CRITERIA TO EVALUATE ANTHROPOLOGICAL FILM

What is required of an anthropologist in making an anthropological film? What should an anthropologist expect of a film that is to be used for teaching or research? What follows is an attempt to answer these questions by establishing a set of criteria to evaluate anthropological film. By viewing anthropological film as a communication from a scientist and by asking what are the appropriate behaviors for anthropologists in producing, using or evaluating film I hope to both establish and justify the criteria to the end of making the use of film in anthropology both more effective and consistent with the aims of anthropology.

There are a number of problems in not only establishing such a set of criteria but also in communicating the criteria. One major problem stems from the fact that film is viewed in two diametrically opposed ways by anthropologists. For some, film is considered as “art” and as such should be approached in terms of aesthetics as subjective expression or as an idiosyncratic view of the world. For other anthropologists, film is viewed as an objective recorder of reality. It captures the “truth.”

Another problem derives from the fact that anthropologists, in general, have paid little attention to the origin, nature and functions of anthropological communications. They haven’t placed their communications in a communication framework and rarely revealed how and why they have produced the messages that they have. While there is beginning to be a more explicit and systematic concern with written anthropological messages, film has not been subjected to the same kind of scrutiny.

Finally, another possible source of confusion is disagreement over what is meant by the term “anthropological film.” Emile Rahman de Brigard, in a “History of Ethnographic Film” (1971), has surveyed the varied approaches to and uses of film in anthropology. Primarily, film has been viewed as a recording device for the analysis of behavior, as a form of entertainment, as a teaching device and as a source of data about the filmmaker and his culture, particularly through content analysis. A more common label for anthropological film is “ethnographic film,” with the implication that the film is a visual ethnography. Quite common to definitions of ethnographic of anthropological film, even in recent articles, is the assumption that they treat the behaviors of primitive or non-Western peoples (MacDougall 1969; Goldschmidt 1972).

Given the varied and often conflicting approaches to film and its uses in anthropology and the general failures to view film as part of a communication process, it is important that we begin to explicitly and systematically base the uses of film in anthropology on an understanding of the nature of the film communication process and on what can be considered appropriate behavior for anthropologists as anthropologists.

The most useful definition of anthropological film for our purposes has been provided by Sol Worth, who has pointed out that there is no way to label a class of films as ethnographic by solely describing the film. Adopting a functional stance, he prefers to define anthropological film “as any film whose makers or viewers intend to use it to study the customs and peoples of the world” (1968). Any film in such a definition is anthropological if it is intended for use or used in an anthropological fashion.

Using functional criteria, Worth labels two categories of film: Film can be used as a means of data retention, collection and transmission, in which case the cognitive system and value structure of the data collector are also data, or as phenomena of culture in their own right, in which case the film can be used for the analysis of the cognitive process and coding patterns of the filmmaker (1968). In any case, no film is a simple, magical record of “reality,” but is in part “about” the cognitive processes of the data collector or filmmaker.

Jay Ruby has distinguished two basic categories of anthropological film, using intent and the associated techniques employed as a means of classification (1971). The first, research films, are primarily designed for gathering data and can be considered as “a visual note taking device analogous to the tape recorder or even the pencil and paper . . . The intent is to gather visual information which will be analyzed at a later time” (Sorenson 1967). A second category of films is labeled interpretive films, which are “more intentionally interpretive . . . and are edited constructions of cultural events which vary in their degree of interpretation . . .” (Ruby 1971). Ruby also points out that these interpretive films or documentaries are used for teaching, usually to supplement or illustrate written materials. It is primarily this second category of film that I shall focus on. This consideration leads me to reformulate Worth’s definition for the purposes of this article.

Worth’s definition, although by far the most useful, is misleading since an important use of film in anthropology is
for pedagogical purposes. Educational anthropological films in the classroom are not used so much for the study of the behavior of the people recorded on film, but for the illustration of anthropological concepts. Films are often used to reflect or make concrete patterns of significance from an anthropological point of view. Such films, then, are not "about" the people depicted, but "about" the behaviors of anthropologists. They are not used to generate hypotheses, nor as evidence to support a hypothesis in a formal sense. Worth's definition might be broadened to reflect this consideration. Rephrased, it might read, anthropological film can be defined as a film whose makers or viewers intend to use it to study the customs and peoples of the world, or to illustrate anthropological approaches to such a study.

This definition would have us consider what the viewers of such a film should expect in order to "study" the behaviors that the film records. What kinds of information should they be provided with, both filmically and non-filmically? Again, we ask, what are the appropriate behaviors for anthropologists in making or using anthropological film?

My criteria are derived from three sets of concerns. One set follows from the fact that anthropological film is a scientific communication. A second derives from the fact that anthropological film is a communication that should utilize anthropological approaches to behavior. The third set stems from the fact that anthropological film is a particular kind of film communication, and thus must be judged on the basis of how successful the communicator employs the medium in conveying his message. While the categories are not mutually exclusive, we could ask, is the film "good science," "good anthropology," and "good film"?

To answer such questions in any extensive manner would entail the use of much more space than is available here. In addition, to adequately sketch the models of communication that underlie the approach to film taken here and to further indicate their limitations would entail lengthy aside. What I have done, quite simply, is to utilize the efforts of Sol Worth (1968) to develop a semiotic of ethnographic film and to treat film as a "non-art," and the efforts of George Gerbner (1960, 1961) to develop a general model of communication that deals with questions of the "truthfulness" or validity of messages or statements. Combining the two models by placing Worth's conception of film communication in the context of Gerbner's general model of communication, useful insights are generated into the nature and function of anthropological film.

In conceptualizing the film communication process, Worth has concentrated on "developing an analytic framework for the study of communication based on the semiotic characteristics of the film code." His primary objective is to understand better how "film is encoded and decoded, and the relationships between the filmmaker's implications and the audience member's inferences" (1972:233). While Worth states that contextual variables are important, it is Chalfen who has systematically focused on this aspect of the film communication process (1972). He supplements Worth's contribution by examining the social activities and cultural patterns surrounding the film communication process.

Worth's model makes clear that film is by no means a magic copier of reality which captures the "truth" but is the product of selection and interpretation of a filmmaker. The filmmaker attempts to transfer his "meanings" or implications to celluloid. The viewer, on the other hand, makes inferences from the images that he perceives. Whether there is a fit between what the filmmaker implies and what a viewer infers is problematic but in part depends upon the establishment of conventions that facilitate such a fit. In the case of anthropological film, the absence of such conventions contributes to the often contradictory or conflicting meanings inferred from the same piece of film.

Using this model we see that the filmmaker always "appears" in this film. The cognitive processes, the coding patterns, the selections and rejections of film topics, and the approaches to filming an event are reflected in the film product. As Ruby puts it, "Any filmmaker makes constant subjective decisions: choice of topic and actors, camera placement, type of lens, length of scene, and so forth. All of these decisions are based upon his evaluation of the best way to depict the event" (1971:36). Worth's view is that these choices can be used to tell us something about the data collector or filmmaker and about the process of sign making and using.

