AN EDITORIAL

Program In Ethnographic Film has adopted some new policies regarding its publications. Because of a decrease in available funds we must now charge for our Newsletter and reprints and increase the cost of Films for Anthropological Teaching. These publications will be printed and distributed by the AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, 1703 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE NW, WASHINGTON, DC 20009. Your orders should be accompanied with payment. Checks should be made payable to the AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. PIEL Newsletter will be published three times per year (Fall - Winter - Spring). The subscription rate is $2.00 per year for individuals and $3.00 per year for institutions. If you are already receiving the Newsletter, do not send any money yet. The AAA will bill you sometime during the next year.

A limited number of back issues of PIEL Newsletter are available through the AAA at $1.00 per issue.

The following PIEL reprints are available from AAA at 50¢ each (minimum order is $1.00).


Films for Anthropological Teaching, an annotated filmography prepared by Karl Heider is also available through AAA for $3.00 ($5.00 for institutions).

PIEF at its Philadelphia office (Room 200 South Hall, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa. 19122) will continue to function as it has in the past - as a clearinghouse for information. The AAA is simply acting as our printer and distributor.

The editorial policy of the Newsletter will remain the same. It will continue to serve as an informal means of communication for all persons interested in the use
of visual media for the study of man (cf. vol. 1 no. 1). All interested persons are encouraged to contribute articles, news of fieldwork, announcements of conferences, festivals and training opportunities and any other pertinent information to Editor, PIEF, Room 200 South Hall, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa. 19122. The deadline for copy for the Fall issue is July 1.

Suggestions for additions and corrections to be included in the future editions of Films for Anthropological Teaching should be sent to Karl Heider, Department of Anthropology, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912.

This is the last issue of the Newsletter to be printed in Philadelphia. The Editors wish to acknowledge the excellent workmanship and generous assistance received from Ed Byerly and John Cantelli of Fidelity Press, A & Courtland Streets, Philadelphia.

If you have any questions about these changes please let us know.

The Editors

ETHNOGRAPHIC FILMING IN UGANDA

Two long films on traditional societies in Uganda are presently being completed. One of these is my own, and I did the filming for both. Although related, they are the results of separate projects, and the peoples they concern could hardly be more different: the Gisu, growers of plantain and coffee, occupying a region of lush vegetation not far from a major town; the Jie, transhumant cattle herders ranging over a dry plain of thorn and scrub in a remote area.

In the Spring of 1968 the Ethnographic Film Program of the University of California at Los Angeles began preparations for a major film in Africa, and I was invited to join the project as its cameraman. A number of African peoples were considered for a film, among them the Yoruba of Nigeria and the Ankole, Acholi, and Gisu of Uganda. A primary consideration was that an anthropologist be present in the field to act as go-between and to provide ethnographic information as it was needed. Various factors, including the civil war, ruled out the Nigerian possibility. Then a contact failed to materialize in Uganda and another proved unavailable at the necessary time. The decision to make a film about the Gisu was only finally reached when we had assembled in Uganda.

A full description of the making of this film will properly come from Richard Hawkins, who was director of both the project and the film. It concerns, in brief, the preparations leading up to the circumcision of two young Gisu men, and it is an attempt to record not only the substance of a ritual ceremony, but also the personal and social background which give it its meaning.

The Gisu are a Bantu-speaking people who live on the slopes of Mt. Elgon and parts of the surrounding plain. In recent years their population has expanded, creating considerable competition for the available land. The Gisu are distinguished by a high rate of homicide (one of the highest in the world) and their personal relations are subject to considerable suspicion, jealousy, and fear of witchcraft. Poisonings are common, especially within families. As a people the Gisu do not have a particularly violent demeanor, yet it is into a context of violence that their initiation ceremony fits.

Throughout a Gisu boy's life, and particularly in the months preceding his initiation, he is taught to fear both the pain of circumcision (here involving, in addition to removal of the foreskin, considerable scraping of subcutaneous fat) and also the certainty of social ostracism if he should flinch under the knife. These twin fears contribute to the trauma of an event which preoccupies much of Gisu life. Once he has successfully passed it, a young man willingly accepts the premises of the existing adult world, and he in turn takes up the responsibility (and delight) of intimidating boys facing their circumcision.
What was of particular interest in filming this situation was the opportunity to show not only the workings of a social mechanism which demands certain performances from its members, but also the human response of specific individuals to a functional but essentially disagreeable means of socialization. The bulk of the Gisu footage concerns preparatory events which reveal the wider social resonance of circumcision through the experiences of the two initiates. They are seen not as symbols but as individuals, and it is through them that the force of social mechanisms becomes understood. Sapir's words might stand as a perfect theoretical underpinning for this kind of filming: "In spite of all that has been claimed to the contrary, we cannot thoroughly understand the dynamics of culture, of society, of history, without sooner or later taking account of the actual interrelationships of human beings."

What will be difficult in presenting this footage will be to avoid echoing the dramatic forms of our own society, and therefore calling forth psychological and cultural interpretations which apparently make sense but which misconstrue the sense of Gisu life. At the same time, it will be necessary to organize the material according to a logic recognizable in our own society, without which the inevitable selectivity of raw footage inadvertently intrudes its own distortions.

Our filming among the Gisu occupied us for about two months. During this time we had the cooperation of Makerere University College in Kampala and worked with the assistance of Suzette Heald, who had been doing predoctoral research in Bugisu for almost three years.

At the completion of the Gisu filming I remained in Uganda with the intention of making another ethnographic film. My wife and I spent some time in conversation with Peter Rigby and other anthropologists at Makerere discussing possible projects. I wanted to find someone engaged in field work in Uganda who would welcome the making of a film as an extension of his own work and who had achieved an intimate knowledge of the people among whom he was living.

Before making the Gisu film, when we had been exploring similar possibilities, I had been drawn to the idea of a film about the Acholi, who at least traditionally were herders in the north of Uganda. This was my third stay in Africa and the fourth year I had lived there, but my experience of African pastoralists was slight; yet the quality of pastoral life and its imagistic possibilities held a strong attraction for me. Toward the end of the filming in Bugisu I had made a two day trip into Karamoja District and had been struck by the physical and social grace of the Karamojong people.

The memory of this now stayed with me in Kampala, and when it finally seemed that all the anthropologists in Uganda had either just begun their fieldwork or just completed it, or were away on leave, I approached Kenneth Gourlay, an ethnomusicologist who had been studying the music of Karamoja for the past three years. Gourlay could not go north with us to Karamoja, but in a memorable evening he infected us with his enthusiasm for the area and its people. He also gave us the names of friends and informants in Moroto, the main administrative center. With Gourlay's help, and with the studies by Gulliver and Dyson-Hudson available, we decided to go ahead sans anthropologist.

