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Evaluation Essay

*Joker* has been proved as the biggest disappointment of the year 2019. It rises with strangely adult self-obsession from the tulip fever of celebrities grant season as an upscale turn on a recognized popular culture brand. The previous year, it was Luca Gudagnino who disappointed viewers with the release of Suspiria and this year, it’s a director and co-writer of Joker, Todd Phillips.

The character of Joker “Arthur Fleck” is played by the Joaquin Phoenix. He is depicted as a wretched failure and loner of Gotham City in the 1980s. After leaving the psychiatry facility, he decides to live with his mother. Arthur is seemed to suffer from a neurological condition where he is unable to control his laughter at inappropriate moments. He has a crush on his neighbor. He dreams to pursue a career as a comedian in a well-established setting. The only job he got was as a clown with a gloomy makeup and creepy smile. He used to get bullied by the muggers and thugs on streets. Tired of being humiliated, one day he realizes that he is only good at spreading violence instead of laugher.

Phillips has just directed a film including a splendid unfunny-amusing figure with learning challenges: Alan in *The Hangover*, played by Zach Galifianakis, that abnormal useless figure who mispronounces the noun "Insane". I wonder what Joker would be like if Zach Galifianakis was cast as a lead character. All things considered, the cast of Phoenix shows how sexually appealing the Joker is supposed to be.

The production design by Mark Friedberg is amazing. The cityscape images by cinematographer Lawrence Sher is proved to be marvelous. The performance done by Phoenix is good, but it is not his best. It is nothing as compared to his performance in ‘*The Master’,* directed by Paul Thomas.

The film holds your attention up until Joker's horrendous vengeance bloodbath on the subway, may be inspired by the infamous Bernhard Goetz shooting of 1984. Although Phillips wisely makes it a non-bigot assault. After this, the film loses your enthusiasm, with dull and constrained material about Joker's alleged triggering of anti-capitalism against rich development, with nonconformists dressing as clowns. A career of Joker which is supposed to be violent, tremendously fails.

The film makes reference to motion pictures from around the show's period, for example, the Death Wish films, The French Connection and perhaps Star Wars, however, it's clearly a difficult and trivial praise to the Scorsese/De Niro’s great *The King of Comedy* with a touch of *Taxi Driver*, which implies that at different moments, it's somewhat similar to *The King of Comedy* and *Taxi Driver*, just not as great.

This presents Joker's beginning as strongly matured and unanimated, contrasted with, Jack Nicholson's low-level convict Jack Napier, falling into a compound tank in Tim Burton's *Batman*, transforming him into the Joker with white skin, green hair and a rictus smile. (The appearance of DC's Joker was initially propelled by Conrad Veidt in the 1928’s quite exemplary *The Man Who Laughs*, a man whose face was deformed into a smile by his dad's political foes.)

There is no motivation behind why Phoenix's extravagantly sequel Joker shouldn't be as amazing as Heath Ledger's enigmatic, unprovoked, disoriented Joker in *The Dark Knight*. In any case, at some stage, the comic-book universe of supervillaindom must be entered, and Ledger was more dominant since he wasn't overloaded with this pragmatist detail and exaggerated unexpected noir arrogance, and he wasn't compelled to convey a whole story all alone. This Joker has only one act in him: the principal demonstration. The film ,one way or other figures out how to be frantically genuine and shallow.