But there is another implication directly relevant to my effort to establish a set of evaluative criteria. By the nature of the communication process, the problem is not whether the filmmaker should appear in the film—he cannot be left out of it—but how. His appearance is either covert or overt. The filmmaker can "make himself public," or leave it to the viewer to ferret out the answers to who and why. Leaving his presence covert places a greater reliance on the inferential capacities of the viewers. Also, as Lewis Dexter has pointed out, "to establish the intentions of a source demands a considerable knowledge of the circumstances under which the message is uttered, the purpose the speaker has in view, the assumptions about human behavior and the audience which he presupposes" (1964:18). Dexter's comments were made with reference to the fact that such information could not be expected within the context of mass communications, but it should be expected for a scientific or educational communication. The users of such communication are entitled to know,
among other things, how and why the film was made, and who the filmmaker was, so they can assess the “truthfulness” or validity of a communication. To put it another way, it is a question of where and how the filmmaker makes himself public—whether filmically or extra-filmically. Here is where Gerbner’s comments on the communication process are most applicable.

For Gerbner, a communication model must include reference to what a communication is “about.” He points out that many models of communication fail to include reference to a “reality” outside of the communicating agent, or to the event to which the communication refers. Without such a referent we have “no way of explaining, evaluating or even understanding the message . . . we cannot ask questions about its truth or validity . . .” (1961:9-10).

Gerbner has stated that the truth value of communication is a function of contextualization.

Truth in communication is a relational attribute of content. It is not a “thing” that exists independently of statements. The truth of a statement is a measure of its adequacy and coherence to the event it stands for (or proposition for which it stands) we need to examine its correspondence to the event (in the conventional forms of a culture), its adequacy in emphasis, intensity, etc., and its coherence with other statements about the event known to be true or false (1961:30).

When Gerbner speaks of validity, he is referring to the content of communication, not simply in terms of what is recorded, but in terms of the point of view or approach taken to what is recorded. “The question of validity focuses attention not on the fidelity or accuracy of a statement but on the value attributes imparted through the particular approach or ‘point of view’ apparent in the message. One can photograph the same face in ways that make equally ‘true’ likenesses appear ‘good’ or ‘evil’ . . .” (1961:32).

Gerbner’s model makes clear that the user of a scientific communication should have access to a wide range of data to assess the fidelity and validity of the communication. The anthropological filmmaker is obligated to make public information on how he arrived at the implications he did to assist in this process of evaluation and understanding. Verbal supplements to film may be necessary to contextualize or clarify the events on film, or filmic conventions may be generated to convey the necessary information. In any case, appropriate behavior for an anthropological filmmaker entails making explicit a great deal of information that is often neglected. The Warner Module Series is one recent positive contribution to providing this kind of information.

I have dealt extensively on the first of the three concerns—film as scientific communication—because anthropologists have consistently failed to consider film as part of a scientific communication process. My comments on the two other sets of concerns will be a bit briefer.

If it is to be used for study or illustration, anthropological film should utilize or reflect anthropological approaches to behavior. Are the behaviors or events depicted in a film presented as culturally patterned and socially regulated? Are the patterns approached as learned and shared, or placed in such a context? For example, does a film attempt to “explain” behavior by positing “good guys” and “bad guys,” or does it relate the behaviors of each category to role obligations, world view, political and economic processes, etc.?

The structuring of film form to adequately reflect the patterns and processes of the societies that are depicted is a quest of some filmmakers (MacDougall 1971:24). This quest involves a set of anthropological and filmic considerations as well as scientific ones. The order that is inferred for the event by the filmmaker should reflect an anthropological focus on the event. The implications that are transferred to film entail the use of the medium to convey the structure perceived by the filmmaker. And finally, the viewer infers the structure of the event from the filmic statement if the fit is successful. The film conventions that the filmmaker uses are crucial to the process if the communication is not only to be successful, but accurate or valid. Ultimately, the filmic decisions should be rooted in anthropological approaches to the subject matter.

A further obligation of the anthropological filmmaker is to contextualize the film communication. If a film is intended for educational purposes, for example, and is “about” a very complex or exotic series of events, the viewer is assisted if the events are placed in context, either visually or through other means. Asch’s technique of covering the same material twice in his film The Feast is an example of contextualization. The production of anthropological film should be founded upon the systematic and explicit application of scientific, anthropological and filmic considerations. The obligations for any producer of anthropological film can be phrased as a set of questions.

1. Has the filmmaker provided information on how he made the film?
2. Has he “made himself public,” and revealed his social identity and his role in the filmed events?
3. Has the filmmaker indicated his intent in producing the communication?
4. Has the filmmaker revealed the data and the approaches to events that he used to infer a structure for the events?
5. Has the filmmaker used an anthropological framework to order the events filmed? (Has he focused on learned, shared patterns, and has he related atypical or deviant events to such a context?)
6. Has the filmmaker contributed to anthropological theory or methods?
7. Does the film impart information that is useful for anthropological study and/or teaching?
8. Has the filmmaker conveyed the “patterns of significance” he intended?
9. Has the filmmaker made the appropriate filmic decisions to make the film “believable” and “true”?
10. Has the filmmaker demonstrated competence with respect to (a) technical considerations and (b) filmic conventions?
11. Has the filmmaker produced a film which is usable as produced or packaged?
12. Has the filmmaker contextualized his communication?

While the task of satisfying such a set of criteria or “obligations” does make the filmmaker’s job more demanding, the films that result may be more useful for research and teaching. At the least it should make it impossible to approach the production of an anthropological film as if it were a home movie. And for teachers, such a list of “obligations” or questions means asking of a film a number of questions that all too often go unasked. Most importantly, answering such a set of
criteria can only lead to a more sophisticated understanding of the film communication process and the uses of film in anthropology.
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A LETTER FROM PAT LOUD

Copyright © 1973 by Pat Loud

Editor’s Note: The following letter was circulated by Ms. Loud to members of the Forum for Contemporary History. We have secured permission to reprint it here and are doing so because it represents one of the few occasions when the subject of a documentary has articulated its reactions to being filmed.

It isn’t only the critics and the firehouse sociologists—people we’ve known for years—ask us, in one way or another, why we did it. Why did we let the cameras in, and once in, why did we let them roll on, over our lives, apart and together, soaking up things that many people wouldn’t tell their lovers or tax accountants? I don’t want to pretend that the answer to that question is easy, but I’ll bet it’s a lot less complicated than the answer to a question that I think is even more interesting and that, yet, few of the critics and reporters seem to want to trouble their heads over.

The question is, what nerve have we touched? Why has An American Family become the hit of the public television season? What is it that has switched on the audience—particularly the heavy thinkers, popular essayists, beautiful people, cocktail party analysts, the dealers in novels from Truman Capote and Shana Alexander, right down to Cleveland Amory? I would like to know; I want really to know. In part to help make sense out of what’s been happening to us lately, but also for what it tells us about the pretensions of television, and especially that part of the medium that prides itself on serving up popular education. If we can find some answers to those questions, the question Why We Did It will fade into unimportance. The fact is I don’t know why we did it, and I haven’t been helped much by all the free counselling we’ve been getting. Still, I—we—would like to believe that we mind when he came to recruit us. He wanted us, he said, to bring to the surface certain “universals”—people in television talk like that—that describe, shape, animate, the lives of American families. Not that we were in any sense typical, but that something could be distilled that might be.

