L. Mankiewicz’s *Julius Caesar* to aid in making the point that American society should not rely on physical appearance as a signifier.

Barthes begins by explaining that viewers associate Roman figures in film by their fringe aka their hair. In truth this is unrealistic. Not all Roman’s had such a similar hair style but through cinema it has been associated as such. Barthes explains that in other countries like France, this seems silly because they don’t just recognize Roman’s by a stylish period piece hair style. In a way it is degrading to Roman history that they should be whittled down to the tresses atop their head. This is similar to the idea that in the ‘90s not everyone wore plaid flannel and torn jeans but I’m sure in fifty years a film portraying this decade may dress everyone in this outfit to overstate a point of what part of history the actors are supposed to be in. It truly is silly.
What comes to anger Barthes even more is Mankiewicz’s use of sweat in *Julius Caesar*. Supposedly the sweat is a symbol for moral feeling. “Everyone is sweating because everyone is debating something within himself.” (p.27) This may seem cleverly metaphorical but Barthes negatively critiques the very idea. He believes that a sign shouldn’t be confused with a signifier. I admittedly still struggle with this statement. The best example for a sign given is the use of Chinese flags in plays/film which always stands for a regiment. Because it has one key meaning, which you either know or don’t it lacks all ambiguity. Barthes calls out the use of sweat as pretentious because the meaning is ambiguous. Sweat isn’t always directly associated with moral feeling. Sweat has many meanings; it could stand merely for working hard in the sun or embarrassment. Mankiewicz’s most likely felt clever including a so called “artsy” metaphor though it’s not exactly fair to the audience.

In the end, viewers should not associate actors with their character based on their dress or physical appearance, it is not necessary. It’s artificial and degrading to the complexities and differences of the actual culture as it had existed. A symbol shouldn’t be ambiguous to avoid being considered “pretentious.”

Regina Harsanyi
Bibliography

In this article, Lucia Albers argues that gardens should be regarded as art/architecture. Albers begins her argument by showing the reader that ancient Greek and Roman gardening was written about extensively as an form of architecture. Alberti, a respected architect of the early renaissance stressed in his famous essay “De re aedificatoria” that the designing of a garden is the work of an architect. In the second section of her argument titled “The Concept of Art”, Albers explains what she believes the definition of art is based on the renaissance’s outlook. She goes on to state that art was the result of a practical application of knowledge or natural ability; something made and shaped by humans as opposed of something which existed naturally. This can be used in my argument because it explains how just because say, a bush can naturally exist in an environment doesn’t mean it’s not art especially if manipulated, trimmed, planted, etc, to look a certain way. Leonard Springer is later quoted stating “A garden artist, like a sculptor, has to create something that can be viewed from all angles”. He states this because he is relating gardening to painting and how they are artistically different but should both be viewed as art forms. Truthfully, the fact that a reputable source can be found to argue gardening as an art at all will help my essay. Dezaillier, another highly regarded architect of the renaissance, believed that gardening is an art because good gardening requires an array of knowledge, specifically architectural knowledge. Albers continues to talk about how gardening as an art has even been a philosophical subject matter. Due to arguments, gardening was often placed between architecture and science before a decision was made to consider it more closely related with art. Albers mentions a famous poet James Thomson who’s poem The Seasons mentions gardening as a “sister art”, even separate from architecture. Throughout Albers article she is constantly quoting philosophers, architects, poets, critics, etc spanning history to back up her belief that gardening is
an independent art form and should be regarded as such. This can help my argument in making
the point that the garden is important in itself, not just because children from a public school
planted it or that it was dedicated to 9/11 but that it’s important in itself as a work of art.

Sipe, Susan. “School Gardening at the National Capital.” The Elementary School Teacher 6.8

Susan Sipe’s article explains the “value of gardening in child-development”. She encourages
gardening in elementary school student’s curriculums. Sipe believes that hands on labor with
raw materials can teach a child about life in a way that regular study can not. It can only benefit a
child in being that much more well rounded. Gardening as part of the elementary curriculum can
also spread to activities at home. Sipe boasts that 45,000 children due to this different way of
educating will be encouraged to buy “penny packages” of seeds so that can continue planting at
home. The value in gardening as part of the elementary school curriculum is stated as a form of
manual training for children and as a vacation movement or as I think she’s trying to say, a
healthy catharsis/getaway. This would be a major aid in my argument because it shows the
positive message behind gardening and why tearing down that specific piece, in that specific
place would give Queens College a bad reputation on our view of positive influence and
education through artistic expression. It would also make the school look bad when it comes to
our view of the environment versus consumerism which is surely a point made by almost
everyone in the class.

