From the Editor...

With this issue, one year has passed since I first began as editor of the newsletter. When I started I felt that the greatest contribution I could bring to the publication, and to SAVICOM in general, was to encourage a greater regional and international participation in the newsletter coverage. I now feel this effort has proved quite successful, and believe the content and contributors now more accurately reflect the growing worldwide community of visual anthropology. The newsletter itself has in fact taken on the making of a unique tool for both identifying and creating this community. Editing the newsletter has provided me with the rewarding experience of being involved in helping people to learn about others they may not have known about before, who in many cases shared similar, if not identical, interests with them.

My involvement in actual film production this coming year makes it imperative that I more fully focus my energies on the film projects at hand. Therefore, I must reluctantly turn over the reins of the newsletter to someone with more available time and energy than I presently have.

It is consistent with the spirit of continually expanding our networks which I have tried to encourage, that a new SAVICOM newsletter editor be named. It is my hope that the new editor will be an untapped resource of experiences, talents, associations, interests and ideas. Until a formal election at our next board meeting in Cincinnati, our Assistant Editor William B. (Pete) Lee will serve as acting editor. He will continue to work through USC's Center for Visual Anthropology to produce and distribute the newsletter. Pete Lee is Curator and Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History, and an Adjunct Assistant Professor in USC's growing Visual Anthropology program. Pete is a well known ethnographic filmmaker and is currently conducting research on the contributions of Edward Curtis to our field. He shares with me the commitment to strengthen our focus upon ethnographic film production in the newsletter, and to creating the kind of visual anthropology community that we all want to be a part of.

The announcement of a new name for the newsletter, as well as additional contributing editors will be the responsibility of the next editor. In this issue, note the special insert page containing SAVICOM news and election information. This time you don't have to tear up your newsletter to vote!

At this time I would like to again thank Dean John Schutz of USC's Division of Social Sciences and Communication for making this last year's publication of the newsletter possible at USC, and also thank Dr. Barbara Myerhoff for her invaluable contributions in both spirit and action, making it possible to house the newsletter in our department.

Next year's publication of the newsletter will clearly require a significant increase in financial support from SAVICOM if the quality and scope of coverage is to continue. At the risk of being a prophet of doom I fear I must inform you, our readers, that unless the financial support already voted upon by our board for this coming year's issues is supplemented by additional allocations, I doubt the newsletter will be able to continue as it has this past year. This would be a pity, because we have, I think, shown what an important role an expanded and polished publication can do to further our goals and sense of community.

The last three issues have cost over $1200 each to print and distribute. Foreign mailing is an especially costly item. We are presently funded for only $2,000 for this coming year inspite of the significant and important job we do. If you are concerned about the continuation of this newsletter in its present form I suggest you either write or contact in person individual SAVICOM board members at the AAA meeting to let them know how you feel. I have done all I can. There should be a total of at least $3600 allotted to publish three good issues a year.

Being editor of the newsletter has given me a great deal of satisfaction. The mailing of each issue has brought with it a sense of completion much more easily achieved than when making a film. However, for me not to devote myself entirely to filmmaking now, in the long run considerably lessens any contributions I might make to a field I am quite committed to. I thank all of you for the incredible opportunity of being able to work with so many fine and committed individuals in an activity I have fully enjoyed. If I have been able to make any contribution to investing the newsletter with a greater sense of participation, it has been the result of the support and cooperation of our readers and fine staff of Assistant and Contributing Editors.

IRA R. ABRAMS, Editor
A Comment on Hubert Smith's Comment...

Hubert Smith's criticism of the state of ethnographic filmmaking (Vol. 7, No. 2) is well taken. He says that what ethnographers study is inherently interesting and that film can and should be used to make their discoveries available to people outside the discipline. Regretting anthropologists' limited success at realizing this relationship between message, medium and audience, Smith contrasts filmic flops with sophistication of written presentation within the profession. The comparison is misleading. The failure of ethnographic filmmakers to speak with clarity and appeal to general audiences is shared by most of their colleagues who work in print. Measures of the theoretical substance and craftsmanship of ethnographic writing are made without regard to the limited scope of its leadership. It cannot be said that great advances have been made, nor rewards offered, for popularizing anthropology in any medium. It is seen as service work of limited intellectual import, the watering down of scholarly argument to make it fit for the layman's palate. Little wonder, then, that too many ethnographic films are unpopular among both anthropologists in the Academy and the non-academic public.

Intellectual subtlety and popular success are not incompatible. In order, however, to make films that satisfy both academic anthropologists and those who don't share their theoretical concerns, we have to admit that the grist for professional journals does not have the broad appeal the people we study. One way to present the latter without lapsing into either dull documentary footage or aesthetically pleasing but superficial exoticism is to focus on the ethnography as fieldwork rather than as final product. Films which illustrate the process of coming to understand human beings who seem at the outset strange and incomprehensible can engage different audiences, carrying the double message of relativism and reflexivity.