We really believed, so help me, that by letting all of us hang out, we might help to free some pent-up soul out there. Why else would educational television, which turns up its nose at the merely sensational and titillating, be interested in us? Why, indeed? I am not sure yet—as I say, I am still trying to get things straightened out—but I get the feeling that what we learned is not going to be consoling to our pride, and even less assuring to the pretensions broadcast by public television. I will try to say what I mean.

As a parent, I’ve been battling television for years, and in about the same terms as many other parents. We can all use some entertainment at times, but do we need all that much? (Who was it said that the sign over the gate to Hell reads “Continuous Entertainment”? Will it turn the kids into addict-observers, career spectators rather than participants? To walk into a room full of kids lying around watching TV when they should be off doing something is to know frustration and rage at the strength of the tube. And isn’t the screen altogether too literal, foreclosing on the imagination and squeezing the flights of the mind we used to go on while listening, chin in sweaty palm, to The Inner Sanctum on radio—squeezing that down into a 21-inch frame? Thinking about those things made me question even the value of a lot of made-for-classroom film. I am sure there is a lot that can be told about Grand Coulee Dam on film, but “family relationships” (and for that matter, Hamlet) are vistas too big to be contained by a screen,
Yet I turned traitor to those parental misgivings, and maybe I got what traitors deserve. I have been told that there are tuition-paying students of family life who consider the series grist for their pestles, and that courses in sociology are being built around it. Shows are being taped for replay in class, and then students are assigned to play one of the various roles within the family. I suppose that’s what we bargained for, but the prospect is a little forbidding. I had hoped the series might be taken seriously, but not that seriously; not in the classroom, anyway.

I think probably that the series is better suited to a class in what sociology can’t do, or film either. I suppose that it ought to be a matter of common sense that the presence of a camera in a household can’t be ignored. Having tried it, I can tell you that it can—but not all of the time, and not to the extent necessary to make for a reliable picture of what un-self-conscious life in our house is like. Here we had no Oscar Lewis, quietly, patiently and unobtrusively inching his way toward an easy intimacy with his subjects. Cameras manipulate people. I don’t mean to say that ever and always we were fully aware that the camera was on us, but the brain never fully rejects that kind of information. Cinéma vérité, maybe; sound sociology it isn’t.

Margaret Mead, bless her friendly voice, has written glowingly that the series constituted some sort of breakthrough, a demonstration of a new tool for use in sociology. Having been the object of that too I think I am competent to say that it won’t work. Even in the hands of a researcher who is not looking toward a film credit, the method is altogether too clumsy. The cameras, as I say, made a difference in how we acted toward one another; you might imagine its effect on a bunch of teenagers brought up on television. Not to be overlooked is the schizophrenia that inevitably afflicts the producer of a series of this sort. He is looking with at most half an eye to new sociological truths; with the other three-halves to the other demands—those of art, perhaps, to the demands of the medium, and, since he is no less than human, to whatever marquee he’d like to see his name on.

Lord knows we tried, and I am sure the producer did too. Sometimes we walked willingly before the lens; at times we had to be coaxed and cajoled. The family’s job was to be as open and free in front of the camera as it found it possible to be; the producer’s job was to protect that trust in the manner in which the film was edited, publicized and presented. It didn’t work out; not as sociology, nor as a bargain. We didn’t succeed from our end, nor did the editing and publicity given the series merit our trust or offer much in the way of enlightenment.

The result is less than the producer said he had in mind, and something less than we had hoped for. I don’t want to come on like Camille, but I have felt in recent weeks as if I had walked into a strange, uncomfortable room, without being sure why I am here. Like Kafka’s prisoner, I am frightened, confused and saddened by what I see. I find myself shrinking in defense not only from critics and detractors, but from friends, sympathizers and finally, myself.

The reviews have been hit-and-run scornful—not of the series, which seems to have scored as spectacle, but of the Loud family. We stand embattled and condemned in the center of a mass-media paroxysm of interest, comment, zings arrows and judgment. The question I began with was, Why? The truth is starting to dawn on me that we have been ground through the big media machine, and are coming out entertainment, like the rest of the hambinger—only for the very special audience claimed by the wonderful folks who brought you The Forsythe Saga. The unspeakable truth is that we—the Loud family—might just as well have been Tiny Tim.

The lurid publicizing of the series and the almost unanimous critical disgust shown some of us, the controversy and excitement of the media, the treatment of us as objects and things instead of people has caused us wildly anxious days and nights. It has denuded us of such honor and dignity as we owned. I have wished it undone many times and yelped in anguish that I never would do it again. But I would, in fact, if I could just be sure that it did what the producers said it was supposed to do. If we have failed, was it because of the family, the editing, the lurid publicity, any or all of these, or because public television just doesn’t educate? And if it can’t educate, what can it do?

If we failed, what role did the limitations of film and tape play. Can electronic media really arouse awareness and critical faculties? Or finally, did we, family and network alike, serve up great slices of ourselves—irretrievable slices—that only serve to entertain briefly, to titillate, and diminish into nothing?

Patricia Loud
Associate Editor
Forum for Contemporary History

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL FESTIVAL OF THE CINEMATOGRAPHIC DAYS OF CARTHAGE
September 30-October 8, 1972

Copyright © 1973 by Emile Rahman de Brigard

For several years, we have been listening to reports of Africa’s new cinema, and so we gladly accepted the invitation of the Tunisian Ministry of Culture to attend the Festival of Carthage and see for ourselves. It has been predicted that the most exciting films of the next ten years will come from Africa. A week in Tunis convinced me of the first part of the prediction—the films are exciting. But they will not be seen even at home, by Africans, unless African filmmakers can overcome formidable obstacles to production and distribution.

Although new films from Europe were shown at the festival, we decided to concentrate on new productions from Africa and the Arab world. On the first afternoon we were dosed with anti-Israeli propaganda films. Some were filmically awful (one sequence involved Uncle Sam, some bankers and Moshe Dayan in guerrilla theater), but others succeeded in reporting the news: what our papers call “guerrilla headquarters” are often located in refugee shantytowns, and bombing attacks on them maim old men and little girls, along with, presumably, some Fedayeen. More effective communication about guerrilla aspirations and activities comes from Portuguese Guinea (Guiné dita portuguesa), where the struggle has been stylishly documented by the Italians (Labanta Negro) and the Cubans (Madinia Boe).

After their images had gone, the last of the guerrilla films
remained. It didn’t take long to realize that, with very few exceptions, the films at Carthage were about oppression.