This article also regards the importance of gardening in elementary school curriculums. Even though this piece has the same main idea as the Susan Sipe article, it focusing on different points. Akerbold believes that there are “two general aims” when it comes to gardening as education: To provide experience in the knowledge of gardening and to develop a child’s sense of beauty and aesthetics. Akerbold scorns the school system for frankly dumbing down children by basing their curriculums around “learning by heart” and not letting the students form their own opinions and ideas. He states that schools should “pay heed to children’s energy and curiosity”. This belief was shaped by a horticulturist Olof Eneroth. Akerblom sites John Dewey, a famous American philosopher’s beliefs to help aid is argument. He is apparently the father of the expression “Learn by doing”. Dewey believed that gardening and outdoor learning as a whole aided in intellectual and moral growth. This can definitely help aid my argument for the garden because it was planted by children and if demolished for a soda machine it will show a negative outlook on child development and nature. Gardening to Dewey showed a type of education that made children take their own initiative which is seen as a healthy way of learning. What does it say about Queens College if we tear down something that stands for child development and healthy learning? The article also explains how urbanization has been detrimental to the importance of nature/gardening as an art and education tool. In our current society where “going green” is seen as important there doesn’t seem to be any possible way to make consumerism in place of nature a positive decision. It will be looked down upon.
Regina: Good evening and welcome to “The Cinematic Perception.” On today’s episode we’ll be discussing the concern of “Kino-Pravda” or “Film Truth”. Our guests this week are famed film critic, theorist and writer of “The Ontological Realism of the Photographic Image”, Andre Bazin as well as the respected art historian and published journalist Lucia H. Albers. We have very little time so let’s get started.

How would you define “Kino Pravda”?

Bazin: When I hear “kino-pravda”, or film truth, I understand it to be a deeper, more esoteric meaning and essence of what is being viewed on a cinematic screen without the aid or persuasion of the director/writer/cinematographer themselves. Vertov’s Man With a Movie Camera, if you remember embodied the very idea that when something, anything is filmed, it is not only the reproduction of something happening in reality but contains it’s own aura and “truth” that doesn’t exist beyond the screen.

Albers: Film truth or “kino-pravda” as coined by Dziga Vertov in the 1920s is described in Kino-eye: the writings of Dziga Vertov: 
“Every instant of life shot unstaged, every individual frame shot just as is in life with a hidden camera, caught “unawareness”, or by some analogous technique-represents a fact recorded on film, or film-fact.”

Bazin: Kino-pravda is much more complex than you’re making it appear. When a film like, say, the Italian neorealist film *Umberto D.* shows an old man standing on train tracks waiting to die, it doesn’t produce the same effect that seeing an old man suicidal in real life would. Because Umberto is on screen there are different layers of emotion. It is an adaptation of reality, not reality or truth itself, therefore it produces emotions that are based on the adaptation and not necessarily true feeling.

Regina: What do you think best represents film truth: Mise-en-scène or Montage?

Bazin: Though say, Vertov would argue for both, he had a tendency to say that montage could be overdone while mise-en-scene can’t. Mise-en-scene which I already expect the viewer to understand clearly represents truth on the screen that montage can’t portray. To use montage would already be manipulating what has been filmed while mise-en-scene has the ability to flow like reality, therefore mimicking reality, creating deeper meaning and giving the viewer an uncanny feeling that what is portrayed is in fact reality itself. The audience doesn’t have to adapt to the style of filming like they would have to do with montage as well as all other mediums of art, i.e painting, drawing, and even photography in comparison and it can therefore relate it to their own lives more easily. Take for example, the radio show *The Green Hornet* vs. the film. The
film, mostly shot in mise-en-scene style is more relatable to the audience than the radio show. If the film was shot in montage it could also be less relatable because it is that much further from reality though it is irrational to see it as reality at all because it is from a screen and fictional.

Albers: Though Vertov may have believed montage could be overdone he also sites it as important to kino-pravda. He used montage as a dialogue for certain films so that the films were still speaking for themselves.

Bazin: I honestly don’t agree with Vertov when it comes to montage. Montage automatically means that the viewer should look for depth and metaphor in the specific scene they are watching which isn’t truthful but artificially concocted. Mise-en-scène leaves the scene to the audience. It causes them to look deeper on their own for truth; the scene isn’t doing the work for them.

Albers: Understandable but sometimes the audience needs to be made aware of what the truth is. If it is made obvious that there should be something seen behind what is being viewed then viewers will more easily find the truth.

Regina: Agree to disagree? Haha, pressing onward; is film fictional since it is reproducing what may/may not have happened in reality? Even if on a screen in real-time/order isn’t it just a reproduction of what exists in the world?

Albers: Not everything is fictional in film just because it came from a camera and was placed on a screen if that’s what you’re getting at. A documentary can still be seen as reality, not just a representation of reality. When dealing with documentaries for instance, Fredrick Wiseman, one
of the most important documentarians of the twentieth century stated: “I don’t think by large people change their behavior in the presence of the equipment or of the film-maker...people will act more rather than less characteristically.” If people are being themselves in documentary, that is enough proof to say it is not fiction, it is reality.

Bazin: Albers, you’re still missing the vital point. It’s not that film itself is being truthful or not, whether fictional storytelling or candid camera; it’s about the truth of the film on it’s own, the story beyond the story being told in itself. It can’t be reality, even if a documentary because it isn’t seen directly with the eye but needs to be seen with what Vertov would call the “Kino-eye.” It’s an adaption of what reality was filmed and then made into it’s very own language as you said before.

