

## WHY NOT MELODRAMA?

In the 70's it has been  
~~It is currently~~ unfashionable to refer  
to a movie you like as a "melodrama."  
Call it a "mystery suspense thriller"  
(as the ads for EYES OF LAURA ~~WARS~~ refer  
to this turgid melodrama); call it a  
"women's picture" — even this soft core put-down  
is preferable to calling a sordid a sordid.  
But as far as Hollywood ~~language~~<sup>language</sup>  
promotional and descriptive language  
is concerned, ~~the~~ melodrama is as  
old-fashioned and deadly as the  
western. The term is used only  
in a derogatory sense: "Sorry, but  
this is just too much of a melodrama..."

Random House defines melodrama  
as "a dramatic form in which exaggeration  
of effect and emotion is produced and  
plot or action is emphasized at the expense  
of characterization." By this definition  
we must realize that Hollywood produces  
~~a lot of~~<sup>some</sup> but melodramas =  
~~almost nothing~~<sup>nothing</sup> among the summer releases, but all  
under other <sup>pseudonyms</sup> ~~acronyms~~.

② Hollywood's fear of melodrama seems to be part of the industry current rush of pretentiousness. Hollywood makes "realistic, contemporary dramas", which usually means that the director has no style and is trying to hide behind a claim of verisimilitude to reality. To my mind, the 70's are so bleak that I can't understand anyone wanting to reflect that reality, because it is synonymous with boredom, frustration, banality, total lack of creative impulses.

Hollywood in the 70's has wanted to be realistic only because it has forgotten how to make good fantasy. And yet the term "Hollywood" has always been synonymous with fantasy. Movie ~~exist~~ to the popularity of movies is dependent upon the capturing and manipulating movie fantasies. If ever we needed melodrama it is in the 70's — a fact that Hollywood is just now beginning to understand. But now, where are the few directors with the integrity to stylistic integrity to make a truly contemporary melodrama? To date, we have only had copies of ~~old~~ <sup>melodramatic</sup> ~~stylistic~~ visual styles from the 30's, 40's and 50's applied to nostalgic fantasy films.

(3)

I look forward with great anticipation to Robert Mulligan's new film BLOOD BROTHER, (which will probably be released by the time you read this) because it has already been described in the press as an "unabashed melodrama". Mulligan is one of the few directors in town who is ~~totally~~<sup>totally</sup> contemporary and has an affinity to the exaggeration of effect and emotion, aimed at the 70's psyche.<sup>His films have a purposeful</sup> Perhaps because of this, his reputation has languished in this decade, but the few films he has managed to make are, to this viewer, among the most acutely perceptive and disturbing expressions of the dismal horrors of the times. THE OTHER (1972) and THE NICKEL RIDGE (1975) were both highly expressive, nightmarish films, pertinent to, and damning of, the 70's — melodramas of the highest order.

Hitchcock made melodramas almost exclusively; so did Griffith, Douglas Sirk, and <sup>and</sup> Rose <sup>Conrad</sup>. These films were not realistic, and yet, in their calculated distortions, their formal exaggeration, they cut closer to the bone of their times than any of the ~~more~~ <sup>usually</sup> realistic directors who were more widely heralded when it came to acknowledging a director's perceptions of reality.

④: A ~~good~~ good director comments on reality in his ~~exaggerations~~ or effect and emotion. This, to me, is a higher function than simply reflecting reality without comment. If I want to see the ugliness of the ~~streets~~, I can go out for a walk. ~~I don't~~ under the pretense of existentialism.

I think Hollywood is ready to re-embrace the melodrama, but because unrality and fantasy are again "in." But the industry ~~as~~ has little notion of what a high art melodrama can be. When they actually see those ~~exaggerations~~ or effect and emotion, they are frightened that it might not ring true - for they are still hung up on the liberals' intellectual insistence on realism.

Well Raaham thinks, and that's why the movies were born.

The second part of the Random House definition of melodrama suggests that "plot or action is emphasized at the expense of characterization." The great directors, Griffith, The deterministic nature of the a good melodramatic plot - the sense in which form comments on content - can does ~~also~~ reduce the freedom of a character.

⑤ A character is said to be "caught up" in a melodrama. The character struggles against the deterministic forces that the storyline forces ~~to~~ <sup>on his actions</sup>, and <sup>a lesser extent</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>but</sup> Hitchcock and Griffith countered this tendency by using ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> "stars" whose personalities and idiosyncrasies compensated for the lack of freedom they had as ~~personalities~~.

3-dimensional characters. ~~As~~ <sup>As</sup> Directors like Sam Peckinpah and Roger Corman, however, were less concerned with ~~the~~ the likability of their characters, who became the victims of their wildly improbable deterministic storylines.

~~However much Steven Spielberg struggled~~

<sup>as Steven Spielberg</sup>  
A realist 70's director may struggle to make his characters likable and 3-dimensional, but they are doomed to be overwhelmed by the mechanics of the sick melodramas as Jaws and Close Encounters. The characters in STAR WARS are likable only in their complete surrender to the 2-dimensionality demanded by the melodramatic form. Other directors - <sup>Why Robert</sup> Altman sacrifice story for character, and their films never quite sit as contemporary mythology. Brian De Palma, on the other hand, revels in melodrama, its excesses and its extremes, leaving us little time to worry if his characters ~~are~~ <sup>their</sup> personal or not.

⑥ Melodrama involves hyping reality, making things bigger than life to better focus ~~life's~~<sup>sights</sup> nature ~~to~~<sup>any</sup> conflicts. The "melo-" or melodrama is from the Greek for "song". Melodrama is drama tempered, ~~met~~ by song, seduction. Melodrama takes reality and re-grounds it in mythology. Horror movies are invariably melodramas. So-called women's pictures ~~are~~ talk ~~the drama of everyday life~~ are usually melodramas - the stuff of life enraptured ~~by~~<sup>the</sup> romance of song.

In its denigrated form, melodrama is thought to be hokey, over wrought, or mindlessly sensation-full — like THE OTHER SIDE OF MIDNIGHT or its TV series WHEELS. For many liberals, melodrama and trash are synonymous. Since life itself is not bigger-than-life, it seems frivolous to portray it. But then, liberals have a sense of the function of art in society (and once in a blue moon a movie still does qualify as art). Liberals dislike melodrama as much as reformed alcoholics ~~hate~~ find it irresponsible for people to escape ~~from~~ reality via wine or drugs. We are supposed to have grown up beyond the need of melodrama.