



Volume 11, Issue 12, December 2024
**SK International Journal of
Multidisciplinary Research Hub**

Journal for all Subjects

Research Article / Survey Paper / Case Study

Published By: SK Publisher

(www.skpublisher.com)



A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access Multidisciplinary & Multilingual International Journal

Special Issue: Two Day National Interdisciplinary Conference on "Script Writing"

Organised by: Department of Languages, Shankarlal Khandelwal Arts, Science & Commerce College, Akola, Maharashtra 444002.

(Sponsored by Pradhan Mantri Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan Grants to Strengthen Colleges)

Scriptwriting as a Process of Directorial Gaze: An Ethical Reflection on Storytelling

Ankit Hiraji Banpurkar

Assistant Professor, Dept. of English.

Dr. Ambedkar College,

Deekshabhoomi, Nagpur, India.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61165/sk.publisher.script.writing.2024.7>

Abstract: Scriptwriting plays a critical role in the art of filmmaking, serving as the foundation upon which narratives are built. Often, the director's involvement in scriptwriting is shaped by their creative vision, which imposes a subjective gaze that can either enrich or constrain the storytelling process. This paper explores the ethical and creative tensions inherent in scriptwriting under the directorial gaze. Drawing on Laura Mulvey's analysis of the gaze, Michel Foucault's power-knowledge dynamics, and Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of dialogue, the study critiques the transactional and mechanical nature of this process. Using a case study of filming a documentary at the Anandwan leprosarium, the paper examines the ethical implications of prioritizing control and efficiency over collaboration and authenticity. It concludes by proposing a dialogic, collaborative approach to scriptwriting that honors the complexity and richness of human narratives.

I. OBJECTIVES

1. To analyze the ethical challenges posed by the directorial gaze in scriptwriting.
2. To explore the theoretical implications of control and objectification in storytelling.
3. To critique the transactional nature of scriptwriting under a utilitarian framework.

II. INTRODUCTION

Scriptwriting is an essential process in filmmaking, providing the blueprint for cinematic storytelling. However, when dominated by the director's subjective vision, it risks becoming a controlled and transactional exercise that prioritizes efficiency over emotional engagement. This phenomenon, referred to here as the "directorial gaze," mirrors concepts from film studies and critical theory, such as Laura Mulvey's "male gaze," Michel Foucault's power-knowledge dynamics, and Walter Benjamin's critique of commodification in art. This paper examines the impact of the directorial gaze on scriptwriting, focusing on the ethical and creative implications of reducing contributors to mere instruments for achieving narrative coherence.

To contextualize these reflections, the paper draws on the experience of creating a short documentary about the lives of lepers at the Anandwan leprosarium. The researcher's initial goal was to explore the literary dimensions of the lepers' lives through poems, prayers, oral stories, and songs. However, the process revealed deeper ethical challenges associated with

balancing personal research objectives and the humanity of those whose stories were being told. Laura Mulvey's seminal essay "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" (1975) introduced the concept of the "male gaze," arguing that cinematic practices often position the audience to see through the perspective of a dominant male subject. While Mulvey's analysis focuses on gender, her critique of control and objectification provides insights into the broader dynamics of power in filmmaking. In scriptwriting, the directorial gaze operates similarly, imposing a unidirectional narrative structure that prioritizes the director's vision over collaborative storytelling.

Michel Foucault's theories on power-knowledge dynamics, particularly in *Discipline and Punish* (1975), further illuminate the hierarchical nature of scriptwriting under the directorial gaze. Foucault describes how power shapes the production of knowledge through systems of control and surveillance. In the context of filmmaking, the director's authority transforms the scriptwriting process into a methodical extraction of information, limiting the contributors' creative agency.

Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of dialogue, as explored in *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981), offers a counterpoint to these hierarchical practices. Bakhtin emphasizes the relational and dynamic nature of dialogue, advocating for a storytelling approach that values the interplay of diverse voices. This perspective underscores the potential of scriptwriting as a collaborative, human-centered endeavor.

a) Scriptwriting at Anandwan Leprosarium

The short documentary about the lives of lepers at Anandwan provides a practical lens for examining the ethical tensions of scriptwriting under the directorial gaze. The primary objective of the project was to uncover literary compositions within the lepers' experiences, such as poems, prayers, and oral narratives. Interviews were conducted with several residents, focusing on their lives, families, and experiences with leprosy.