The exceptions were the ethnographic films. Although Jean Rouch, a festival participant in past years, was notably absent, several of his associates sent their work: Oumarou Ganda showed an already well-known short fiction film, *Le Wazzou Polygame*, and Sophie Ferchiou—a Tunisian anthropologist who has written a doctoral thesis about the history and manufacture of the *chechia*, the Tunisian man’s traditional headgear—was represented by *Mariage Sabrya*. (Ferchiou’s films can be obtained through the Comité International du Film Ethnographique et Sociologique, Musée de l’Homme, Paris XVI.) Moïse Ze Lecourt, from Cameroun, won a Bronze Tanit for his ethnomusicological documentary, *Le M’Vet*, which showed the construction and use of a musical bow. I didn’t get to see the Indian government’s entry, *Rites Religieux Des Musulmanes De L’Inde*, but the standard of their productions is usually high. What the anthropological documentaries at Carthage shared was a static view of the societies they described; and this point of view was unpopular in an audience which was deeply moved by Mohamed Bouamari’s *Le Char-Bonnier*, with its visionary picture of the new Algeria.

The jury awarded this year’s Gold Tanit to two films, *Les Dupes* (Syria) and *Sambizanga* (Congo), and their decision to do so, which was reached after long and reportedly acrimonious debate, took into account questions of politics as well as art. None would question Tewfik Salah’s cinematic mastery of *Les Dupes*, his sixth feature, which has been likened in its maleness to the films of Howard Hawks. From the first image, of a Syrian peasant eulogizing the earth in a date grove, it is a singularly exciting film. Desperately seeking a way to slip into oil-rich Kuwait, the peasant and two other men encounter a mysterious Palestinian. This anti-hero, played by Mohamed Kheir Helwani, will be revealed as politically and sexually impotent: a former commando, he has been surgically castrated as a punishment for neglected duty. He promises to smuggle the Syrians across the desert in an empty cistern truck. But the truck is detained at the border in the heat of the day, while a Kuwaiti official, who knows the Palestinian’s secret, twists him about his romances. The naked, suffocated bodies of the three Syrians—young, old, and middle-aged—are later abandoned by the Palestinian, at a flaming oil field inside Kuwait. The triumph of *Les Dupes* is its effectiveness both as suspense and as political metaphor. Its director is an Egyptian who lives in voluntary exile in Damascus. Compared to this film by Salah, the Egyptian productions at the festival resembled sugar candy—stimulating but quite devoid of nourishment.

*Sambizanga*, which shared the Gold Tanit, is on the other hand not a masterpiece, merely a promise of one. We hope that Sarah Maldoror, the Guadeloupe-born director who is the wife of the Angolan leader, Mario Andrade, will do more and better: in *Sambizanga*, she demonstrates her commitment to Angola’s liberation, without an equal commitment to the formal systems which give a work of art its integrity. This is surprising, as she received her film training in the Soviet Union, the homeland of formal discoveries. Perhaps the horrors of colonialism are such that it is impossible to give them coherent form in the fiction film. Certainly the least successful elements of *Sambizanga* are those of form, not of content, which remains interesting—though unoriginal—throughout: the lush countryside, the beautiful Elisa Andrade (another Marpessa Dawn), the tenderness of a young mother and father for their child, prison beatings from which the man dies, and finally a neighborhood dance and political rally. Events are connected by views of the wife’s long march from her village, where her husband has been suddenly, inexplicably arrested, to Luanda, where she learns for the first time of his political involvement and of his death. “No longer will she accept being simply a wife and mother,” the press release states: “through her husband’s brothers-in-arms she will discover another reason for living: to fight for her freedom.” Unfortunately, *Sambizanga*, which is based on Luandino Vieyra’s novel, *The Real Life of Domingos Xavier*, does not succeed in communicating this; had it done so, we would have been moved by admiration for it, rather than by a sense of duty toward good intentions. Other critics have compared it unfavorably with Maldoror’s previous film, *Monangambee*, and have found “occidentalism,” in the sense of betrayal of Africanism. To me, *Sambizanga* sounded like a statement in a foreign language that one cannot bring oneself to speak well, because one hates its native speakers.

It seemed that something very different from this was happening in King Ampaw’s *They Call This Love*, which caused the week’s only moments of real anger on the part of the notably good-humored, mostly male audience. There’s a remarkable sureness in this film by Ampaw, a Ghanaian, who studied film in Munich. Despite his modest equipment, Ampaw has an ability to capture a sense of place which reminded me of Losey’s. Unless he’s deterred by receptions like this one, he will become a director to watch. *They Call This Love* is about a black American jazz musician who has decided to remain in Germany after military service. He earns his living in a nightclub and easily obtains the favors of German women, but in time it becomes clear that his acceptance by the community is superficial. Neither the qualities of the film, nor Ampaw’s assertion that it faithfully reflects conditions in Germany, could placate *le tout Tunis*. It’s rare to see nudity or realistic sexual activity in Arab pictures; this film had both—and a lot of drinking—and many, clearly, were deeply offended by it.

So prudish, by American standards, are the Arabs, that a Tunisian short, *Seuls Interdits*, by Ridha El Bahi, caused a sensation by portraying the effects of enforced celibacy on a respectable young man in Kairouan, Tunisia’s holy city. The theme of thwarted physical love was present in a number of films, none more striking than Khalid Siddik’s *La Mer Cruelle*, about life in a Kuwaiti pearl mining village before the discovery of oil. Eve Arnold’s *Behind the Veil* also shows a traditional wedding, in reality and on a grander scale, but Arnold was unable to film crucial events which Siddik was free to stage, impressionistically and well, including in the process much carefully reconstructed ethnographic detail.

The styles of the North African films varied from country to country—Egypt’s Hollywood-style soaps are a world away from Tunisia’s gentle neorealism (*Et Demain*) and Algeria’s serious formalism (*Le Charbonnier*). But all are derived from European models. The situation is altogether different in Sub-Saharan Africa, where exuberance and experimentation are the order of the day. The playfulness in this cinema may well leave its technically more advanced but less original Arab counterpart behind before many more years.

Mahama Traoré won a Tanit for *Lambaye*, his wry Senegalese remake of Gogol’s *Government Inspector*, but I was
more interested by his first film, Reou Takh, in which an American sees for the first time the land of his ancestors. Another gifted filmmaker is Mali’s Souleyman Cisse, whose Cinq Jours D’Une Vie is an important film about growing up. Its devastating account of Koranic education, illiteracy and chômage is an antidote to the bowdlerized view of traditional education which got started with Flaherty’s Moana. This film confirms the belief that a view from the inside of a society can be much better than one from the outside. Ababakar Samb Makharam’s Codou, which tells of a village girl’s initiation, her family’s shame when she refuses to carry it through and of modern and traditional psychiatric treatment, should make an excellent comparative film with Satyajit Ray’s Devi.

African cinema has come a long way since the first films of Paulin Vieyra and Ousmane Sembene in the late 1950s and early 1960s. (For an excellent account, in French, see Les Cinémas Africains en 1972, edited by Guy Hennelbe, part of the series “L’Afrique Littéraire et Artistique,” obtainable from Société Africaine d’Édition, 32, rue de l’Echiquier, Paris X; price 20 NF.) Sembene’s films (Mandabi, Emitai) now get theatrical distribution in Europe and the United States, but Sembene is an outstanding exception in a cinema which is desperately struggling to break into the production and distribution establishment. (Egyptian films are widely distributed in the third world, but that’s a story for another day.) As Sarah Maldoror tells it, “Africa is a sewer in which the whites dump their turnips.” Before visiting the United States, Samb took a ritual bath so as to be protected against the consumer society. The members of the jury at Carthage have called for support from the governments of the African and Arab countries, both in developing national cinemas and in distributing films at home and abroad.