Our first and most important contact was a Jie secondary school student who had been one of Gourlay's informants. We made several trips with him to Jieland, some seventy-five miles north of Moroto, where he introduced us to his relatives and friends. One friend, a young agricultural officer, eventually became our primary contact with the homestead in which we would do most of our filming.

The Jie occupy a dry, windswept plain edged by mountains. From the air their homesteads and kraals must look like brown coral reefs scattered over a dun-colored sea. They cultivate some sorghum, but their area is a marginal one for agriculture. The basis of their economic and social life is their cattle. Their outlook and institutions belong unmistakably to what Herskovits termed the "cattle
"complex." Each year during the dry season they move most of their herds to the west into an area of wooded savanna near the Acholi border where water and grazing are abundant. This seasonal movement allows the grazing in the homestead to renew itself.

It was only through care and good luck that we were able to film in Jieland. The prospects were hardly encouraging. Under the British protectorate Karamoja had been a restricted area, and this condition had been maintained in many respects since independence. Travel was theoretically restricted, and visitors were forbidden to take photographs, presumably because the nudity of the tribes was a source of official embarrassment. The area was also beset at this time by intertribal cattle raids, the worst of them directed at the Jie by Turkana raiders from across the Kenya border armed with automatic weapons. Against them the Jie, armed only with spears, were defenseless. A further complication was that a short commerical film exploiting the exotic and sensational aspects of Karamoja had been made a few years before, much to the government's displeasure.

Through our ties with Makerere we introduced ourselves to the Karamoja District Commissioner and were able to convince him of our good intentions. Luckily he was sympathetic and gave us further letters of introduction to the Assistant District Commissioner in Jieland, the County Chief, his Sub-County Chiefs (all these holdovers from the British apparatus of "indirect rule") and the police garrison. With all this paperwork we felt impressively armed. Only months later did we learn how precarious our position became at one point when a visiting cabinet minister disapproved of our presence and was only mollified by the A.D.C., with whom we were on friendly terms.

Even more than in the Gisu filming, I wanted in our work among the Jie to use the camera to penetrate situations of informal social behavior, which I felt previous ethnographic films, with their predilection for ritual behavior and material culture, had given all too scant attention. Through situations revealing the concerns of specific individuals it seemed that a different kind of picture of the values of pastoral peoples could be achieved. Indeed, the unemphatic situations which interested me were precisely the kind through which most field workers accumulate their understanding of a society, yet which all too rarely make their appearance in finished monographs.

The film footage which we shot over approximately five months contact with the Jie will reveal certain traditional attitudes and patterns of life against the background of an intruding economic and social system. Although the Jie are at present remarkably independent, they are within a generation or two of a radical re-acculturation. This is already evident in taxation, the harbinger of a cash economy. In order to pay taxes, the Jie must sell cattle at monthly government-sponsored auctions. For a people who do not regard cattle as negotiable this amounts to a direct assault upon their values and institutions. The traditional culture stands out all the more clearly in the light of what is coming. Change is inevitable for the Jie as for most preliterate peoples. What matters is whether or not they will be able to find modes of social and economic life which extend rather than contradict the uniquely valuable things which their culture has evolved.

This film will be completed by the Spring of 1971. Toward the end of our stay in Jieland, when we went to one of the seasonal camps in the west, we were able to make a shorter, more fragmentary film in the odd moments when not occupied with the major one. Called NANI, it was released in the fall by Churchill Films and is intended primarily for use in schools.

During the first few months of contact with the Jie we did no filming, although we made it clear that eventually we wanted to take pictures. Instead, we devoted this time to establishing friendships in a single homestead and learning some of the basic elements of the language. We also decided against having an interpreter at the start because we wanted our initial contacts, however crude, to be as direct as
possible. One result was that we were often forced to rely upon more universal kinds of communication than speech, a proceeding which sometimes mystified our hosts but seemed to assure them of our good will.

When we did begin to film we very soon had our equipment with us always, establishing the fact that now we were doing our work while others did theirs. I had my Eclair mounted on a special pack-frame brace so that my eye was always at the eyepiece. I went through the following months in this manner, sometimes carrying the camera twelve or more hours a day. There was little to indicate when I was filming and when I was merely observing. The Nagra recorder was carried on a similar brace by my wife, who took all the sound.

One aspect of filming in this manner was that in the midst of events remarks and even whole speeches were addressed to us, and sometimes our questions encouraged this. Although many films attempt to exclude an awareness of the presence of the filmmaker, some of this footage is so much more revealing than what might have been gathered from a stance of aloofness that I have no intention of eliminating it. Probably it is time ethnographic filmmakers in general ridded themselves of the old convention of the "invisible" camera inherited from the fiction film, even though many of their efforts (as were ours) are bent on being unobtrusive.

Before leaving Uganda we and two Jie assistants made transcripts and translations of our fifty-odd recorded tapes, producing some 600 pages of foolscap, including notations about footage, recorder stops, and camera synchronization. Such a record has value in itself, but it is of course essential in editing and subtitling a film in a language with which one is only slightly familiar.

The work in Jieland is only one step towards a film record which eventually will represent all of the tribes of an important culture area lying north of the Bantu-speaking region of Uganda and east of the Nile to Lake Rudolph and beyond. It is important that this record consist not only of the material and structural aspects of these pastoral societies but also convey their emotional life, which has little abstract reality outside the human encounters in which it is expressed. With this in mind I intend to make additional films about the Jie in coming years.

David MacDougall, Rice University

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION FILM SCREENINGS, 1970

(Editors' note). The following two articles by Jack Sanders are his reactions to the AAA film screenings at San Diego. Jack Sanders is a student of anthropology and film at Portland State University. Last Spring he completed his first 16mm sound film, A MAN AND HIS WORK, an urban ethnographic film about a public works employee, a sewer department foreman.

Filmmaker or Anthropologist?

The state of anthropological film as evidenced at the AAA film screenings is grim indeed. It seems to me that the vast majority of those making anthropological films lack an appreciation of the language of film, or are even aware that this unique language even exists. It seems strange, with linguistics being of capital interest to growing numbers of anthropologists, that the language of moving images is so thoroughly neglected.

This becomes glaringly apparent in films made by those who take up film later in their careers; first as a research tool, eventually as a presentation device. By-passing serious study of film and technique, they seem to think that all they need to know is how to operate a camera and splice together the rolls of film. If a presentation is desired, that is scant knowledge for the job required.
Today's audiences, academic or otherwise, have grown critically accustomed to viewing sophisticated presentations of moving images. "Home movie" style just won't do. If valuable information is presented in a formless, haphazard manner, the viewer just won't watch it as closely as if it were more carefully done.

For film to communicate effectively, it should create an interaction between viewer and screen. They should be as "in sync" with one another as two people in conversation. This is an ideal, of course, but for most effective film communication it should be the standard. Information contained in anthropological film should be presented in such a way as to generate this vital interaction. It is as legitimate to attempt this in anthropological film as in any other genre.