Film can present raw or partly digested data in all the complexity with which the fieldworker encounters them. That complexity, and our way of making sense of it, may be the most compelling idea that ethnographic film can convey. If this is so, perhaps we ought to ask whether conventional documentary style, which signifies the presentation of objective fact, is adequate to the task. Ethnographers who make films, and those who write, in order to extend their impact beyond disciplinary bounds, will need to consider the capacities of different styles of presentation to portray multifaceted social life and the process of unraveling its intricacies.

DEBORAH A. HEATH
Dept. of Anthropology
Johns Hopkins University

Margaret Mead: Portrait By A Friend...

Jean Rouch filmed, John Marshall took sound, and Emile De Brigrad produced this sensitive portrait of Margaret Mead.

The American Museum of Natural History is now distributing it. Write to Louise Lo Presti, The American Museum of Natural History, Central Park West at 70th Street, New York, New York 10024. Rental fee is $50.00 per screening.

Please send Newsletter contributions to appropriate regional contributing editors or to Editor. The deadline for submission of copy for the next issue is November 15, 1979. Please send contributions double spaced and in duplicate.

Published three times a year: Fall, Winter, Spring, the Newsletter is provided free to all SAVICOM members. Subscriptions are available to individuals and institutions for $5.00 per year. Subscriptions should be sent to: SAVICOM Newsletter, American Anthropological Association, 1703 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20009. Payment should accompany any order. Make checks payable to the Society for the Anthropology of Visual Communication.
Directions . . .

A PERSONAL COMMENT ON THE QUALITY OF ‘HUMAN DOCUMENTARIES’

By HUBERT SMITH

In the first installment of this series, I discussed the technical and conceptual deficiencies in ethnographic films. I concluded that the imposition of philosophical, epistemological, and social choices *grounded in non-filmic anthropology* often confound what film does well. These are the issues I will discuss in this second installment.

**PART II**

Professional anthropology in the United States deals mainly in language. It trains its students to write down what they observe, to conduct analyses in their minds and on paper, and to go public in print. A symbol system shapes the knowledge it produces, and what the ethnographer and his readers know is determined largely by the possibilities and limitations of language.

This isn’t remarkable, given the place of language in human history. It is the most refined and broadly useful symbol system available. The visual media are not as well known. They are in an early stage of refinement; their laws, grammars, and practice are being explored and developed. And while I find film every bit as difficult to master as language, I also realize it is deceptively (and seductively) attractive — partly because it is poorly understood, and partly because it invites one to believe all it does is display “reality”. So I can understand why it would never occur to me to attempt writing an ethnographic text, and why many anthropologists sally forth to make films with little more than an idea of how to load the camera.

I can also understand why most anthropologists consider visual media inappropriate for doing “real” anthropology. They look in films for the satisfaction of standards created for the medium of language. Few people would ask a written ethnography to provide the sorts of information that a film does; yet many an anthropologist shun the visual media because they do not meet criteria established by and for language-based anthropology. We must make distinctions between fundamental intellectual requirements and those that vary depending on the medium. Anthropology and anthropologists must learn enough about film either to practice it well or to criticize it intelligently.

These issues are critical because anthropology does involve itself with visual media, and more non-professionals see films made by anthropologists than read professional publications. Such films implicitly assure the viewer that they represent reasonable and accurate representations of *entire societies or cultures*. And although some anthropologists decry film’s inaccuracies, such films are rarely withheld from any showcase that can be obtained for them, even when they are under the legal control of professional anthropologists.

I think it’s time to begin to construct for ethnographic films philosophical, epistemological, and methodological approaches that are both responsive to the intellectual requirements of anthropology and particular to the film medium. Let’s leave aside the hundreds of marginal film exercises cranked out by the naive, the gadflies, and the greedy. Let’s not bother with films that show us tribes instead of individuals, or use bits of activity ripped from the behaviors that precede or follow them. We won’t be talking about films whose subjects had to rearrange or interrupt their daily lives in order to convenience an investigator or a cameraman. When I talk of “film” in this article, I mean visual and aural chronicles of the life processes and human interactions that make up cultures and societies.

To engage these issues, we must be prepared to question what professional anthropology considers inviolable fundamentals — not because anthropology is necessarily wrong-headed, but because different criteria must be applied to different media.

* * *

Ethnographic films are inherently more public than printed forms of anthropological inquiry, for the good reason that the visual media have broader appeal than specialized technical language does. This difference goes to the heart of the intellectual questions under discussion and, at the same time, establishes an important ethical argument.