While the conversations appeared to center on understanding their stories, the researcher's underlying goal was to extract material that aligned with the documentary's theme. This approach raises critical questions: Were the questions posed with genuine curiosity, or were they driven by a predetermined agenda? Did the researcher truly listen to the lepers' stories, or was the focus solely on gathering content for the script?

Leprosy is a deeply isolating disease that often results in social ostracism. For many lepers, the opportunity to share their stories is rare and deeply cathartic. However, the transactional nature of the interviews risked reducing these interactions to mere data collection. By guiding the dialogue toward specific objectives, the researcher may have unintentionally objectified the lepers, treating them as instruments for achieving narrative coherence rather than as individuals with unique experiences and perspectives.

Once the script was finalized, it incorporated selected excerpts from the interviews, leaving behind other meaningful aspects of the conversations. This process highlights the tension between achieving research goals and respecting the humanity of those whose stories are being told. While the script fulfilled its purpose, it did so at the cost of emotional depth and collaborative engagement.

b) Dehumanization and the Loss of Authenticity

The dehumanizing effects of the directorial gaze stem from its emphasis on control and efficiency. By treating contributors as mere answer-providing entities, the process strips storytelling of its relational and emotional dimensions. This critique aligns with Walter Benjamin's analysis in "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" (1935), where he argues that the commodification of art under industrialization erodes its "aura"—its unique, human essence. Similarly, when scriptwriting becomes a mechanical process of extracting answers, it loses its authenticity and collaborative spirit.

The focus on efficiency and precision often leads to homogenized narratives that reflect the director's singular vision, overshadowing the diverse perspectives that contributors might bring. Such narratives, while coherent, risk becoming emotionally sterile and disconnected from the complexities of human experience.

c) Theoretical Reflections on Conversation and Control

The contrast between objective inquiry and heartfelt dialogue in scriptwriting can be further understood through Bakhtin's concept of dialogism. Dialogue, as Bakhtin describes, is inherently relational and open-ended, allowing for the co-creation of meaning. Under the directorial gaze, however, scriptwriting becomes monologic, with the director's vision dominating the process. This dynamic undermines the potential for collaborative storytelling, reducing it to a unidirectional exchange that prioritizes control over connection.

III. CONCLUSION

Scriptwriting under the directorial gaze, driven by a need for specific answers and narrative control, risks becoming a dehumanized process that prioritizes objectivity over emotional depth and collaboration. While this approach may produce coherent narratives, it does so at the cost of stifling creativity and diminishing the authenticity of the storytelling process.

By incorporating theoretical frameworks such as Mulvey's critique of the gaze, Foucault's power-knowledge dynamics, and Bakhtin's dialogism, this paper has highlighted the ethical and creative implications of the directorial gaze in scriptwriting. Reimagining scriptwriting as a collaborative and dialogic process offers a path forward, one that values the human elements of storytelling and fosters narratives that resonate with authenticity and depth.

References

1. Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Illuminations*, translated by Harry Zohn, Schocken Books, 1968.
2. Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, University of Texas Press, 1981.
3. Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 1975.
4. Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Screen*, vol. 16, no. 3, 1975, pp. 6-18.
5. Leigh, Mike. *Interviews in Filmmakers on Filmmaking*. Faber & Faber, 2005.
6. Hitchcock, Alfred. *Interviews in Hitchcock/Truffaut*. Simon & Schuster, 1983.

∴ Cite this article ∴

Banpurkar, A. H. (2024). *Scriptwriting as a Process of Directorial Gaze: An Ethical Reflection on Storytelling*. Two Day National Interdisciplinary Conference on Script Writing, 31–33.
<https://doi.org/10.61165/sk.publisher.script.writing.2024.7>