One of the simplest ways to describe the effect this type of communication has, is to say that the film "stays with you," that it leaves a lasting impression, a feeling of physical presence with the images. THE NUER achieves this, as does FAMILY OF MAN. Conversely, TIBETAN TRADERS or IMAGINERO fails to produce this interaction, for a number of reasons. These last two films fall short of their assumed goals of credibility.

Competence in anthropological filmmaking requires an appreciation of the art of film, as well as skill in production. Too often this fact is overlooked. The understanding of film language, which normally arises from a comprehensive exposure to all sorts of films, is as necessary a part of filmmaking as the proper use of the camera, tape recorder, and editing equipment. Only by viewing film critically and knowing what "works" and doesn't "work" - and why - can an individual begin to exercise film sense in his own work. It's a reciprocal thing. Working at the editing bench increases one's understanding of what he sees on the screen, and seeing films gives him a better idea of what can be done at the editing bench.

Exposed footage and recorded sounds are the raw materials from which a film is made. Montage, the arrangement of these sounds and images, is shaped and formed at the editing bench, from the material itself, and should not be the response of some dogmatically-phrased memo from the "higher up". Freedom must exist to allow the montage to grow out of the material and not be arbitrarily forced upon it. This is not meant to exclude scholarly, but appreciative, supervision.

Filmmaking is a creative process, it takes time for ideas to be nurtured and reach maturity. Writers are not expected to crank out brilliant material by the clock. Neither should filmmakers be expected to produce exciting and original films by the hour. Shoot the film and make tape recordings in the field and then give the filmmaker the time it takes to create a worthy film, doing justice to the original effort and intentions. Of course, the old adage about "a silk purse out of a sow's ear" holds true. If the raw material is of inferior quality then the result, no matter how well the material was manipulated, will reflect this.

A written rough draft of a manuscript is seldom the version that appears in print. So why expect a first version of a film to be the best one? A number of films shown at San Diego could have been improved greatly by an additional editing. This would have refined their use of film language in much the same way that revisions in a manuscript polish and enhance their use of written language.

Unless this attitude is adopted, unless anthropologists begin to use the medium of moving images with an appreciation and understanding of its language, they will continue, with few exceptions, to be responsible for producing substandard films, doing discredit to the dignity of their film subjects.

Does all of this mean that anthropologists lacking any sort of film experience, and desirous of using film, must put aside everything else and study film for a year or two? Though an ideal, this is perhaps asking too much. A more acceptable and profitable idea is to encourage students of anthropology to spend some time with film, to develop dexterity in both areas. In this case, they should be exposed to film as undergraduates, to allow them a more confident hand as graduate students. Eventually, their role in anthropology departments would be to educate their predecessors, in a subtle way, to the uniqueness of the medium, the structure of film language, and the infinite possibilities for film in anthropology.
If this direction is taken, then, perhaps a few years from now anthropologists will deserving be credited with combining their distinct talents as students of man with a competent and sensitive use of film.

Archaeological Films

If films are to be made on archaeological subjects, they should be conceived with the intention of producing an edited presentation film, with all the costs and time that involves. No longer should these films be the result of "taking along a Bolex and some Kodachrome II." They must be conscientiously planned as part of the project, and not the result of some quasi-enthusiastic "afterthought".

Good films cost time and money - they don't just happen. If an expeditionary team, for example, is willing to commit itself to the making of a good film document of its work, using film language as interpreted by a competent filmmaker (perhaps an anthropologist himself) provided with the necessary time and materials, the result would be a permanent, moving, visual record of their energies and its result. Anything short of such a commitment would result in unacceptable film and a defeat of purpose.

A well-made film could go beyond documenting the fieldwork itself, interesting as it may be. It could tie in images (from museums, university collections, etc.) of the results of previous expeditions in the same area, illustrating relationships between earlier and new evidence, developing new hypotheses, or concluding earlier ones. A film like this, similar to the new films by Julien Bryan, would testify to an understanding of the language of film.

In planning an archaeological film, be it about an expedition or illustrating an hypothesis, plan it all the way through - from research to release print. It is no longer adequate to use a spring driven camera and film stock meant only for the projection of the original, such as Kodachrome II. Skillful shooting and sound recording (synchronous or "wild") in the field, work prints for editing, sound mixing, studio rental, special effects, A and B rolls for printing - these are items which must be budgeted if the desired result is a professional-appearing film that will hold the interest of today's critical audiences long enough for the message to come across. Judging from the archaeological films screened this fall in San Diego, this area of filmmaking is in dire need of a professional "shot in the arm".

Jack W. Sanders, Portland State University

FILMING WITHIN A FAMILY

Neil sat on the couch, dozing. The camera was in his lap, the battery beside him. I sat on a small canvas campstool, recorder on my knees, long silver microphone pointed at the ceiling. The refrigerator motor ran noisily. I got up, Neil opened an eye and closed it. By spinning a flimsy plastic wheel to the left, the motor was silenced (remember to turn it back on).

There was a stirring in the bedroom near us. The alarm would go off soon. I didn't bother to sit again. Neither of us were used to getting up this early, less-used to sitting in the dining room of a sleeping suburban California house. In a few minutes Gigi (Marguerite, "...but call me Gigi") would arise, put on a gray housecoat with red trim, and walk to the kitchen to begin making four lunches and four breakfasts. Somewhere mid-way in the process she'd climb the stairs, pause at the top and look out the window, walk to one of the two bedrooms, and begin waking the children. More often than not we'd film this entire process and much of the breakfast that followed. We'd always film the maelstrom of leave-taking. Between 8:30 and 9, when the house was empty, we'd go our separate ways. We'd be ready again at 3 to welcome David 11, and Amy 8 home from school. George 14, and Lisa 16, would come soon after. Gigi would usually make it by 4. Harry, the
father and husband would arrive before 7 but never before 5:30. His entrance was always filmed, as was most of dinner. We camped in the house until all were stowed in bed. Our criteria for filming were loose but, in general, encompassed two broad areas: 1. The fabric or "daily round" of the family, and 2. The presence (or absence) of active concourse that would be intelligible on film and a) that would flesh-out characters or b) interaction that would seem to typify (or deviate from) an important pattern.

Within these filmed phenomena, we looked for as many layers of communication as possible. Although dialogue was always accorded importance, Neil had freedom to explore positions, distances, gestures, etc. at his discretion.

As might be expected, we shot a great deal of film.

Neither of us had any particular background in anthropology. I've been making documentary films for nine years, getting progressively more fascinated by the more subtle human interaction. Neil is a young and very good cinematographer with uncommon sensitivity. I'd grown bored and impatient with films about people that treated only phenomena - usually the sorts of phenomena that would need minimal changes to become the bases for commercial television drama.