Americans interested in seeing the films mentioned here should write to the Film Department of the Museum of Modern Art, New York, which is in contact with many of the filmmakers. Obtaining the films privately is difficult and slow, as requests must be routed by each embassy’s cultural attaché through official channels. Fortunately, the festivals of Carthage and Ouagadougou provide opportunities to see the newest African films and to meet the filmmakers. For information about the Festival of Carthage, contact: The Secretary-General, Tahar Sheria, Festival International des Journées, Cinématographiques de Carthage, Ministère des Affaires Culturelles et à l’Information, B. P. 1029, Tunis.

Flying in for a landing at Tunis felt like being gently deposited by the Roc in storybook land, complete with cactus corrals and mysterious terraced houses. And the streets of the European city recalled Babar’s Célestialville, with rows of fat palms and beaux-arts architecture. But by the time we flew out, our eyes had been opened to real situations which this country’s press has ignored to a degree. I can recommend the experience.

Emile Rahman de Brigard

---

PROGRAM NOTES FROM ANTHROPOLOGICAL CINEMA:
A RETROSPECTIVE AT THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART
May 17-July 3, 1973

Nearly seventy-five years of anthropological films are represented in this first major retrospective of a genre that has only recently been defined. These films come from many sources: archives, the commercial and documentary cinema, television and private collections. What they have in common is their ability to yield ethnographic data to the social scientists who study them.

When motion pictures were first invented, they were envisioned as a tool for scientific study—part of the optimistic materialism of the late nineteenth century. But the entertainment film’s sensational popularity eclipsed the scientific film and arrested its development at a stage of parализed naïveté from which it did not begin to recover until after World War II—just in time to film the disappearance of many of the world’s traditional cultures. More than seventy-five years after the first anthropological motion pictures, we are only beginning to study the anthropology of visual communication.

In this we are indebted to the conscious artists of the cinema who paved the way with their experiments in montage, focal depth, and sound, to the aestheticians who grappled with this most characteristic twentieth-century art, and to all those whose professional commitment is to ethnographic filming.

It considering a film, we make two distinctions: Is it scientifically usable or not? Is it a work of art or not? The categories of art and science not having yet been reconciled, these distinctions must be made independently. Sometimes art and science fuse, and we are in the presence of a masterpiece of anthropological cinema. To understand a film, we must take into account the fit, or lack of it, between the intentions of its maker and its retrospective significance. Conventions of communication, which we now recognize as culturally patterned, are constantly shifting. It would be possible to use a blatant propaganda film, not for its intended “educational” purpose, but for research, at a variety of levels, from the larger one of thematic content all the way down to the extremely fine one of movement and gesture study.

An anthropologist has remarked, “the relation between the knowledge you have and the film is what counts.” But it’s not necessary to be a trained ethnologist to recognize human truth on film. And it’s true for all of us that film is revelatory or intrusive, depending on context. No film is completely objective; the decision to film or not to film is in itself a subjective one. All film is objective, no matter how fanciful, because it is a mechanical record of the physical world. In this apparent contradiction reside the strength and singularity of anthropological cinema.

The stylistic diversity of these films equals the diversity of the people shown in them. But all deal, in ways that are more or less artful and scientific, with human universals—making a living, the life of the spirit, family life, culture contact and change. They reveal almost as much about the culture of the filmmakers—the explorers, the anthropologists, the inventors of cinéma vérité—as about the culture of the filmed. Thus the series as a whole might be viewed as a series of vicarious encounters between filmmaker and filmed.

The work of assembling this program at the Museum of Modern Art began more than a year in advance. The Choreometrics Project of Columbia University, directed by
Alan Lomax, provided the foundation on which it is based, the World Ethnographic Film Sample. Still earlier, the Ethnographic Film Program of the University of California at Los Angeles, directed by Colin Young, provided the stimulus for my historical inquiry, in which I've been generously aided by many. Margaret Mead, who has done more than nearly any of her colleagues to present the findings of anthropology to a lay audience, is the anthropologist chiefly responsible for film’s respectability in science. And no organization has done more to collect and publish information about ethnographic films, both new and old, than the Comité International du Film Ethnographique et Sociologique, guided by Jean Rouch of the Musée de l'Homme, Paris.

The present generation of filmmakers has, it seems to me, much to learn from these unfairly neglected films, and precious little time to learn it before mankind's treasure of cultural diversity is lost. Only film has the capacity to record the multi-leveled nature of events, the potential for teaching new ways of seeing and the power to evoke deeply positive feelings about mankind by communicating the essence of a people.

A Series of Twenty-Four Themes

1. The North American Indian has been filmed in a number of different ways, of which the best known is the Western. Here are some others.
   - The March of Prayer and Entrance of the Dancers, Parade of Snake Dancers Before the Dance, Moki Snake Dance by Wolpi Indians (1901) Edison (Library of Congress); 5 min. The Vigil of Matana (1914).
   - Edward S. Curtis (Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago); 26 min. Glimpses of Life Among the Catawbas and Cherokee Indians of the Carolinas (1930) Frank G. Speck (University Museum, University of Pennsylvania); 12 min. Sucking Doctor (1964) William R. Heich; 45 min. Intrepid Shadows (1966) Al Ciah (Center for Mass Communications, Columbia University); 18 min. Now that the Buffalo’s Gone (1968) Burton Gershfield (Creative Film Society, Van Nuys, California); 7 min.
   - The mechanical objectivity of the motion picture camera is altered by the subjectivity of the cameraman; film is both objective and subjective, a state of affairs which makes some scientists uncomfortable. Technical, political and theoretical development of cinema-verité.
   - Credit for originating the anthropological documentary belongs to Robert Flaherty, despite the questionable ethnographic content of his films.
   - Nanook of the North (1922) Robert Flaherty; 60 min. Moana (1926) Robert Flaherty; 85 min.
   - As part of the Museum's Short Films program, a series of screenings of scientific films.
   - The interpretive film.
   - Survivals.
   - Carnivals in Belgium (Fêtes de Belgique: L’Effusion Collective) (1972) A series of five short films by Henn Storck; 65 min.
   - 7. It was fully realized by the first anthropological filmmakers that

Here are three films of salvage ethnography of Australian Aboriginals. Reporting and reconstruction.

Aborigines of Central and Northern Australia (1901-1912) Sir Walter Baldwin Spencer (Australian News and Information Bureau); 34 min. Desert People (1969) Ian Dunlop (Contemporary/McGraw Hill); 51 min. Gunabibi (1971) Roger Sandall (Extension Media Center, University of California, Berkeley); 30 min.

8. Sequence filming.


11. In the 1920s, the anthropological teaching film assumed its visual lecture form of cultural inventory, which has remained virtually uncharged until recently. At about the same time, the Soviets were discovering the principles of documentary film, a mass-education medium designed to aid transformations in society. The static versus the dynamic view.

Medieval Moderns (1928) J. A. Haseler (American Museum of Natural History); 30 min. Salt for Svastia (Sol Svanelti) (1938) Mikhail Kalatozov; 54 min.