Albers: I guess I’ll never understand. I have much less experience when dealing with film history. I like backing up my ideas with other famous people to make a point instead of giving my opinion on it’s own. My expertise is fine art and gardening. I have much respect for Bazin and Cahiers du cinéma.

Bazin: I appreciate it. You put up a satisfactory argument and made some key points.

Well, there you have it folks. Join us next week when Sergei Eisenstein and Seth Rogen argue about the importance of metaphor in film.
“Square in Four Parts”, the masterly short film by Maya Stella, may truly speak for the art community. Maya honors film theorist and director Dziga Vertov by expressing a true grasp on the theory of kino-pravda, displays an appreciation for ambiguous sculpture as well as showing Queens College’s acknowledgement for art. Ms. Stella has not only mastered Vertovian film techniques but with little dialogue has achieved a flowing narrative and structure for the particular sculpture that acts as her subject. She helps familiarize viewers with her sculpture so that they may understand her opinion while constructing their own. Though Maya focuses specifically on “Square in Four Parts” she may have made a statement for the importance of ambiguous art as a whole.

Maya Stella, a college freshman, has compiled a body of work throughout her first semester at Queens. Professor Kevin Ferguson has encouraged her, as well as nineteen other students to create short observational documentaries and interview films that make a statement for one specific piece of campus artwork. The projects had certain instruction but were still left mostly to the interpretation of the students. In the final film project, the Kino pravda essay, Maya has chose to keep it simple, letting the viewer observe the artwork for themselves.

Maya has shown a mastery of the Kino pravda essay film. Her observational documentary, lacking sound, text and opinion has been incorporated into “Square and
Four Parts”. Maya displays an unbiased view of the sculpture, solely showing various angles of the artwork as well as it’s placement.

Maya’s careful decision to show placement truly helps aid to her argument. She doesn’t only show the environment around the artwork, but brilliantly uses the camera as if it were her own eye. She films as a person would walk up or down the steps towards the sculpture, or simply walk past entering or leaving the dining hall. This technique is unique in that any Queens College student viewing the film could put themselves in her place. They have surely walked down these very stairs and had the same experience. Seeing it through the camera lens may help a viewer appreciate the sculpture in a way they would never have previously if having not viewed it on a screen. Film can have this affect.

Ms. Stella includes a quote by Victoria Newhouse that states, “…it is easy to overlook the extent to which the perception of these objects is influenced by their presentation.” This quote helps to give true insight into what Maya is trying to vocalize. How and where the object is placed affects how a person may view it. Maya demonstrates how the world may view the sculpture while on campus so we understand the influence of placement. The viewer is truly being familiarized with the artwork.

Stella continues to focus, without sound, on “Square in Four Parts.” She quotes author Bernard Gortais who believes “there is a universal generic formula from which all artistic creations arise from including diagonal lines, angles, spaces and surfaces.” Maya spends careful time on each fragment of the formula. The film at this period is still
observational though the viewer is not being told where specifically to look. Diagonal lines, for literally over five hundred years have been of great importance to painting and sculpture. If one went to the metropolitan museum of art and viewed many works of European art they would see the importance and frequent use of diagonals in art. Maya focuses on these diagonals that cut through and practically encompass the sculpture. Maya repeats this attentive process with the other three elements of Gortais’ formula. She even points her camera into the crevices of her chosen sculpture, a place where many passing students would never think to look but may now appreciate.

Throughout Ms.Stella’s film she has exhibited a filming style reminiscent of Dziga Vertov’s Kino pravda, or film truth. Her best example of film truth is seen during the “Campus Community” chapter. Maya places the camera directly over her sculpture, though part of it is still visible. She doesn’t tamper with the angle from this point on. She lets the camera film on its own, capturing life as it would and does exist around the sculpture every day. This acts as yet another perspective. Though each individual passing by the artwork may not be stopping to observe or touch, glancing in itself is interaction.

Lastly, Maya includes snippets of her interview film. Maya wisely arranges her project in this way so that the viewer may unbiasedly form their own opinion on the sculpture without knowledge of other’s views. Even when Maya does present other views they are still mixed, therefore not solidifying any specific judgement. She even leaves in negative comments like “...It’s not terribly exciting. It’s kind of dull and grey.” One interviewee even believes the sculpture would be better if it had a description
which explained it’s meaning. It seems Maya argues for its ambiguity with her filming style as she did not seem to lean towards any specific opinion.

Maya Stella ends her film with a last impression of the sculpture as well as its plaque which states that it has been “donated by the class of 1967.” This may have been a statement that the class did not want a description plaque to be placed; that they believed in ambiguous art.
A cover letter, covering letter, motivation letter, motivational letter or a letter of motivation is a letter of introduction attached to or accompanying another document such as a résumé or a curriculum vitae. Job seekers frequently send a cover letter along with their curriculum vitae or applications for employment as a way of introducing themselves to potential employers and explaining their suitability for the desired positions. Employers may look for individualized and thoughtfully written cover letter example #1: The attention-grabbing headline. Via Venngage As with any piece of writing, a compelling headline helps to immediately capture the reader’s attention. You can see this in action in the above resume for Sandra Barnes.