Film provides the audience a window. The camera moves the window around the wall that separates us from the lives of others. If we are forced to move too quickly, given only fragmentary glimpses, or directed to irrelevancies, we grasp at the familiar, the easily ingested, too often the stereotypical.

The family interests me for several reasons. It provides a small group of people that, once acclimated to the camera, are able to function without the disruption of unacclimated individuals. The roles and general relationships are familiar, allowing more immediate access and attention to subtleties, variations, etc. Most importantly, the family seems to be one of the most commonly-experienced and poorly-understood universalities. Only recently has the requisite equipment and social and scientific climate made possible excursions (or intrusions) into highly personal areas of human activity.

Placing a family before an audience via the medium of film or videotape (Jacques Kaswan, Lenore Love, Daphne Bugental, UCLA Department of Psychology) seems to alter or dilute some elements, but to throw others into bold relief. This has seemed to work best when the audience knew in advance that it was to accord more acute attention to the elements of common character and relationships than the melodramatic, quirky, or deviant.

To be more exact, film seems to powerfully delineate broad situational and/or character traits. The audience acquires a "feel" for the moods, roles, tactics and emotions of people in the film more quickly and accurately than they might as real-life observer-participants. Film seems to grant distance and objectivity. To be sure, film does not grant completeness. Thus, it is not able to stand alone as a source if a thorough description is desired. Yet, its clarity and intensity can often exceed the capabilities of print and oral accounts.

As a filmmaker I am not constrained by the demands of scientific discipline. I need not control or, at the very least, account for all relevant elements of a situation. I can afford to countenance some loose ends in the interest of a more widely-useful film. And I am forced to countenance some loose ends simply because the medium is limited in what it can do.

In addition to the family videotapes of Kaswan, Love, and Bugental previously mentioned, I base the above hopeful assumptions on privileged viewings of the work of Albert Scheflen and Joseph Schaeffer at Bronx State Hospital and some of Ray Birdwhistell's and Jacques Van Vlack's films. Of crucial importance to me has been Birdwhistell's pointed and illuminating guidance to the several levels of activity within the film, and Margaret Mead's historic work with film and its analysis.

The film is now being edited and should be available within three months. I'd like to add a few additional thoughts in closing.
It's hard to do a sales job via print, but it's about time that the old wheeze about the camera "altering or shaping" the way the subjects behave is placed in proper perspective. There is a period of three or four days when a general (but subtle) reticence is present. A cascade of "life" seems to break through after these few days. The filmmaker suddenly feels more a part of the furniture and the frequency and level of undistracted interaction rises. Is it all valid, all unaffected? Certainly not. It is a representation of that group's truly unaffected behavior. Who is to say that it is less useful than the altered representations of printed and oral accounts?

Finally, my preference is to place jurisdiction over the film in the hands of the subjects. They have rights to destruction of all or part of it at any time. It is a rare privilege to be allowed access to people's lives and no amount of benefit to the film's audience can outweigh the subjects' right to control this access.

I'd be delighted to correspond with anyone who has an interest in this area of work.

Hubert Smith
36 Avenue 18, Venice, CA 90291

OUT THERE --

Perhaps relevant to the present discussions as to how much cinema should be in an ethnographic film is the following:

After fifteen years with the United States Information Service as a cinematographer I resigned to make a film on my own. I took my savings, my wife and six weeks old son to the isle of Ullung-do in the Japan Sea. We were the first outsiders to live on Ullung-do and that is why we came. To make one film. This was 1966. It took three years.

My approach was basically this:

No professional actors and no preconceived story idea. I believed if I listened long enough and looked long enough the story and cast would come from right around me. This task ate up the first six months.

No narration or subtitles but sync. dialog used, for those who don't speak Korean, as an effect, not for story development. I believed that by employing cinematic techniques in directing and editing I could still tell a dramatic story, although of necessity, a self explanatory one.

To be unobtrusive. The production crew should be kept to a bare minimum. Use equipment that is not bulky or noisy. If possible, do it all yourself.

Editing should be done along with shooting, in order to take advantage of new situations presented and to improve upon past mistakes. Thus the story line can change.

The right to re-arrange time through editing and to re-stage scenes that happened in the past are pertinent to the story. To re-arrange time is a cinematic necessity. To re-stage scenes may not be favored by some, but without it the filmmaker, be he an anthropologist or not, is limited strictly to the present, which is hardly the way to analyze any situation.

The result of all this is OUT THERE, A LONE ISLAND a 60 min. film which is available for rental and sale through Oceania Productions, 733 Plymouth Road, Claremont, CA 91711. Although OUT THERE is not a conventional ethnographic film it still is of that genre for it shows a society beginning to feel, or perhaps better to say hurt from the encroachments of modernization. The traditional elements still prevail, although there is a feeling this will not last for long. I tried to interpret the truth as I saw it via the film - for isn't truth really a point of view?

Humphrey W. Leynse, Washington State University
TRAINING IN VISUAL ANTHROPOLOGY

(In our continuing efforts to discuss training possibilities in visual anthropology, we have asked anyone teaching such a course to send us a description and syllabus. The Newsletter will continue to publish this information in the hope that it will aid others in their efforts to establish similar programs, and generate some discussion.)

The Editors

Summer Institute In Visual Anthropology

The Department of Anthropology of Temple University in co-operation with PIEF and the Anthropology Film Center will sponsor a Summer Institute in Visual Anthropology (SIVA), June 19 through August 25, 1972. The Institute is supported through a grant from the Division of Graduate Education in Science, National Science Foundation.

PURPOSE

SIVA will train pre-doctoral graduate students and post-doctoral anthropologists in the theories, methodologies, and techniques of a visual approach to the study of man. The Institute will produce anthropologists able to use visual media in their own research and teaching and equip them to establish courses in visual anthropology within the curriculum of a department of anthropology. The Institute will thus fulfill two functions: 1) it will train participants in visual anthropology, and 2) the curriculum is designed so that it can serve as a model for the participants and other anthropologists to use in the creation of similar training programs.

BACKGROUND

For more than forty years, beginning with the work of Margaret Mead, Gregory Bateson and others, anthropologists have attempted to use the technology of film to collect visual data in the field. More recently, anthropologists have come to the realization that mere collection and recording of events was not, in itself, sufficient. The problem has been one of analysis and integration of these materials within the major problems, theories and methodologies of anthropology.

Since Mead and Benedict's Culture At A Distance project (Mead and Metraux, 1953), the way a society represents itself through film has been understood to be a datum of culture in its own right. Again, the problem facing scholars working in this area (e.g. Mead, Metraux, Himmelstein, Weakland, Gerbner and others) has been the development of a theory and a methodology relating their units of analysis to theories and methodologies developed in the study of culture.

