For part B:

A. My Questions about the 1976 version  
1. Do you think there is an important connection between the fact that Matthew doesn’t fix his windshield on the same night that Geoffrey becomes "invaded"? Do you think it could be a sign that their viewing of life was about to become broken?  
2. Do you think Nancy is an intelligent character, or a crazy character? Why?  
3. Why do you think Matthew couldn’t harm the other growing bodies and only himself?

D.

The science fiction chapter of the textbook says that there is a differentiation between the horror monster and the science fiction creature, specifically saying that the creature “has little personality or pathos attached to it” (344). It would be interesting to have a discussion about the differences between what makes a monster versus a creature, or if they’re really just synonyms for each other. In response to *Invasion*, this would be a good way to dissect how the spores are creatures because they came in large groups, and they’re terrifying, while it’s said that monsters can elicit sympathy from the audience.

In response to the Bowen article it’s interesting to think about how it’s mentioned that Matthew and Elizabeth don’t want to believe that “their safety is imperiled, that their cocoons are capable of being breached.” Isn’t that how people felt when the current pandemic was starting in Wuhan those many weeks ago? People tend to believe that bad things won’t happen to them (for whatever reason they may think). It’s a very “well it isn’t bad if it isn’t affecting me” sort of way of thinking. That’s how Matthew first started thinking when Elizabeth was saying something was off with Geoffrey, but in the end it did effect Matthew completely.

For Part C:

A. (1978 version)

1. Which elements make *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*(1978) a classic sci-fi/horror movie?

2. Give at least two examples of foreshadow in the film.

3. What do you think of the Pods' shriek in the movie?

D. (1978 version)

In Bowen's article, he mentioned: "Kaufman embraces the airy ineffability of the material. The images are intricately multilayered yet light, delicate, and often only minutely “wrong." A drop of rainwater could be just that, or it could contain an alien spore. One notices people in the backgrounds of cityscapes who’re standing a little too still and upright" (Bowen). I notice the same thing in the film. Every little detail could be something bigger or a foreshadow of something happening later in the movie. Therefore, I pay attention to many little things throughout the film and put all of my focus on every minute of it. The film successfully tells the story visually. The dialogues never try to expose anything and they leave that job to the image. Speaking of the image, Bowen also wrote: "The close-ups of a body in a health spa are especially eerie in their specificity, capturing precisely how intergalactic tendrils interact with flesh" (Bowen). I think a health spa is a perfect location for that scene. I cannot imagine any place better than a health spa to show the interaction between the evil plants and human. San Francisco is also a great choice of location to tell this story: a busy city with a very high population number and a popular sea international shipping place.

In *An Introduction to Film Genres*, they wrote this about sci-fi films: "The vast majority of them not only feature white males as the dominant characters, but they also personify a vision of unproblematic heterosexual masculinity in their pursuit of the twin goals of defeating the aliens and rescuing the damsel in distress" (339). We can see this in *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*(1978) as the protagonist, Matthew (a white male), rescues Elizabeth (a woman, later become his love interest) from her boyfriend and takes care of her while trying to escape/defeat the Pods.