**Cinematic Analysis of How to Train Your Dragon 2 & Lilo & Stitch**

Since ancient times, humanity has used cinema and animation for religious, logical, instructive and exciting purposes. Many images of advanced visual culture, such as Mickey Mouse or the small hourglass on a computer screen, come from animations (Loader, 2012). The vast majority of them are intrigued by children's programming and this has undoubtedly greatly affected our vocabulary and our normal social patterns. The liveliness essentially includes the introduction of still images so as to dream of movement in the brain of observers. The animated film is a classification or a kind of animation. On the widest dimension, there are two types of vivified films: two-dimensional (2D) and three-dimensional (3D). The 2D activity therefore incorporates procedures such as vivacity, hand-drawn patterns or outlines, sand movement, direct movement, etc. 3D liveliness involves methods such as model activity, 3D computer movement, pixilation, time slippage, and so on (Schwan, 2017). This is by no means a complete description of the activity strategies, as different mixtures of this type are used from time to time and new specialized arrangements are created continuously. In order to better understand the strategies, the following article will examine the essential topics and realistic methods used in animated movies named Lilo and Stitch, and How to Train Your Dragon 2, by Disney and Dream works respectively. In both these film along with the strong themes of warmth, friendship, and family values, they have a strong characterization and animation techniques which in case of Lilo & Stitch connected audience with the characters, and in How to Train your Dragon 2 also captivates them with the larger than life dragon world.

“Lilo and Stitch is an ideal family film, and extraordinary diversion for all ages. It's a customary, hand drawn, 2D (Schwan, 2017) full length animation, using everything Disney movement does directly in its earnest attempts. In the event that this is the last shot conventional activity specialists have before every Hollywood animation go CG, they couldn't request anything better to legitimize their stand. This is identity character liveliness done right; personified individuals we can identify with, way-out space animals to chuckle at and strict flights of extravagant envisioned with the style that hand drawn, hand painted vivified cartooning can guarantee as only its own (Unsworth, 2015). Lilo and Stitch has humor, heart, style and workmanship - with the most noteworthy guidelines we've generally expected from Walt Disney Feature Animation (Falah, 1970).”

“Lilo & Stitch is wonderfully old-fashioned in its simple straightforward storytelling, charming characters and strong motivations. Not only did Sanders come up with the original idea for the film, but he worked in close collaboration with DeBlois to write the screenplay, storyboard virtually all the scenes, record Stitch's dialogue and direct the film. This film was focused on the simplicity and warmth of the relationships. Previous Disney films have pushed to achieve technical marvels and emphasize dimension (Falah, 1970). This film liked the idea of abandoning some of that in favor of emphasis on the character development. Lilo & Stitch slowed down the world a little bit and do away with the epic set pieces and the throngs of people so that it could deal with two characters and how they interact with one another.”

“This film did break the conventional story telling techniques. One thing that was clearly evident in the film was to let go of the idea of good and evil. The characters have more shades of gray; they aren't all black and white. They embody human frailties. Lilo, Stitch and Nani are neither good nor bad. They're a mixture of those things like every human being (Unsworth, 2015). As a result of that, we got a more subtle and interesting mix of character relationships. The comedy comes from many places. Stitch's view of Earth and its inhabitants is one source. Designed to be a monster, he's plopped into a suburb with no appropriate city to destroy. One hilarious sequence has him build a replica of San Francisco out of toys and materials in Lilo's room, then demonstrates what he would do to it. The reactions of Lilo and Nani to Stitch's behavior provide the animators with ample opportunity to draw facial expressions and body language that say more than any cheap one-liner.”

“The animation and characterization of this film was also really subtle and unique. The character of Lilo sketched in such a brilliant manner that her deep emotions were shown in every small pose in the movie. We are so used to CG (Quesnel, 1966) now, that this film's simple flat artwork is a treat for the eyes. In a deviation from several decades' worth of Disney features, Sanders and DeBlois chose to use watercolor painted backgrounds for Lilo & Stitch, as opposed to the traditional gouache technique (Quesnel, 1966). While watercolors had been used for the early Disney animated shorts, as well as the early Disney features Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs (1937) and Dumbo, the technique had been largely abandoned by the mid-1940s in favor of less complicated media such as gouache. Watercolors used for Lilo evoke both the bright look of a storybook and the art direction of Dumbo, requiring the background artists to be trained in working with the medium. The character designs were based on Sanders's personal drawing style, eschewing the traditional Disney house style. The refreshing watercolor backdrops remind one of classic 1930s and '40s Hollywood cartoons. CG is, of course, used in the film but mainly in the alien scenes and the space chases.”