The notion of correlating theories of communication, non-linguistic expressive forms and, in particular, visual communicative forms, with anthropology has been one of the most exciting and fruitful areas to emerge in recent anthropological research. Most of these scholars have used as their paradigm, the science of linguistics, e.g. Levi-Strauss (1967) from Jacobsonian phonemics, Lounsbury (1952) and Goodenough (1956) in componential analysis, Birdwhistell (1952) and Hall (1959) stemming from constitutive grammars, and most recently Hymes (1964) and others in the development of socio-linguistics. Many of these scholars came together during the 1962 Conference in Semiotics (Sebeok, 1963) and attempted to formulate a coherent set of problems relating "paralanguage" (as it was called then) to the study of culture. Those aspects of culture which seemed, at that time, most amenable to anthropological clarification and integration were either verbal behavior connected with language by necessity such as inflection, accent, word choice, etc. or behavior connected with language by contiguity such as body movement while speaking and facial expression.

It has only recently become possible to consider visual communication, particularly photographic visual communication (i.e., stills, movies and television) as a form of cultural behavior amenable to similar integration. The possibility has occurred because of the development, if only in embryonic form, of a small body of theory which might be
be subsumed under the heading the ethnography of communication, and further broken down into the ethnography of visual communication. Here the work of Hymes (1967), Worth (1970a, 1970b) and Chalfen (1969) represent one arm extended from the body of anthropology allowing for this integration.

The other arm begins with the films of Robert Flaherty and extends through the whole development of the anthropological documentary film (e.g. the films of Robert Gardner, Jean Rouch, Edgar Morin, Asen Balicki, John Marshall and many others). Again, the development of film as a pedagogical device has been limited by a lack of coordination between the anthropologist's traditional view of his research and teaching and the demands that film production and utilization place upon him. The anthropologist, as a filmmaker or as an educator using films, must see these materials as an integral part of his work or they will forever remain on the periphery.

It is possible, therefore, for the first time in the history of anthropology to bring together a body of theory which enables one to understand how the technology of film is used, how filmmakers actually make films, and how people respond to film (i.e. theories of film and film communication) with a body of theory and a methodology in anthropology which is designed to deal with the problems necessary to explain how this form of communication influences and is influenced by culture.

PROGRAM

While it is possible to bring these two areas together, it must be realized that it has not, up to now, actually been accomplished. To operationalize this goal this experimental training program has been instituted to bring together those people knowledgeable in the theoretical, methodological, and technical aspects of visual anthropology in a setting which will enable them to both develop this new theoretical framework which we are calling the ethnography of visual communication and to test it in an actual field situation with a diverse group of researchers who are themselves working on problems central to anthropological study.

There are three major purposes to be accomplished in this Institute. First, all participants will develop a knowledge of how the technology of film communication functions. The emphasis will be upon presenting alternative methods of capturing an image of an event and then structuring and relating the isolated images in the presentation of a total cultural event within a specific context. The second purpose is to train participants in the various forms of film analysis so that they might discover the form most suited to their particular research purposes. These purposes may range from the micro-semiotic such as kinesics, proxemics, and choreometrics to the macro-semiotic in which one attempts to relate subject matter, narrative style, and actual syntactic and semantic forms to other aspects of culture (e.g. Worth and Adair, 1969). A third goal, but inseparable from what might be called the filmic and semiotic aspects described above, is the development in the participants of a knowledge of the various ways these materials could be used in the context of anthropological education.

FACILITIES

The Institute will consist of an intensive ten week program housed at the Anthropology Film Center in Santa Fe, New Mexico. The Institute will utilize the Center's motion picture production and editing equipment, supplementing, when necessary, with rentals. The participants will have access to the Center's library as well as the eight other anthropological libraries in the Santa Fe area.

STAFF

The Institute will have four full-time staff members: Jay Ruby, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Temple University and Executive Secretary, Program In Ethnographic Film; Karl Heider, Anthropologist, Berkeley, CA; Sol Worth, Professor of Communications, University of Pennsylvania; Carroll Williams, filmmaker, Director of the Anthropology Film Center.
In addition, guest lecturers will be brought in for periods of one to two weeks. Each lecturer has been selected on the basis of his unique contributions to training in visual anthropology. Among the invited lecturers are: Alan Lomax, Columbia University - Choreometrics; Raymond Birdwhistell, University of Pennsylvania - Kinesics; Edward Hall, Northwestern University - Proxemics; Paul Ekman, University of California, Berkeley - Non-verbal communication systems.

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

Twenty participants will be chosen on the following basis:

1) They must be either a graduate student in a Ph.D. program in anthropology or a closely related field (e.g. folklore, communications or sociology) or hold a teaching position in a college or university in the U.S.A.

2) Each applicant will submit either a research proposal which involves the use of visual media or a biographical statement which contains the applicant's interest in and familiarity with visual anthropology.

The directors plan to choose participants with as wide a range of experience and skills as possible. We would wish at least half of the participants to have had some previous experience with audio-visual communication equipment as well as some theoretical and field experience in anthropology. We will choose the other half on the basis of their theoretical and field experience and expect them to acquire technical skills during the Institute.

Persons interested in applying to the Institute should write to SIVA, c/o PIEF, Room 200 South Hall, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa. 19122 for an application form. The deadline for applications is December 15, 1971. Notification of acceptance will be sent by February 1, 1972. Applicants are encouraged whenever possible to have a personal interview with one of the Directors. Interviews can be arranged in Philadelphia, Santa Fe, Berkeley, or during the 1971 AAA Meetings in November.

SUPPORT OF PARTICIPANTS

Each participant will be provided with a stipend which will partially cover the costs of transportation, housing, food and supplies.

CURRICULUM

The curriculum has been designed so that all participants share in a basic core of knowledge. During the initial period the following topics will be covered by lectures, film screenings, discussion, directed readings, and workshops:

1) The history of film (anthropological, documentary and other related styles) from a technological, theoretical, social, research and educational point of view.

2) A survey of the analytic methods developed in anthropology for the study of space (Proxemics), body movements (Kinesics), dance grouping (Choreometrics), sound and song grouping (Cantometrics), film analysis (Content analysis - Mead and Wolfenstein 1953), macro-analysis of long term behavior through the use of videotape (Schaeffer 1970), frame analysis of behavior in public places (Goffman 1959), as well as other forms of non-linguistic communication.

3) The history and development, modes of analysis, and methods of teaching people from other cultures to make films depicting their own view of the world. This section will concentrate on utilizing the "ethnography of communication" model in the analysis of "natively produced" film. We will also attempt to deal with the problem of culture change caused by the introduction of new communication media into a culture (i.e. Does man's self image become altered when he is given a new means of imaging himself?)

