To critically analyse the piece we must look towards basic assumptions of film theory and criticism. The piece can be seen to work with conventions in the genre that revolve around the idea of the "chase sequence". When we deconstruct it we can make meaning in terms of how the shots are constructed, what basic film theory says about the film, what value we can gain from a semiotic analysis of the piece, and finally how a central twist swings the piece from realism to formalism.

It is clear in the film that the construction and positioning of shots change during the twist half-way through the piece when the picture becomes black and white. This is to signify a change from the conventions that were being used from a fast-paced action genre to a stunted comedy genre. In the beginning we are dealing with shots that are characteristic of modern film: wide pans, over-the-shoulder shots, close-ups and others. When our figures enter the building the shots change to mostly stationary medium-shots which are characteristic of old black and white comedy movies featuring artists such as Charlie Chaplin. It was indeed in these early movies where the chase sequence was first developed (McCaffrey 1964:1).

We can consider the piece in light of film theory. Well-known Russian film-maker Sergei Eisenstein (Fourie 2004:187) distinguishes between three film theories: "establishing-shot theories" (where the social context is important), "medium-shot theories" (where the human and public interaction with the film is considered), and "close-up theories" (where semiotic considerations are made). Considering the social implications of the piece, attention must be brought to the establishing impetus: the stealing of the bread. Most viewers would find this funny because it is generally considered, in the everyday social world, absurd to steal something of as low value as a loaf of bread. Considering where our characters take us from this impetus show us the human interaction. We can ask ourselves: who are these people and why are they chasing one another? Their parts are played out absurdly but the chase that is expected after stealing something in the world add value to our characters and with the link that is made with the viewer's idea of himself or herself. Lastly the bread is the most important sign from which all meaning in the piece is derived. It signifies consumption and

satisfaction. At the end of the piece when the chaser finds an identification card, it signifies responsibility and self-control.

We can say that the early part of the piece represents a realist representation of reality which the second part deconstructs reality and views it in formalist consideration. Fourie (2004:197) defines realism as film trying to portray reality as honestly as possible. With fast-moving shots and constant changing of shots the first half of the piece attempts to demonstrate the complete action from the point where the bread is stolen to where the figures enter the building. Formalism is defined as an attempt to deconstruct the constitutive parts (or signs) which make up the piece (2004:197). The second part is minimalist with each scene set up so that the actors needed to enter the shot to engage with the props included (be it stacked boxes, fire closet or roof door).

As we can see it is possible to deconstruct the piece and make interpretations about how it communicates with the viewer and what value there is to be found. By doing this we are being critical about its production and what goes into understanding its meaning-making processes. At the same time, however, it must be considered that these criticisms are not necessarily in the minds of the director or crew producing the piece. The production team works with the conventions available to them and the film criticism relates directly to these conventions and how they add the final product and its understanding.