

*Through the use of facial expressions and body language, the director is able to communicate perception and popularity of different characters and ideas which allows for a greater experience by the viewer*

Much hinges on the detail of the viewer's experience. I'm guessing that all the stases are closed without the introduction of a puzzle/paradox that can be solved observing the effect of facial expressions on the popularity of characters.

*SC author employs various non-verbal communication techniques to convey complex situations and emotions without narration or explanation so that the audience is actively reading the movie rather than listening to it.*

Much hinges on the detailed definition of "actively reading." The juxtaposition of "listening" is "interesting"—in the sense that I want to hear more. As noted in class, the first two lines border on tautology, though the core functionality of conveying complexity is solid.

*In JF's SC, there are a variety of scenes throughout the journey. A key characteristic of note is the amount of people in a scene. The number of people is indicative of the potential results between the characters involved. Whether the scene displays the team growing or becoming less efficient, these scenes typically involve a majority of the group to be present. Alternatively, if two characters resolve an issue between each other or learn something new about the themselves the scene will mostly include two characters.*

I see the form (# of people in a scene) and the function (indicates the scale of the scene). I don't (yet) see the importance of this connection. Are there more nuanced form/function matches? Perhaps in scenes that include both shots of a large group and shots of individuals and pairings of characters?

*Nonverbal communication in Stagecoach, particularly the gestures or body language, music both diegetic and non-diegetic, and facial expressions or reactions, delineates key characteristics of the characters, their relationships, and their emotions in specific scenes, thus, delivering crucial information and clues that are essential for understanding the film's plot and themes both obvious and underlying.*

Can this be more specific? The current breadth could be covered in a book. I see "non-verbal cues provide information to understand the film." as being a closed stasis. If you can turn this into a puzzle of paradox, the stasis can open up, perhaps something like: "Changes in non-verbal cues as the movie progresses show changes in the relationship between characters, which allow the solution of a puzzle."

*Through the use of exaggerated glances, dramatic music, and character interactions, Stagecoach portrays character traits without the use of verbal communication, making this movie a prime example of the transition period between silent and sound movies.*

Can this be turned up-side-down? Use the transition period as part of your problem set-up? Again, the generic stasis is probably uncontested: non-verbal things (form) show character traits (function). To crib one of the examples from the screen yesterday:

Through the use of story-telling techniques of “magical realism”  
Gabriel Garcia Marquez challenges traditional notions of linear time  
which functions to create great sympathy for the peasants of his country.

To

Through the tedious use of [specific] non-verbal communication  
John Ford slows time to show [facial expressions]  
which functions to create great sympathy [for the victims of social prejudice] (in the movie,  
which in turn has the potential to create sympathy for such victims in reality).

*In his movie “Stagecoach,” John Ford uses pauses in conversation, prolonged eye contact, facial expressions, and other non-verbal cues to describe Mrs. Mallory’s mercurial relationship with the rest of the crew over the course of their journey. These cues aid in demonstrating the standards that women of Mrs. Mallory’s social class are expected to uphold, and provides some insight into why those standards exist.*

Super form/function/value triad. Caution regarding near collision with reality, but can be focused on why those standards are important in the movie and how the movie affects an audience.

*In his 1939 western film, Stagecoach, John Ford highlights character traits by employing exaggerated body language, which elicits sympathy within the audience toward certain characters and thus keeps the viewers engaged in the movie wishing safe travels for the stagecoach.*

Function & form A-OK. Is the value stasis of “sympathy for characters keeps audiences engaged” closed? Is there a similar value proposition that would be more open?

*In his 1939 western film, Stagecoach, John Ford portrays the Native American culture as evil savages by depicting their deaths in a barbaric manner, providing them with minimal verbal lines, and only including them in the “ambush” scene. This portrayal augments the historical view of Native Americans as an inferior race.*

Form/function A-OK. For me, the stasis is open regarding the question of whether the movie simply perpetuates a racist stereotype or whether it invokes sympathy for Native Americans as victims of social prejudice. Erasure (the non-telling of stories, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Symbolic\\_annihilation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Symbolic_annihilation)) and Freud (voyeurism and fetishism—I’d be hard pressed to explain exactly) might be analysis lenses that could be focused on the plight of the Native Americans in the movie.

*SC utilizes multiple modes of nonverbal communication including facial expressions, eye contact, body language, and musical cues. These features serve to direct the audience's attention, signal changes, and create suggestions about the characters' thoughts and feelings while still enabling some freedom of interpretation for the audience. This extensive use of nonverbal communication in SC provides a revealing commentary on the circumstances of its creation – at the transition between silent films and “talkies.”*

Form & function perhaps on the broad side. Significance will depend much on “revealing commentary.” Again, I recommend leaving the silent/talkies dichotomy out of the argument; it could remain as part of the context and setting up the puzzle.