Concurrently with these survey seminars, technical and theoretical tutorials and workshops will be conducted introducing primary and secondary skills in the use of still and motion picture cameras (silent and sound), sound equipment - both portable field and studio recording, and portable video field recording. Seminars and tutorials in editing motion picture film, sound and video tape will also be held. In addition, examples of various coding and duplicating methods for creating working research archives will be demonstrated or described.
This section of the program is viewed as a period when all participants will become familiar with the technical, methodological and theoretical foundations of visual anthropology. This basic knowledge will enable them to pursue the more specialized training which constitutes the second half of the Institute. It should be emphasized that it is our belief that visual anthropology depends primarily upon cognitive processes rather than hand skills. There will be no attempt made to develop professional skills in visual media on the part of the participants. Students wishing such training are encouraged to attend other professional training establishments such as the film schools at UCLA or NYU. Our purpose is to familiarize students with the theories about how and why visual and sound media can be organized in a variety of ways for a variety of purposes and consequences. The relationship between anthropological problems and the alternative methods of collecting visual and sound events will be continually emphasized.

During the second half of the Institute, the training will be concentrated on an examination of particular aspects of visual anthropology and on the development of the individual interests of each participant. In addition to the individual training (conducted on a tutorial basis by the staff) the teaching staff will be augmented by a series of visiting lecturers. Each lecturer will devise a set of specific problems which will require all participants to collect data in the field to be analyzed with that lecturer. For example, Edward Hall might ask each participant to collect material, in a medium of the participant's choice, to show some aspect of proxemic behavior. He would then work with the students, clarifying and criticizing the formulation of their problems, their method of collection, and the range and depth of their analysis. The participant's work will provide the basis for a series of seminar-discussions between Hall, the staff, and the participants about proxemics and its role in visual anthropology. The body of material produced from this session on proxemics would also be available to the other visiting lecturers to be commented upon and analyzed according to their particular theoretical constructs. The Institute's participants will thus be able to see how the same material does or does not lend itself to a variety of analyses. For example, a series of still photographs taken to record the dress and stance of a Pueblo culture could be analyzed by Worth from a semiotic or structuralist viewpoint, whereas Ekman might wish to look at the social distance involved in the space between the photographer and subject and its consequence in body position and facial expression.

In addition there will be continual screening of films illustrating both anthropological and filmic history and theory. These films will be viewed and discussed by the staff, participants and visiting lecturers from as many points of view as possible. For example, the early anthropological film, GRASS, might be discussed in terms of how it could be used in teaching, how the same problem would be approached today, or how the film might be studied for micro-analytic purposes. We envision the possibility of viewing the same film four or five times for different faculty and providing the participants with the chance to compare several different view points, uses, and analytic procedures made from the same material.

In the above ways, the objectives of the Institute will be coordinated into a framework of visual anthropology. The participants, by the end of the summer, will have a knowledge of the technology currently available, the theories developed for its use, the theoretical problems in anthropology demanding such use, and experience in gathering such material in the field and analyzing it in accordance with formally and articulated problems. The full time staff will provide the participants with an overview of the field, technical instruction in the use of equipment, and continuity between the specialized knowledge given to them by each of the visiting lecturers and the generalized goals of visual anthropology.
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Portland State University

Winter quarter, 1971, I taught a course entitled "Film in Anthropology" in conjunction with "Introduction to Film Making". In this interdisciplinary course (Department of Anthropology-Center for the Moving Image) we discussed the use of film in various fields of anthropology, screened films which are both good and bad examples, and took a look at the future of film in the discipline, with the goal of improving the technique as a medium; in other words, a better understanding of the language of film.

This course is designed to prepare anthropology students to use film more effectively, to enable them to involve the medium the following year by taking a three-term course, "Film Making I, II, III" in conjunction with their anthropology work. "Film in Anthropology", then, is a springboard for involving the medium of moving images in the study of man.

Jack Sanders, Portland State University
University of Illinois at Urbana

(Editors' note: The following course description is taken from the student handout).

An experimental interdisciplinary seminar in anthropology and photography will be offered Fall Term 1971. The focus of the seminar will be on group interaction. Each participant will select his own research topic within this broad area and will both read the relevant social science literature and take photographs, still or film, black and white or color, on the same topic. Possible seminar topics include race relations, the generation gap, foreign student adaptation, women's liberation, or relations between any two segments of the University community. Each student will define his own problem and the three participating faculty will assist him in the execution of the project.

The anthropologist will lead seminar discussions on selected social science literature reviewing key findings and theories, and the photographers will lead seminar discussions evaluating student photographs, but all three faculty members will attend each session. A major objective of the course will be to explore the connections between verbal and visual communication, not in any abstract theoretical sense and not in terms of any false oppositions between "science" and "art" but by doing, by critically reading and discussing on the one hand and by the production of visual images on the other. Each student will be working on his project and hopefully the social science literature will lend depth to the photography and the photographs in turn will illuminate and comment on the literature. The two approaches taken together may yield more understanding of intergroup relations than either approach taken alone.

The course will be restricted to a total of ten students, either graduate or undergraduate. Prerequisites include knowledge of photography which must be demonstrated by showing a portfolio of previous work and an interest in exploring intergroup relations.

Edward M. Bruner, University of Illinois

NOTICES AND LETTERS

Temple University's Second Annual London Film Seminar

During Summer, 1971, Temple University's School of Communications and Theater will conduct a film seminar in London, England for graduate American and Canadian students. The seminar will feature British film directors, writers, actors, critics, educators, labor leaders, scholars, archivists, documentarians, and government officials in a series of lectures and conversations. Field trips to film studios, archives, museums, libraries, and government offices will complement the lectures.

As was the case in 1970, the meeting place will be in London, and the professors in charge will be Dr. Raymond Fielding, Professor of Communications at Temple University and Mr. Kenneth Adam, Overseas Visitor to Temple University and former Head of the British Broadcasting Corporation's Television Service.

The seminar will be operated in association with the British Film Institute, at whose London offices the resources of the library, the film archive, and the research department will be made available to the members of the seminar.

The seminar will extend from July 5 to August 13. It may be taken either for four units of credit, or may be audited. If taken for credit, a research paper will be required in partial fulfillment of the course's requirements. The enrollment fee, whether for credit or audit is $395.00, not including food, lodging, or transportation. The seminar is intended to accommodate no more than 17 students.

Graduate students in all fields and at all levels, recent college graduates, and post-doctoral students are invited to apply for further information to Dr. Raymond Fielding, School of Communications and Theater, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa. 19122.
Liaison between Anthropologists and Filmmakers

With the increasing activity in the field of anthropological film from both "qualified" and "amateur" filmmakers, liaison between anthropologists and filmmakers becomes more valuable. For people like my wife and I, who want to do little else before we are graved, meeting others involved is crucial in this part of the world.