Language permits the investigator to pursue his own agenda; film, because it communicates more directly, creates agendas which are likely to be more particular to the activities of the subjects. The investigator trained in language grows comfortable with its usefulness in making syntheses and generalizations. Much current anthropology seems to seek concepts that set norms — a practice which requires speedily abstracting firsthand observations from their original contexts and categorizing them. Film tends to lock data within their original contexts — contexts that are products more of the subjects’ cultures than of our own. If an investigator then attempts to impose his own agenda, a dissonance occurs. Without the free synthesis which language allows, the data will not complement or support these impositions.

Thus, while language permits data to be used according to our own agendas, film resists. The difference has vast intellectual implications, but more important are the following considerations. Anthropology has established methods for treating subjects responsibly. In fact, the very opacity of language protects locales and individuals in ways which film cannot. However, the use of highly specialized concepts and vocabularies in anthropological writing produces habits which have profound ethical implications when transposed to film work. The professional communicating via print does not bother to reassure his readers that the subjects under discussion are worthy companions on the human journey; cultural relativism is taken for granted. But the nature of film — that it portrays subjects in more direct ways and before more public forums — circumvents specialized professional concepts. Thus the production of any of the three types of ethnographic films that are most often made is likely to involve serious ethical failings.

The scenes shot or edited for a film with a highly technical
agenda may trace a single idea that is important to the investigator. But because the camera tends to preserve context, such a film may look as if it were “about” the people depicted rather than about a theory. One simply cannot stop viewers from noticing behaviors or registering omissions.

If a survey agenda is imposed, the scenes shot or edited may cover categories relevant to published surveys. Such matters as subsistence activities, ceremonies, and dress and housing styles are emphasized in this kind of films. But a viewer might wonder if the people being used to demonstrate these factors possess individual personalities, spirits, and ingenuities; after all, if the agenda that outlines their representation on the screen omits such qualities, how is the viewer to assume the subjects possess them?

If the intent is to make an evocative film about exotic peoples, many of the same problems crop up. The esthetic sensibility of the filming culture is almost always the one in force. It tends not to be concerned with grounding the viewers’ perceptions in balanced cultural relativism; rather it emphasizes fascinating visual and aural phenomena which rarely hint at the subjects’ human worth.

Film invites contact with the individuals it depicts. It has the look of everyday reality, a palpability which automatically alters the investigator’s power to intervene. But most investigators do intervene in one way or another.

During the early use of film in anthropology, it was inevitable that language-bound training would influence what was done. Further, film was expensive and logistically difficult. All these factors tended to make anthropologists use film as a way to prove a theory or display an established fact. The heavy influence of theater conventions on film training also tended to emphasize managed presentations at the expense of filmic inquiry.

But in 1979, it seems to me that the continued con founding of what film does well can be laid to three main causes: First, language-bound anthropology permits intellectual control so that the data selected is personally and politically agreeable to most Western academics and, generally, most Western people. Second, filmmakers have failed to break away from non-analytical modes of thought, thus slowing the development of new film grammars and also hardening anthropologists’ view of them as intellectual inferiors. These factors have hampered discourse and development between the two fields. Third, the socio-economic position of the Western investigator continues to influence the intellectual tenets of professional anthropology. This has important effects on how anthropologists behave in the field and tends to permit field behaviors adverse to improved ethnographic filmmaking.

As I have argued, a communications credibility depends on its being evaluated within the framework of the chosen medium. Films are less credible when imposed agendas clash with what the viewer actually grasps from what is on the screen. Because film puts individuals on the screen, the ethnographer-filmmaker has an ethical responsibility to depict them as such, and he should take care that his agenda don’t interfere with that responsibility. But the field behaviors for acquiring data for print differ substantially from those for film. Data for print can be acquired through various means; data for film are almost always acquired in real time from the actual behavior of subjects. Data for print can be fractioned into bits; their final use need not depend on setting, time, or the actions which precede or follow them. Data for film can’t be fractioned in the same ways without the noticeable harmful effects I’ve discussed.

Many fieldworkers find that film work makes demands unfamiliar to them. The need to be present when things happen creates additional requirements. I’d like to discuss some of those requirements as drawn from my personal experience.

When we approach Latin American peasant communities to film, we say we want to learn about them and film their lives. In such societies, learning is done through direct observations; thus our spending long hours observing and learning is not only permissible, it is inherently logical to them. In a backhanded way, we also benefit from their experience with outsiders who say they want to know them but don’t put in the effort.

Sustained hours of observation are useful because the longer one spends, the better the chance that one will see a wide range of activities. It’s likely that similar activities will be seen several times and that ones missed for technical reasons will be repeated and filmed when conditions are better. The longer one spends with individuals, the better one knows them. Over time, the camera can be started sooner and positioned with ever-increasing foresight. Far more importantly, these long periods of contact diminish our novelty and allow everyone concerned increasing levels of ease and autonomy. The first day’s rapt interest in us soon gives way to chores and light conversation. We go through a number of behaviors ourselves to reinforce this acclimatization. Before long, humor, physical affection, and then conflicts appear. All these elements are vital to the subjects’ establishing on film their own humanity and credibility within contexts particular to them.