Essentially, How to Train Your Dragon 2, which is audaciously increasingly keen on extending in its monster pressed world than it is in seeking after its focal legend versus.- scoundrel plot. Dean DeBlois once in a while puts the film's multi-planar spotlight so obviously on the screen as he does in that particular minute. In any case, notwithstanding when it isn't a piece of the visuals, which is nothing unexpected, since it's anything but difficult to stuff enlivened casings to diversion, that feeling of an occupied, profound world is constantly present.

The odd however wonderful thing about Dragon 2 is how much Drago feels like a third-demonstration bit of hindsight, for the most part a helpful reason for climactic fights and some yelled philosophical discussions about how humankind and winged serpent it ought to identify with one another. Drago appears to be vigorously demonstrated after Mulan scoundrel Shan Yu, in physical plan, development, and danger. But Drago likewise looks like Shan Yu in the manner he burns through the vast majority of the film as an approaching, dynamic risk as opposed to a character. He's Hiccup's theoretical abhorrence inverse, directly down to a late-movie uncover of a significant detail they share for all intents and purpose, yet for all his miscreant monologuing and extensive power, he's still more conceptual philosophical yang to Hiccup's yin than he is a completely fleshed-out opponent. That equivalent reflection reaches out all through the motion picture, which replaces the main film's gut-punching conflicts among Hiccup and Stoick—and the similarly incredible rapprochement between a forsaken youthful Hiccup and his wild, furious youthful mythical beast, with a subtler type of the transitioning subject (Bielenberg, 2014), as Hiccup endeavors to decide his grown-up personality.

The most astounding shot in How To Train Your Dragon 2 doesn't originate from the many dazzling arrangements of individuals riding their excited mythical serpent accomplices, or from the intentionally flashy fights, or the wide vistas swarmed with bright monsters in flight. It draws close to the center of the motion picture, when an occupied character inadvertently kicks Toothless, the dark black, catlike winged serpent who turned into the real draw of 2010's $500 million blockbuster How To Train Your Dragon. Toothless recoils directly off the screen; while the visual spotlight stays on the activity in the frontal area—and much more so on a totally extraordinary plane, on the off-screen activity that caused the kick in any case, a provoked Toothless abandons by out of sight, out of center and scarcely took note. Is anything but a noteworthy occasion; it's a side piece of character business that further confuses what's as of now an outwardly, inwardly, and narratively convoluted scene. It is, basically, a little beauty note that enables the minute to appear to be genuine, in light of the fact that there's more going on than the camera can take in, or than is straightforwardly important to the story.

Be that as it may, the film's genuine enthusiastic heart originates from its brazen fanboy love of monsters. Hiccup's most significant relationship is his security with Toothless, who keeps on shifting back and forth between kittenish play, human-ish emulated winsomeness, and fatal savagery (Loader, 2012), in a way planned make every one of the children in the group of onlookers urgently long for their very own monsters. Profound World felt in the film's tone, which DeBlois intentionally intended to imitate The Empire Strikes Back, since Dragon 2 is additionally the center film in a set of three. It's felt in the stuffed, big name voiced cast. What's more, it's felt in the scale, which is lifted to Pacific Rim levels (Loader, 2012), both in the epic-sized winged serpent battles and in the manner the story over and again takes the characters outside their commonplace world and into a bigger world network (Bielenberg, 2014). Dragon 2's general warmth for the species results in other, correspondingly drawn-out, phenomenally energized groupings, including a mid-air showdown where the mists are as much a character as the dragon riders, a disastrously beautiful scene where Valka wing-strolls between monsters in flight, and a long investigation of Valka's winged serpent filled home. The repetition legend/scoundrel face-offs are energizing, yet the film is in no rush to quick advance to them. DeBlois appears to have a genuine energy for this world, and like Hiccup, he appears to be substantially keener on taking off through the mists than in battling on the ground (Bielenberg, 2014).

To conclude both these films have a strong theme of friendship, loyalty, and family. These films along with the human characterization and original animation made them worth watching. These films tried to project real life emotions and expressions through little characters, so that people can see the strong and real emotions on screen as well. These movies have successfully portrayed the sense of friendship and love through variety of odd characters, which are quite deviant from the sweet, white, and traditional fairy-tale characters.
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