Many more film projects would succeed if there was greater cooperation between the interested technicians and academics with material available. More important, any potential cooperation is minimized by simple ignorance of each others existence. To constantly attract each other by means of a public noticeboard would help bring potential "teams" together. Therefore, a "Noticeboard" type column in a magazine such as the Newsletter listing film crews and academics working in the field and the addresses, would allow contact by their brothers. I am reminded of a cameraman friend who visited New Guinea in search of material but left one area in despair, only discovering later that an American anthropologist ensconced in "his" village would have eagerly used his professional ability during a previously unrecorded sequence of rituals. Both the cameraman (with his gear and film) and the fieldworker never met, although they were within ten miles of each other. The point is obvious, with so much coming and going, more liaison between them is needed. For myself, I am willing to assist, or join any anthropologists working in this area, who could use me and my gear, but we rarely meet due to our isolation. My own film project with the Biami, which will take approximately six months in the field, could be visited by a student or graduate, and we could learn from each other, apart from the experience gained from the Biami themselves. As one who will often be visiting New Guinea, knowledge of others working there could lead to a combined effort, rather than the usual "independent" struggle.

Our Biami film project has been accepted for an Australian Film Institute Film Grant which allows us, at long last, to begin fieldwork in March.

Jef Doring, 169 Bay Road, BIRRALCE, 2159,
Sydney, Australia

One of PIEF's major jobs is to service the needs of anthropologists concerned with the use of visual media in their work and in assisting anthropologists in making contact with persons outside the discipline who share this interest. PIEF Newsletter is interested in beginning a noticeboard listing anthropologists and film crews in the field anxious to make contact. Send us your name and address and a brief description of your project.

The Editor

Request

I am doing doctoral research in the department of speech communication at Ohio State University in the area of ethnographic film. I would be particularly interested in knowing of any research (centering on the audience and/or communicator) done on ethnographic filmmaking. If you are aware of any research on an ethnic group as filmmakers (such as Worth and Adair's report on the Navaho as Filmmaker, American Anthropologist, 1970) or have any such films available for study, I would appreciate having access to such references, unpublished reports, and films that are available.

Sharon Ruhly, 323 10th Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414
Information Needed on Negro Film Study

The following is an open letter I would like printed in your publication. I believe it is of interest to many filmmakers.

I am assembling a sourcebook for courses in the Negro (or Black) in American film. I would very much appreciate information on the following:

1) Names and distributors of films by Black filmmakers or about Blacks, for inclusion in an index. Films of all categories - documentary, political, consciousness-raising, artistic.

2) Information on the all-Black American ghetto cinema, 1930-1945, which included such films as TWO GUN MAN FROM HARLEM, BRONZE VENUS, SEPIA CINDERELLA, TALL TAN AND TERRIFIC, GOD'S STEP CHILDREN. I am interested in screening the films, stills and other memorabilia, interviewing actors or production people, acquiring prints. I can pay modestly and/or swap information. All replies confidential.

3) Critical material on Blacks in films, including scholarly critiques and papers, political commentary, and personal statements.

All material will be acknowledged, read, and returned if desired. Material used will be contracted for.

Norman Kagan, Cinema Studies, New School for Social Research, 66 West 12 St., New York, NY 10021

(Borrowed from FILMMAKERS NEWSLETTER)

Institute of Social Communications Summer Session

The Summer Session of the Institute of Social Communications from July 6 - August 13, will offer the following courses: Philosophy, Sociology, Theology of Mass Communication; Art and the Mass Media; Public Opinion; History of the Cinema; and workshops in Journalism, Cinema, Radio, and Television. The courses are accredited for the Diploma in University Studies in Mass Communication and are offered both in English and French. For further information contact:

Dr. Andrew Ruszkowski, Institute of Social Communications, Saint Paul University, 223 Main St. Ottawa 1, Ontario, Canada

Catalogue of Educational and Motivational Filmstrips

The World Neighbors, a private non-profit International Development Organization has recently published a catalogue of educational and motivational filmstrips for use at the village level in developing countries. Most all strips have been made in the developing countries. Readers are requested to send information on available filmstrips or slide sets for an updated version of this catalogue. Topics should be rural health, agriculture, village sanitation, cooperatives, community development, literacy, etc. The address of World Neighbors is: 5116 N. Portland Avenue, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73112.

Sanford E. Danziger, M.D.

Announcing T-Verite Productions

T-Verite Productions announces a series of video-tapes and cinema films, produced through the auspices of the Anthropology Department of the University of Colorado. The first of the series is "S.A.A. '70", a 45 minute videotape of the 1970 Society for Applied Anthropology Convention held in Boulder, Colorado which focused on the theme of cultural pluralism. The tape may be obtained for a rental fee of $6. Work now in progress includes a 12 minute Super-8 film of a Krishna-Consciousness group, a 15 minute 16 mm film of 1970 Earth-Day campus activity and a film, STONEHENGE II, an anthropological focus on astrology. Information may be obtained from T-Verite Productions, Department of Anthropology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302.
Incorporating Color Transparencies in a Film

This is in reply to a letter which appeared several issues back from someone who wanted advice on incorporating color transparencies in a film. This procedure is not very difficult and can be lifesaving, when essential visual information is not available in movie form. However, one caution - before deciding to edit stills into a film, the filmmaker should decide very definitely on how the stills are to be presented. In some cases, it is possible to hide the fact that what we are seeing is a still, for example in long scenic establishing shots, one of the most frequent uses of stills. Especially if the camera pans over the still, the filmmaker can get away with a few brief shots without making the audience uneasy. This is also the case if the film consists largely of stills, or long sequences of only stills. But there is a middle ground in which the audience senses dimly that something is wrong but doesn't know quite what, or falls into the practice of examining each new shot as it comes on to see if it's a still. Such ambiguity is destructive and, before adding stills, the filmmaker should know how he is going to avoid it.

The technique is easy. Perhaps the easiest way is to buy a Duplikin III (35 mm slides to 16 mm) or IV (16 mm to 16 mm) from Century Precision Optics. (About $160 each, available in C-mount or Arri mount.) These devices fit directly to the camera and are convenient but rather inflexible, as it isn't possible to pan or crop.

Otherwise, one needs: 1) A heavy, substantial camera support, such as a wooden motion picture tripod with all adjustments locked down. If you have it, you can also use an optical bench - but then, you wouldn't need this information.

2) Something to hold the slide, e.g., as a cardboard box with a hole cut in the bottom the size of the transparency. The best thing is a mechanical stage for a microscope, preferably the kind that have both the x and y drives coming out on the right side, where you can manipulate them while the camera is running (available from Edmund as catalog #30,058 for about $37.) This should be bolted to a piece of metal or plywood painted black and mounted vertically, assuming you will shoot with the camera horizontal. We use a system of chemical apparatus clamps, but you could just screw shelf brackets to the plywood and bolt them to a heavy table.

