SUPERMAN III
Premieres at the Main Theater

In 1978 came “Superman the Movie,” an elaborate $57 million production which prompted Christopher Reeve to international stardom. As the celluloid incarnation of the comic-book hero, Reeve then played Lex Luthor’s evil twin to save America’s Pacific coastline into a private playground.

Boiled by Academy award-winning special effects, a critically acclaimed performance by Reeve, and a tally of more than $500 million at the worldwide box office, “Superman III” became inevitable.

Today, the two movies have the combined total grossing of more than $1.000 million, breaking the one-week American attendance record in the process.

As a thriller sequel, “Superman III,” released in 1983, had Reeve and the indestructible Man of Steel continuing his heroic struggles by battling three super villainy with our time, such as computer technology. A plot like none other around a comic character, a computer wizard whose brainchild is a giant computer programed to recognize the Man of Steel as its enemy—a planing, whirling, whacking thing of digital flights, oscillating monitors, grouping of facts and facial patterns—may not seem the offspring of old time exists between a hydro-electric plant and an environmental joke box.

With a criminally insane wizard behind an equally insane computer of the future, Superman is also faced with a crew of new adversaries such as a teenage social activist who has learned the secret of controlling Earth’s environment and having no control over it.
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JARVO SCENARDO is the finishing touch that we need to round up our organizational setup. We only need to do this for the sake of harmony to keep up with our expectations.
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THE ADVENTURES OF THE ROYAL WARRIOR

The curtain now rises for Volume II No. 1 of Jario Scenario, the official monthly organ of the Experimental Cinema of the Philippines. By way of introduction, a listing of personnel and respective photos is included in this issue. It is hoped that this will serve as a way of knowing who's where in every department and not who's who? In a small big community such as ours. To those not listed WHO are you?
Film Fund Subsidizes 13 Films

As the aim of the Film Fund is to extend financial aid to promising young directors, it was created to assist upcoming movie projects that are commercially viable, and have artistic value through straight, bridge or rendezvous financing. These types of financing are now prevailing upon the need and the production range of the film.

Straight financing means that ECP subsidizes 50 percent of the budget, the approval of which heavily depends on the actual merits of the film. Bridge financing, available for projects that have completed at least 50 percent of principal photography, consists of a producer who can apply for equal credit or emergency financing. Regular bridge financing, up to $30,000 on the basis of the film’s actual qualities, or in case of emergency bridge financing to cover films that are common with the others.

On the other hand, bridge can also provide the films that are refused by the financing schemes, which grants a specific degree of financial help and provides the producer with the registered list-office receipts of his film starts from theater owners. So far, the Film Fund has announced 36 projects that win in the Film Fund-ECP-Will- (Powership) cooperation. The underlying principle is to contribute to the film production, in an effort to establish a Cinema department in cooperation with the Film Fund to support the film industry.

Speaking of finance, as the valid financing of the Film Fund in 1983 has already $52 million (approximately) for the prop-up of a total of 13 films this year, which is aimed at improving the financial situation of the Film Fund as a whole, and the Film Institute overall. The idea is to ensure that the Film Fund will continue to operate and continue to be a resource for the industry.

Applicants for the Film Fund is subject to the approval of the Film Fund Executive Committee, which includes the Film Fund Board of Directors and the Project Evaluation Committee, which is also subject to the approval of the Film Fund Board of Directors. The Executive Committee consists of the president, the Film Fund’s Executive Director, and the head of the Film Fund. The project evaluation committee assesses the projects based on the following criteria: the quality of the screenplay, the artistic merit and potential of the director, the potential market, the budget, and the Film Fund’s financial constraints. Projects that are approved for funding will receive funding on a case-by-case basis, with the Film Fund reserved the right to refuse funding if the project is deemed not to be commercially viable or not in the interest of the Film Fund.

Second Annual Short Festival Ninth Away

Where photography enhances human emotions and slits of truth on paper, filmmaking, on the other hand, gives much more "moving" version of dark and light enough to reach our hearts and feel personal statements as ideograms. In the awareness of the world and the evolution in the cultivation of Filipino taste and culture through short filmmaking, and at the same time improve the quality of Filipino film and advance its cre- ation, the ECP organized its second annual short film festival from November 4 to 10. The event was the fruition of the original idea by ECP President Dacanay, which was to be held in the short film in the Philippines. The response was overwhelming. A total of 93 entries entered the contest and the jury finally narrowed the entries down to 10 films, which were presented at the festival.

For this year’s competition, there were some issues raised in the rules. The three distinct (Documentary, Fiction and Experimental) categories were set up. It was stated that "the Philippines is considered a select group of countries that have accessed the 10 best films of all time..."

MFF 84 and FRB A Rated Films

Nations are under way to define the official selection in the 1984 MFF along with the 1984 FRB categories. The event was geared toward the promotion of Filipino films and culture. The event is held in partnership with the Film Institute of the Philippines and the Philippine Film Commission.

The long list of film entries was briefly narrowed down to 10 films for the short film festival. Following was a short film selection of 9 films. The first two films were presented to the jury for consideration of the final selection. The films selected for the final selection were "A" (directed by Henry Sequi) and "B" (directed by Jun Jarque) for the short film section.

The overall selection process was rigorous and involved various criteria, including artistic merit, technical quality, and thematic relevance. The final selection was made by a panel of experts, including film professionals and representatives of the Film Institute of the Philippines and the Philippine Film Commission. The final decision was made based on the quality and potential of the films, as well as their alignment with the themes and values of the Film Institute of the Philippines and the Philippine Film Commission.

Overdraft of Philippine Cinema

By the mid-1980s, the Philippines had become a major player in the global film industry. The country had produced several critically acclaimed films, both locally and internationally, that had won numerous awards at various film festivals worldwide. The country was known for its rich cultural heritage and diverse landscapes, which made it an ideal location for film productions.

The success of the Philippine film industry was not without its challenges, however. The film industry faced competition from other countries with more established film industries, as well as from the proliferation of cheaper and more accessible forms of entertainment such as television and digital media. Despite these challenges, the Philippine film industry continued to thrive, with filmmakers and distributors working tirelessly to bring their films to a wider audience.

An Everyday Tragedy

Mireda Acena-Guico, a retired English teacher, was on her way to church on a Sunday morning when she was killed by an armed group of men on the road between Davao and Cagayan de Oro. Her husband, who was also a teacher, was uninjured but severely shaken by the incident.

The assassination was the latest in a string of attacks on educators in the southern Philippines, where violence has become a daily reality. Mireda and her husband, who were both well-known for their commitment to education, were active in local teacher's organizations and had been involved in the struggle for better conditions and resources for their students. Their murder is a severe blow to the education community and a reminder of the dangers faced by those who work in the field of education.

The assassination was also a blow to the already fragile peace process in the region, which had been underway for several years. The government and the rebels have been engaged in peace talks, but the recent violence has cast doubt on the prospects for a lasting peace. The assassination of Mireda and her husband is a tragic reminder of the dangers faced by those who work in the field of education and highlights the urgent need for a comprehensive solution to the conflict in the region.