

Jorge Goldenberg

(Screenwriter, Screenwriting Trainer, Dramatist)

We all have stated our position on that immense field we agreed on calling cinema.

We all have said at some time, in a way or another, that it is not possible to teach or write, that nobody "makes" an artist or a craftsman. I would not have the minor objection in saying it again today. But at the same time, my presence in this meeting would not make any sense if I did not believe that the "didactic situation" had a chance of a healthy intervention. As far as I understand, this intervention can be verified specially as stimulation and criticism (in the strict sense), since it would be difficult to maintain as the transmission of an established knowledge and verifiable by the protocols of the scientific methods.

Actually, the fundamentals of the issue we are talking about are unstable. Even though it falls within a fertile history that offers multiple references and examples (we could even consider a certain tradition in the script teaching), the diversity of the poetics that shelter under the word "cinema" resists any attempt of normalization. The fact that dominant poetics, determined by the not pretty innocent market, could be verified, is no more than a statistic piece of information.

On the other hand, I consider the task of the screenwriter as highly specific. It is not much about writing a "story" than "writing a film". In my opinion, the fatal paradox that feeds this statement obliges us to consider the writing more from the cinema point of view than from the literature. In other words, the screenwriter has to, temporarily, usurp the director's position. We might then wonder about the accuracy of the term "writer". Nevertheless, a screenwriter can be a writer... but not necessarily.

Naturally, all this reflexion involves making one's position clear. Of course, stating one's position is inevitable, whether explicitly expressed or not, whether theorized or not. In the same moment we express an opinion about a film (or about a script or a project), such position is bound to take place. It is worth saying that such possibility to conceive a neutral space of teaching-stimulation does not exist. I think that only the recognition of this condition allows us to use strategies meant to avoid, at least, the imposition of our own options as consolidated truths. In that sense, I think we should take into consideration the fact that, deep down, nobody knows the project as well as its author. In consequence the function of the "teacher" is, paraphrasing a principle of the psychoanalytic clinic, to help the author to know what he knows. This help is possible if we adopt an empathic questioning attitude. In other words, a critical attitude that would come out of what we could consider the inside of each project.

I usually begin exposing these generic ideas to each group I am supposed to work with, so that all the participants have a clear understanding of the "teacher"'s positions. These positions are outlined as follows:

- a) that each project is singular. In other words, and theoretically, each project is likely to end up in a specific film.
- b) that "unique" or "singular", does not mean a need in originality but in specificity.
- c) that there is no story without law, that is to say the specific procedure established, consciously or unconsciously, by each author, when presenting a determined fiction.
- d) that the consistence of such fiction , as well as its verisimilitude, can only be verified within the law established by its author.
- e) that in consequence, the possibility of verisimilitude of all the constitutive elements of a script (characters, plot, handling of the time, situations, dialogues, sets) depends , first of

all, on the loyalty to the proposed procedure, and that there is no possibility to search guarantees comparing them to what the common sense calls "reality".

At the same time, I usually expect that before the beginning of each workshop all the participants should know their colleagues' works, in order to establish collective discussions. I believe that these discussions, where the analysis and foundation of the opinions are privileged and where the value judgements are radically excluded, give the author a wide-ranging critiques, not only reserved to the opinion of whom, justifiedly or not (who knows) was chosen to be the "teacher".