3) A light source, the right color temperature for the film you are using. The light should be at right angles to the axis of the camera lens, and directed at a white card at a 45 degree angle behind the slide. (This diffuse illumination produces better results than condenser illumination.) Put up a baffle so none of the light strikes the front or back of the slide directly. Mask off any portions of the transparency that you don't intend to photograph. (Use black paper strips stuck with printable flatback tape - it peels off easily.) For color correction, so that the slide will match the footage, put CP Acetate filters between the slide and the white card, far enough from the card so the filter surfaces are out of focus.

If you own an Omega color-head or something similar, with some fooling around you can use the enlarger both to illuminate and hold the slide.

4) A lens and means for extending it. Any slow (f1. 8 or slower) normal or long focus movie lens will work well - for example, a 25mm Kodak Ektar f1.9. Avoid fast lenses and wideangles. I find it convenient to use a lens of longer focal length, it gives more working distance, and use a coated f4 90mm Leitz Elmar.

To fasten the lens to the camera, I recommend extension tubes instead of bellows. Most bellows are too flimsy. Unless you get one that's really substantial, like the old Leitz, support it separately and rigiddly, and drape shotbags over it, bellows will vibrate and blur the image. C-mount extension tubes are available from several sources. If you use an Arriflex I would advise a different system, even if you plan to shoot the stills on a C-mount camera. Use extension tubes with Leica screw mounts: they are cheaper than the C-mount tubes, and the larger diameter decreases flare causing internal reflections. A leica-screw to Arriflex adapter is available from Bolex, Beaulieu, and Spiratone; a leica-screw to Arriflex adapter is available from Century or as the adapter for the older 150mm and 300mm Tele-Kilar lenses made by Kilfitt. Adapters to fit almost any lenses to leica-screw are available as part of the Novoflex system from Burleigh Brooks.
If the image you will be making is bigger than the original image (that is, you will make a copy on 16mm of less than about one quarter of the original slide), you might benefit from a reversing ring, to turn the lens around so what was the rear element now faces the slide. This doesn't help all lenses, the improvement is not that great if you choose a suitable lens to begin with, and the rings often have to be specially machined. If you have to forego this refinement, don't worry about it.

Now you are almost ready to make the copy, which requires two steps, focusing and setting the aperture.

At magnifications near 1:1, one cannot focus by extending the lens, as you are changing both lens-to-film and lens-to-object distances at the same time. Either the camera and lens must be moved as one unit, or the slide must be moved. In this case, it is easier to move the slide, and it is often possible to do this by hand. (Slide the box with the slide taped to the bottom toward and away from you as you peer through the finder.) If you lack the delicate touch required, or intend to do a lot of this copying, it is easier to get a sliding mount for the transparency. One can be made from a rack and pinion from Edmund (catalog #s 40,891 and 60,572, about $26) with rather coarse adjustments, or you can obtain excellent rack and pinion or micrometer dovetail slides from C.H. Stoelting Co. These begin at around $33; their accuracy exceeds that of research microscopes. The other alternative, moving lens and camera as a unit, should be considered if you do a lot of other extreme close-up work in which moving the camera would be easier. In this case, try a universal compound vise (Sears #99 KE 2432C for $36). This 35 pound monster provides a 6 inch movement backwards and forwards, and 5 inches side to side, and the mass dampens vibration. It can be tapped for mounting on a tripod and the camera fitted to the top by clamping a U-shaped piece of metal in the vise and passing a 1/4-20 bolt through that into the camera.

Reflex focusing is essential. If your camera doesn't have reflex focusing, you can use such gadgets as the reflex finder made by Bolex or Birns and Sawyer, which fit into the camera gate and are absolutely accurate, but require opening the camera when you need to focus - or you can add a reflex focusing housing (by Century), or an old screw-mount Leica Viso flex I or Novoflex housing. The latter two can be used with the leica-screw mount adapters mentioned earlier.

The best way to determine exposure is to keep notes and use quartz-iodine bulbs that have nearly constant light output. I use a spot meter and I imagine anyone with a 35mm SLR with spot-reading could use that. Bracket exposures and one will probably be right - if not, your notes will tell you which way to go. Incidentally, pick your f-stop and then adjust the light to suit the stop. For example, Kodak says the aforementioned Ektar performs best at f3.5. So set it at f3.5 and move the light toward and away from the card until you get an f3.5 reading. If you're not panning, you can undercrank the camera - 12 frames per second means an extra f stop of light. If you're not familiar with the performance of your lens, use the rule of shooting closed down two stops from wide open. Don't forget you have to allow for extension in computing exposure. (If the image size is 23% of the object size, increase exposure half a stop; 40%, 1 stop; 75%, one and a half stops; 100% [same size], two stops; and so on. Tables are available in Kodak and other publications.) Don't spend a lot of time trying to measure the exact magnification - get a rough estimate and then bracket exposures.

## SUPPLIERS MENTIONED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century Precision Cine/Optics</th>
<th>C.H. Stoelting Co.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10661 Burbank Blvd.</td>
<td>424 N. Homan Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hollywood, CA 91601</td>
<td>Chicago, IL 60624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Spiratone |
|-------------------------------------------------
| 135-06 Northern Blvd. |
| Flushing, NY 11354 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edmund Scientific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600 Edscorp Bldg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrington, NJ 08007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stevens Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>340 Newport Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Beach, CA 92660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Lord, 2928 Santa Monica Blvd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica, CA 90404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
American Film Institute's Guide to College Film Courses

This edition of AFI's Guide, covering 1970-71, documents the state of film study, its growth and trends in the changing scene on the American college campus. Each of the over 300 schools surveyed for the Guide has provided a brief paragraph summarizing the philosophy, priorities and aims of the school's film program, and a list of all film courses offered. Special features of this 160-page soft-bound edition are a separate breakdown of schools by degrees granted, a section listing schools which offer film study courses for teachers and the designation of the 70 schools which have 35 mm screen- ing facilities on campus.

AFI's Guide to College Film Courses, 1970-71 may be obtained for $2.50 from the American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, IL 60611. (AFI Education Members receive the Guide as a membership service.) For further information contact: Sali Ann Kreigsman (202) 347-9311. In New York contact: Howard Haines (212) 421-6720.

American Anthropologist Film Reviews

If you have a film that you want reviewed in the American Anthropologist or if you wish to review a film, please write to Timothy Asch, A.A.Film Review Editor, 73 Frost Street, Cambridge, Mass. 02140.

PIEF Newsletter is published by Program In Ethnographic Film, a committee of the American Anthropological Association, through a grant from the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. The deadline for the submission of copy for the next issue is July 1. Please send your contributions double-spaced and in duplicate to: Editor, PIEF, Room 200 South Hall, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa. 19122.

Permission to reprint articles or notices is not required, but please cite us as the source and send us a copy of the publication.