How Did Sound Affect Film Universality?

Of major interest on a personal level is the position that the article takes when it states that ‘the introduction of sound, the universality of film was largely destroyed.' It should be noted that the use of sound is largely meant to reach a larger audience, to make the films to be universal tools. The main reason given for this is that it ‘directors could now produce films that were specifically targeted to members of their language group, which is the main component of national identity. As such, characters presented in films could take on distinct identities through their use of language’ (Rittmayer, 2014).

It should be noted that the use of a language is a major position that defines any individual. It helps to show the person their identity, their heritage and also to teach them various behavior that comes with having a relationship with a particular language. It has been noted that for ages, the use of a language is one of the major social and psychological aspects of contextualizing a society. It implies that the language in the first place should have been a way in which films sought to understand before coming to existence.

The other issue that the position raises is the whole aspect of translation. Why do people get involved in the business of translation? For example, there have been issues as to why the Bible has been one of the most translated books in the world. By referring to the Bible, it should be understood from a broad perspective in that, the Bible and all other films that have been produced with relevance to the Bible. Which raises a rather disturbing position on what universality could be attained without the element of language, the sound.

On further analysis, the reading notes that ‘shooting the same scenes on the same sets but with different casts and crews representative of the language versions to be produced’ was one of the ways in which the sound killed the universality of the films. Therefore, it can be deduced that the reading interprets the universality of film based on the physical and geographical locations.It implies that the assertion that the reading could be pointing to the reader is that films are universal if they are seen and interpreted by people, based on their location and context.

It is the same position in which the reading goes to explore the target text, and by extension the target audience. It is a position that seeks to consolidate language as an aspect of films that only interprets the way of life of people and individuals based on a subjective manner, rather than the usual objective manner. It is not possible to pick put from the reading on its major way that it sought to maintain the universal nature of films by not incorporating sound. The whole aspect of sound has been instrumental in making sure that films are universal. For example, how many people can say that they have learned the dialects of various people by the utility of films? It is therefore not logical that sound destroyed the universality of films but rather, helped to enhance this universality.

The importance of this question is that it seeks to have a clarity on what is the real position of sound in cinema. It seeks to implore further research on this area. It is true that at times have promoted feelings of imperialism and nationalism in some films, but is this a reason enough to overlook its contribution?
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