

Neo-Realism is a movement of a collective human nature —how does the action of every day of a human living being become “the Subject of Interest”? If there is a *Law of Desire*, there must be a section for the Desire of the Voyeurs; an humane instinct to be an Observer, rather than the other way around —just like the food pyramid eco system where the hunter must voyeur/watch his prey/victim. In fact, this desire to ‘watch’ is not of just the animalistic natures of prey/victim (voyeurism); but “a desire for understanding, for belonging, for participating —for living together, in fact.”¹ Now if every moment would have counted, say, a middle aged woman doing her chores for 2 full hours in the theaters, who is going to watch that now? For the same reason (the durational dilemma) one hesitates to go see *Sátántangó* (not too far off to say it’s ‘Hungarian Neo-realism’), or simply because there probably are already YouTube Videos out there of the same thing? Perhaps even a live streaming?

Neo realism is accused of only depicting Poverty; however it does not offer solutions —that’s why the end of a neorealist film is particularly inconclusive. - *The Killing of A Sacred Deer* (2017) dir. Yorgos Lanthimos, known for the impacts of the ecstasy of Greek New(Weird)-Wave Cinema, — is strangely enough sniffs the element of Neo-realism in depicting a sub-conscious, *mythical* reality if it were to be the character’s involved in *its reality*. If Neo-realism “must sustain moral impulse that characterized its beginnings; in an analytical documentary way”², has *Sacred Deer* not succeeded already? The ‘curse’ —the ‘greek mythical tool’ to fictionalize the ‘reality’ of the characters involved in the *Life* behind the cameras.

¹ Zavattini, Cesare. ‘Some Ideas on the Cinema’

² ‘

Life: not what is invented in “stories”; life is another matter. To understand it involved a minute, unrelenting, and patient search; “The true function of cinema” Zavatti wrote, is “not to tell fables”, but to rather capture Life”; to “Observe reality, not to extract fictions from it”.³ So if the tools that were used to make the film — a *fantasy* rather than the *reality* — were in fact, *real*, does it in fact hinder the Spirit of Neo-realism? The banal “dailiness”, of the protagonist’s (who is merely a heart surgeon) karmic endeavors and the choices he must make to pay for *his debt*, or human conflict of the nature of discrepancy — is it worth watching? If an extremely elongated split second of the entire scene; where the protagonist has to decide which of his family member to kill to end ‘the curse’ would be impactful to the souls of Neo-realism cinephiles and the anticipators of the narrative fans altogether. For it has no other ‘divine’ cosmic entity to resolve this horrendous conflict, the screenwriter wrote for this character, it becomes ‘non-fiction’ in its frame of fictitious reality — of course, speaking in terms of acting, or how the story flows in the sense of ‘human nature/instinct’ (going back to the beginning) — the use of diegetic/non-diegetic sound, the cinematography, the dialogue itself would not be considered something ‘Neo-realistic’ for any viewer.

³ Zavattini, Cesare. ‘Some Ideas on the Cinema’