12. Rasmussen’s charming reconstruction of Greenland Eskimo life, the story film The Wedding of Pulo, has been overshadowed by its predecessor, Nanook, possibly the best known ethnographic film anywhere. The authors of the Netsilik Eskimo series, also a historical reconstruction but in documentary form, have made a film of modern Eskimo life as well, The Netsilik Eskimo Today.

The Wedding of Pulo (1937) F. Dalshelm, Knud Rasmussen; 72 min. Group Hunting of the Spring Ice, Part II; Fishing at the Stone Wall, Part I; At the Winter Sea Ice Camp, Part III (1972) Gilbert Blass (Education Development Center, Newton, Mass.) The Netsilik Eskimo Today (1972) Gilles Blais (Education Development Center); 18 min.

13. Views of Africa during the colonial period and after independence.

Regard Sur L’Afrique Noire (1947) A. Mahuzier; 20 min. To Live with Herds (1972) David MacDougall; 70 min.


Choreometrics. Work-in-progress presented by Alan Lomax, Director, and Forrestine Pouly, Associate Director, Choreometrics Project, Columbia University.

15. Film in ethnomusicology and cultural feedback.

Sia Chorus (1972) Adrian Gerbrands (Stichting Film en Wetenschap, Utrecht); 20 min. Traditional Music and Dance of Sikkim (1972-1973) Fredric Lieberman, Michael Moore; Part I, 30 min. Spend It All (1972) Les Blank (Film Flowers, Disney, Oklahoma); 90 min.

16. External manifestations of the life of the spirit can be filmed and compared cross-culturally, according to Luc de Heusch in the first monograph on ethnographic film, The Cinema and Social Science (1962). Here is de Heusch’s example:


17. A commercially successful film of cultural imperialism.

Mondo Cane (1962) Gualtiero Jacopetti (Audio-Brandoni); 105 min. Popular films of exploration.

Grands (1925) Merian C. Cooper; 56 min. The Great Migrations (1934) Newton E. Schoenbeck; 66 min. Yellow Cruise (La Croisiere Jaune) (1936) Leon Poirier (Motion Picture Study Collection, George Eastman House, Rochester, New York); 80 min.

19. Death and afterlife.

Dead Birds (1963) Robert Gardner (Contemporary/McGraw Hill); 83 min. The Healer (1972) Tom Cohen (Amram Nowak); 28 min.

20. Filmed ethnography and impressions.

End of Line (1940) John Grierson; 9 min. The Sinking of the}
THE APPLICATION OF PHOTOGRAMMETRY TO PHOTOGRAPHIC ETHNOHISTORY

This article describes in brief detail a test case study of the application of photogrammetry to ethnohistorical photographs of a traditional Haida house and its associated totem poles. The metric data that result from this analysis cannot be replicated by any other methodology, and the detail of information provided by photogrammetric analysis could not be gained from archaeological investigation of the housesite today. This type of information has not been recorded in Northwest Coast ethnology or ethnohistory. The results of this analysis point the way for future comparative photogrammetric studies of Northwest Coast housesites and even entire villages. The present study was directed and advised by Professor Perry E. Borchers of the Department of Architecture, the Ohio State University.

The Haida architecture subjected to photogrammetric study consisted of the house and three totem poles belonging to Chief Weah, the town chief of the Queen Charlotte Islands Haida village of Masset. The large cedar plank dwelling was constructed around the year 1840 and was torn down between 1901 and 1903. The housepit and the two tiers that rose about it were left intact when the house was levelled (see Figure 1). Since 1903 three Anglo-American style houses have stood on this site. When the present house was constructed in 1962, the upper platform or tier of the traditional house was removed and the depression filled in. The rear lower housepit wall, however, was not removed, and 27 feet of its length are still visible in the crawl space beneath the present town chief’s house. I excavated this wall in August of 1971 and found it to be 46 inches in depth from its top to the housepit floor. This dimension became the scale factor used in the metric analysis of the house interior. The three totem poles associated with the front of the house were all removed and burned when the house was levelled. Chief Weah’s house and totem poles are known from twelve photographs taken between 1878 and 1897. Five of these photographs were used in the photogrammetric analysis.

Photogrammetry is a science for determining true distances in object space from dimensions recorded in the image planes of photographs. Close range photogrammetry as opposed to photogrammetry using aerial photos was used in this study. Here, the photogrammetric methods involved primarily the application of reverse perspective drawing to single photographs. Objects in photographs are seen in perspective and, consequently, are not represented true to scale. The application of reverse perspective drawing entailed the construction of a plan and elevation of Chief Weah’s house from the perspective representation of it in the photographs.

Photogrammetry has for many years been used as a means of reconstructing to exact scale important buildings and monuments which have been partially destroyed (see, for example, Thompson 1962). Generally, photogrammetry of this type is undertaken only when there is survey control on the ground; that is, only when datum points are present both in object space and in the photographic image. The present application of photogrammetry represents an exception to this because Chief Weah’s house essentially survives only as a photographic image. Although a portion of the lower housepit wall was used to determine the scale of the plan and was thus a datum point, this point of scale could not be located exactly in the photograph. Photogrammetric methods using single photographs have never before, to our knowledge, been applied to the vanished architecture of a nonwestern, traditional culture.

The application of reverse perspective photogrammetry required certain assumptions be made about both Haida architecture and the cameras that took the photographs. Image planes of different photographs were combined in this analysis enabling object space to be viewed from more than one camera position, so it was possible to test the assumptions about Haida architecture and about the cameras. In the case that there were discrepancies in the location of points from different cameras, an adjustment of one of the original assumptions was necessary.

The assumptions about Haida architecture were as follows: (1) Haida houses are rectangular or square in plan; (2) the outside house walls, the housepit walls and the outside houseposts are essentially vertical; (3) the housepit floor, the platform floors surrounding the housepit, and the roof timbers are essentially horizontal. These assumptions seem reasonable due to the limitations of plasticity inherent in the heavy timber construction used by the Haida. Both the ethnohistorical literature on Haida houses and my field survey of several Alaskan Haida village sites indicate that Haida houses were fairly regular structures.

The following two basic assumptions were made regarding the positioning of the cameras that took the five photographs used in the present study: (1) the camera axis, which is a line intersecting the center of the lens, was horizontal and (2) the film plane was vertical or nearly vertical, so that the camera axis was perpendicular to it.
Figure 1. Interior of Chief Weah’s house, 1884. Photograph courtesy of the American Museum of Natural History.
The photographic materials utilized in this analysis were second or third generation paper prints from museum photo archives. This type of photograph is not the most desirable for photogrammetric studies as random expansion and shrinkage of photo papers can be problematic. Also, each time a copy negative intervenes between the original and the final print, error is introduced. No original glass plates were available for study and no cameras belonging to these early photographers are known to exist. Despite the technological limitations of the photographs available for this study, there are a number of features that particularly recommend the photographs of Chief Weah’s house to photogrammetric analysis. The exterior of the house was photographed from several different angles, and in this series of photographs, the complete front facade and length of the house are shown. In addition, one photo presents in true proportions (that is, not in perspective) the front facade of the house (see Figure 2). When this photograph was made the front of the house was parallel to the film plane in the camera. Each of the three totem poles directly associated with the house appears in two photographs that enabled me to locate the poles in space and determine their individual heights. Two views of the interior of the house were taken (Figures 1 and 3). From these photographs a plan of the house interior was drawn. In addition, the photographs of the house interior provided a means of cross-checking the length and width dimensions of the house obtained from analysis of the exterior photographs.

