

recorder...tape! This of course was expensive only Hollywood could afford these types of cameras!

As time went on and with the pressure on budgets and with technology improving there was a good reason to move to using video cameras instead of film. The savings on film costs, instant viewing of pictures on set, no waiting for rushes, and the huge cost savings by having no show prints as video projectors in cinemas became high quality and lower in price. All this hasten the reduce use of film.

Then 'Red' came out '4K' resolution and low price compared with other 'film' like video cameras, the market was shaken.

Then came Alexa, Epic, etc., and then the Sony F50 which is 'better' than 35mm film. But all these cameras are video cameras, not a sprocket hole in sight, no film grains, no chemicals, just pure electrons!

But we still go on film shoots with these cameras. We go to the cinemas to watch a 'film' not a video. In Hollywood there are still 'film' producers who will make their drama using a video camera, edit in video, and watch it on a video projector, but if they called themselves a Video Producer what image will that give them? Can you imagine the scene when a producer goes into a meeting with money men and says he wants to make a \$200 million video! How about being a Digital Medium Producer if being a Video Producer feels too down market?

Now there are a many cameras with large format image sizes to fill the 'demand of the programme maker'. But are these



programme makers just buying into the 'film' brand as people do when wearing shirts with Adidas on them? They will say there are shooting a 'film' but using a Sony F3 video camera.

There are people who will spend a huge amount of money on buying a Mulberry hand bags because they want to be seen as brand conscious, are people the same with 'film'? You can buy a fake Mulberry and now you can make a 'film' on video and as with the handbag example most viewers won't notice! Do the viewers care whether the programmes are made on video or film?

In the film 'Citizen Kane', said by some to be the best film ever made, the makers worked really hard to make everything in focus, deep 3 shots all in focus, just like video. So was this not the 'film look'?

If technology has moved on with speed has people's attitudes been left behind? I am looking forward to Film Producers re-branding themselves as Video Producers! But I think 'film' is a too powerful

brand for that to happen. I expect that there are Brand Managers who wish they could own the 'film' brand, it must be worth millions!

Now when's my next film shoot?!

Graham Reed

Lighting Cameraman, Lighting Director, Trainer.

Graham worked for the BBC for 21 years, first as a Camera Assistant, then as a Cameraman, before leaving as a Senior Cameraman to work as a Freelance Lighting Cameraman.

Graham worked on every type of TV programme, both in studios and on location, single camera and multi-camera with a very wide range of camera equipment.

As a Lighting Director he works both in studios and location lighting both small and large events.

As well as being a Sessional Lecture at Ravensbourne College, he runs training workshops on camera work and lighting for training companies.

grahamreed2006@yahoo.co.uk

www.grahamreedlightingcameraman.com