**Basic Procedure**

The first step in the photogrammetric analysis was to determine the vanishing points of horizontal lines in the photographs. Since objects shown in photographs are in true perspective, then planes that are parallel in object space will, when represented in perspective, vanish to points at the right or left of the photograph. The vanishing points for one of the interior photographs (Figure 1) is shown in Figure 4. (The two walls on the right vanish to the left point, the two on the left to the right vanishing point, represented here as $V_L$ and $V_R$, respectively). A horizon line connects the two vanishing points and represents the line of neutral perspective; this line also bisects the lens of the camera and indicates the camera height above ground level. Through point $P$, the point of scale on the lower rear wall, an image plane is constructed in the image. Measurements made along this plane are true to scale. Above the horizon of the image and parallel to it, this same vertical plane is represented as a line.
Lines which in the image vanish to a given point will, in plan, be parallel to a line from the camera station (represented in Figures 4, 5, and 7 as S) to that vanishing point. Thus, the lower rear wall which in the image vanishes to the right vanishing point is constructed in the plan parallel to the line from the right vanishing point to the camera station. Since the walls of the Haida house have been presumed to meet at right angles, it follows that lines from each vanishing point to the camera station will also meet at a right angle. All possible locations of the vertex of this angle lie on a semi-circle connecting the two vanishing points. In the case of Figure 1, which was a full frame enlargement of one member of a stereo pair, the camera station, which lies along the camera axis, was determined by bisecting the image. The point at which the camera axis intersected the semicircle marked the locus of the camera.

The procedure for determining all the dimensions of Chief Weah's house using the five photographs of it was tedious and lengthy, so I will confine my procedural remarks to an illustration of how the house pit walls were located and drawn in plan. I will then describe in brief how the images of the exterior of the house were combined to locate points on the outside of the house.\(^{3}\)

As noted previously, in this schematic representation of the house interior, point $P$ represents that point where the lower house wall is 46 inches in height. Since this point could not be exactly located, a point on the lower wall easily identifiable in both images of the house interior was chosen. To construct a plan from a perspective, points in the image are projected perpendicularly to the image plane of the plan. Point $P$ on the lower house pit wall was projected to the plan (where it is drawn as $P^\prime$), and the lower rear wall drawn in plan through this point in plan parallel to the line from the camera station of the plan to its intersection with the wall in plan. The other lower wall was constructed through the corner in plan and parallel to the line from the camera station to the left vanishing point. Ideally this line should also pass through point $P^\prime$ in the plan. However, as illustrated in Figure 4, it did not. Later operations indicated that the floor of the house pit was uneven and thus point $P^\prime$ in the image was incorrectly located. The side and back walls of the house and the right rear corner shown in Figure 3 were drawn in plan by the method just described.

A small portion of both the lower front house pit wall and the remaining lower side house pit wall appeared in the interior photographs. Figure 5 illustrates the procedures by which
with the image plane of a photograph of the house exterior taken in 1897 (Figure 6). The point of intersection, arbitrarily chosen, was the left edge of the doorway. The camera position for the 1897 photograph could not be determined by the same procedure as that described for the interior photograph because the former photo had been obviously vignetted. However, lines of sight to several house features on the facade plane and image plane should converge to a point on the semicircle connecting the vanishing points of this image plane. This point marks the camera position for the 1897 photograph. The image plane of a third photograph of the house exterior taken in 1888 (not shown) was combined with the facade plane and the image plane of the 1897 photograph. A point was found on the facade of the house in this third image where the scale was equal to that at the left edge of the floorway in the 1897 photograph. At this point the image plane of the 1888 photograph was intersected with the facade plane. The results of these operations are shown in Figure 7.

The facade plane represents the front wall of the house in plan. Once two camera stations were determined as shown in Figure 7, points in front of the facade plane such as the totem poles could be located in plan by the intersection of lines of sight from each camera station. Actual distances were determined by using the distance between the two inner roof timbers as the scale factor.

Dimensions: Discussion

The correlation between the length and width dimensions determined from the sets of interior and exterior photographs

Figure 4. Location of lower housepit walls in plan.

these walls were drawn in plan. The lower walls were extended beyond the image to their point of intersection. This point, L, was projected to the image plane of the plan (where it is represented as Lp), and a line of sight was drawn from the camera station of the plan to locate the end of this wall.

The distance between the two drying racks in the interior of Chief Weah’s house (see Figure 1) was an important dimension which was essential to the analysis of photographs of the house exterior. These racks hung on either side of the smokehole, which, in Haida houses, was always centrally located. It appeared from the photograph of the house interior that the racks were suspended from the inside edges of the two innermost roof timbers. Thus, once these racks were located and drawn in plan, the distance separating them became the scale factor in the photogrammetric analysis of the house exterior.

Three photographs were used in the photogrammetric study of the exterior of Chief Weah’s house. From these three photographs the width and length of the house were determined and compared to those same dimensions obtained from study of the house interior. The projection and spacing of the large roof timbers, and the location and heights of the three totem poles were also determined from study of these three photographs.

Figure 2, taken of the house in 1881, presents the front facade of the house in true proportions. In this photograph horizontal lines remain horizontal and do not vanish. A plane representing this front facade of the house was intersected

Figure 5. Location of lower north housepit wall in plan.
was good. The length of the house from front to back, for example, obtained from study of the house interior, was 54.64 feet; as determined from the photographs of the house exterior, this dimension was 54.17 feet, a difference of less than one percent. The width of the house across the back was 55.95 feet based on examination of the interior of the house. This dimension equaled 56.61 feet as determined from photographs of the house front. The difference was three percent. There was good agreement, also, for several other dimensions of the house obtained from more than one photograph. These results are particularly gratifying because they come from photographs taken at different times by different photographers. Moreover, they were acquired under minimal conditions, using second or third generation paper prints. Other important dimensions of the house are reported in Table 1.

**Conclusion**

This study represents a successful test of the application of photogrammetry to Northwest Coast architecture, and it has demonstrated that photogrammetry can contribute unique data. The wider potential of photogrammetry for studies in photographic ethnohistory is significant. Photogrammetric analysis could be an important research tool in studies of late nineteenth century settlement patterns. For the entire Haida region there exist over one thousand early photographs about ninety percent of which are of villages. Several of these village sites contain the remains of house foundations and a few totem poles, features which can readily be linked with their appearance nearly one hundred years earlier in photographs. The procedure would involve taking aerial photographs of the village sites with a photogrammetric camera. With three known points of survey control on the ground, it is possible to map a large area and then project the metric data obtained from these aerial photos back into the ethnohistorical photographs. Thus by combining photogrammetric technology with ethnohistorical photographs, entire village plans and elevations could be exactly reconstructed. This reconstruction is even possible for Haida villages like Masset. With the exception of a housepit depression upon a hill, the housepit retaining wall of Chief Weah's house, and a marble monument, no nineteenth century features of this village survive today. However, these three features constitute minimal but sufficient data for reconstructing the plan and elevation of the village of Masset.

Photogrammetric analysis of Haida village sites has great possibilities for a study of the exact patterning of houses and totem poles over an entire region and the exploration of region-wide variations in settlement patterns. This type of study would also be of interest because there are identifiable links between Haida settlement patterns and socio-political

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Dimension (in feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House interior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housepit</td>
<td>8.04-8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>29.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>31.46-32.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower platforms</td>
<td>4.64-4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper platforms</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drying racks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height above housepit floor</td>
<td>7.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House exterior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height at front doorway</td>
<td>16.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height at side wall</td>
<td>13.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof timbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projection beyond front wall</td>
<td>4.18-5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totem poles, height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right cornerpost</td>
<td>25.46-26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left cornerpost</td>
<td>25.93-27.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontal pole</td>
<td>54.89-55.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organization. Photogrammetric analysis would provide a means of determining the exact spatial relationships among the different types of Haida totem poles and their distribution respective to houesites. Such an investigation would also contribute data on the metrics of totem poles. The height of poles were known to have been a function of the wealth and status of the owner of the pole. Through photogrammetry the relationship between parameters of house size and the number and spacing of totem poles on housesites could be explored; various proportions between house dimensions could also be examined over the entire Haida area. Projection of metric data into ethnohistorical photographs from different time periods would permit study of the metrics of change in the village plans. There are ample ethnohistorical photographs of villages of other Northwest Coast groups contemporary with the photographs of Haida villages. Photogrammetric methodology could be used in a culture-area wide analysis of settlement patterns. The application of photogrammetry to the study of traditional nonwestern architecture is not limited to the Northwest Coast area alone, but could be applied wherever ethnohistorical photographs of village sites exist together with some features at the sites identifiable in the early photographs.

The position of ethnohistoric photographs in respect to photogrammetry is a pivotal one. Although photographic technology has confined ethnohistorical photographs to a recent and narrow span of time, the results of photogrammetric analysis can provide the basis for examining archaeological settlement patterns or for studying the relationship between late nineteenth century site patterning and that of today.

Notes
1 This paper was originally read at the 71st Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association in Toronto, 1972. I am most grateful to Professor Perry E. Borcher of the Department of Architecture, Ohio State University. Mr. Borcher gave considerable time aiding and instructing me in the rudiments of reverse perspective photogrammetry.
2 Lubschez (1926) gives a concise introductory treatment of the science of perspective.
3 Chapter 6 of my dissertation (Blackman 1973) undertakes a more complete photogrammetric analysis of Chief Weah's house and totem poles.
4 Professor Perry E. Borcher of the Department of Architecture, Ohio State University, is currently conducting a photogrammetric study of six Western Pueblo villages.
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NOTICES

Society Business Meeting Scheduled

The annual business meeting of the society will be held during the 72nd Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, on Saturday, December 1, 1973, in the Wildcatter Room of the Fairmont-Roosevelt Hotel, New Orleans, from 6 to 8 PM. All members are urged to attend. Among the items on the agenda are the incorporation of the society, elections, and the creation of a new journal.

Election Results for the Society for the Anthropology of Visual Communication

During the first two weeks of April, ballots for the election of a Board of Directors and an Advisory Committee and for changes in the Constitution were mailed to the membership. The returned ballots have been counted, and I am pleased to announce the following results.

The first Board of Directors shall consist of the following eight elected nominees:

Sol Worth
Napoleon Chagnon
Carroll Williams
Paul Hockings
Larry Gross
Laura Greenberg
Howard Becker
Philip Dark

The left-hand column of Board members shall serve for a two-year term (1973-75); the right-hand column of names shall serve for a one-year term. Both terms of office shall begin during our next annual meeting, November 29, 1973.

The first Advisory Committee shall consist of the following elected nominees:

Ray Birdwhistell
Dan Ben-Amos
Timothy Asch
Edward Hall
Dell Hymes
Karl Heider
Margaret Mead
Alan Lomax
John Marshall

The left-hand column of Committee Members shall serve for the first three-year period (1973-1976); the middle column of names shall serve for a two-year period (1973-1975); and the right-hand column for a one-year period. All terms of office shall begin November 29, 1973.

Corrected copies of the Constitution will be available at our next annual meeting in New Orleans.

Richard Chalfen
Secretary/Treasurer

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, MA 02140.
Conference on Visual Anthropology Scheduled

Temple University will hold its 1974 Conference on Visual Anthropology (formerly called Anthropological and Documentary Film Conference) on March 6-9, 1974. The Conference seeks to bring together people interested in the use and analysis of Behavioral Recording Media, including still and motion picture film, videotape and sound tape, for the portrayal of the human condition. All interested persons are encouraged to submit their productions and ideas.

The Directors of the Conference invite participation in the following categories:

1. **Motion Picture Film**: Standard and Super 8mm (sound or silent), 16mm (silent, magnetic, or optical). Submission deadline is November 5, 1973. Write for an application form. Five to 10-min. film will be given special consideration. We anticipate a large variety of films, but short ones can be more readily included in the program. Do not send your film. We will contact you after reading your application.

2. **Still Picture Exhibits**: Send a short description (250 words or less) with one sample photo. Pictures larger than 11 X 14 in. cannot be considered. Deadline for submission is November 5, 1973.

3. **Videotape**: We will consider 1/2, 1, and 2 in. Helical Scan and Quadraflex Lowband and 3/4 in cassette. Write for an application form. Deadline for submission is November 5, 1973. Do not send your tape. We will contact you after reading your application.

4. **Papers, Symposia, and Workshops**: We will consider any subjects in these categories as long as they relate to visual media and the social sciences. Abstracts should be 250 words or less. The deadline for submission is December 3, 1973.

The Selection Committee will meet in early December to screen films and VTRS and to compile a preliminary program. All persons invited to submit materials will be notified in January.

**NOTE**: This is not a competition. No prizes will be awarded, although we will try, within the limits of a small budget, to partially defray the costs of transportation and living expenses of some of the people we invite to the conference.

If you wish further information, please contact Jay Ruby, COVA, Department of Anthropology, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122.

**Candid Camera Collection Available**

Alan Funt has donated a collection of Candid Microphone recordings and Candid Camera prints to Cornell University's Department of Psychology for scientific and educational use. A copy of the catalog can be obtained by writing: Dr. James B. Maas, Director, Cornell Candid Camera Collection, Department of Psychology, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14850.

**Dates Set for Festival Dei Popoli**

The 14th edition of the Festival Dei Popoli, International Festival of Social Documentary Films, organized by the Istituto Italiano per il Film di Documentazione Sociale will be held in Florence at Palazzo dei Congressi on December 3-9. The purpose of the Festival is to present documentary films with a view to making known aspects of man's existence, both at the level of the individual and the community, in all social contexts. The deadline for submission of films is October 1. Additional information and application forms can be obtained from: Segreteria del Festival dei Popoli, Via Proconsolo 10, 50122 Firenze, Italy.