I should emphasize that the observation we practice is “passive” only in our endeavoring to enhance our subjects’ feelings of autonomy. Often subjects engage us and sometimes we engage them, either to gain information or simply to socialize.

Most anthropologists planning to work mainly with language don’t have to put in these long periods of contact. They can derive data from many sources (e.g., interviews, gossip, archives) which don’t require their presence at the behaviors they describe. And because language both permits and encourages the pursuit of technical agenda, long periods of passive observation may seem pointless. The subjects may simply not do things that are relevant to the investigator’s plan. But the fieldworker choosing film must adapt his work habits, if he acknowledges the difference that in film credibility is locked to the ongoing behavior of the subjects.

However, it seems to me that these long hours of contact have another benefit which cuts across all types of field work: subjects and investigators develop a social relationship based on shared experiences. The anthropological literature is quite explicit about peasants’ feelings toward outsiders. North American fieldworkers have observed such persons as ladino traders and merchants, government workers, and missionaries in their relations with peasants. A picture of cynical exploitation emerges, in which the peasant plays the outsider for what he’s worth while loathing his laziness and lack of commitment to knowing country
life. I've often wondered if many anthropologists' field methods did not tend to place them in the same category as these other outsiders. If one declares that his purpose is to learn but then proceeds to practice selectivity according to an obscure private agenda, he may signal little more than laziness and lack of commitment. This might well result in social relations that limit the investigator's access to data.

We have found that our initial proposals are met with reserved acceptance. Not until we have trekked out to fields and sat around homes for several weeks do our promises become tangible enough for our subjects. At that point, there is a definite increase in their ease and expressiveness. Often when it comes time for us to leave a family or a community, we are told, "You went everywhere with us. You know us. You are companions and now you won't be around to accompany us."

It should be noted that many North Americans are uncomfortable with passive observations as a social form. Their upbringing stresses that people within a social sphere should overtly acknowledge one another; thus engagement feels "good" and passivity feels uncomfortable. But Latin American peasants, while full of good conversation, tolerate what we would feel are long and pregnant lapses. One has to wonder if good data both for film and for other uses could be garnered by using more passive methods in these groups.

Most filmmakers would do well to borrow extensively from ideas and methods established and refined by anthropology. Most filmmakers don't realize the importance of long periods of fieldwork. They do not maintain a self-conscious attitude about how their actions affect relations with their subjects. They don't place enough importance on gaining access to the local languages. They tend to make culture-bound assumptions without the anthropologist's customary caution. And overall they tend to be much more concerned with their craft than they are with the intellectual and social issues of ethnographic work. Although film craft is demanding, it is chimpwork compared to these other issues.

But perhaps the most important adjustment one has to make in order to do film work in the ways I've outlined is a political one. The use of language permits removing data from context and fractioning them into bits to serve multiple agendii. Language thus allows a form of intellectual dominion. It permits and even encourages one culture's analysis to call the tune. Film (executed as I've described) tends to capture data in ways which make subsequent manipulation more difficult. It's almost impossible to compel the viewer of a film of human interactions to attend only to those elements relevant to a single research problem. Film is neither "better" nor more "real" than writing; it does, however, resist the wholesale imposition of the grids of one person's or one culture's intellect.

It has become painfully obvious that the world's exotic peoples have knowledge which we have managed to misuse or ignore. Their ingenuities of spirit, ecology, and socialization have passed through anthropological study in ways which made our utilizing them impossible. There is a school of anthropological thought which hold that current epistemologies serve political rather than social purposes. The use of film as a medium of inquiry and revelation may offer us a road back to those areas of human knowledge that we realize we need to learn and appreciate. It may also help us to analyze the structure of present anthropological study and advance plans for the future. But to do any of this, film will have to create grammars particular to itself and responsive to the broad goals of human study. These are issues I will discuss in the next installment.

THE FIRST STAGES OF COMPARATIVE ETHNOGRAPHIC FILMING

By TIMOTHY ASCH

Timothy Asch, who created the noted Yanomamo series with Napoleon Chagnon, is affiliated with Documentary Educational Resources, and has worked over the years with its Director, John Marshall to produce many other ethnographic films. He has taught visual anthropology at Harvard University, and is now at the Australian National University, where he has been filming in Indonesia on the islands of Bali and Roti with anthropologist James Fox (see International Section article on Australia). The following article addresses many of the same issues as Hubert Smith has in the preceding article, but from another point of view.

Making sound synchronous films of people in isolated parts of the world has been technologically possible since 1960; and not surprisingly, there has been an increasing number of projects to do just that. "Ethnographic film" has become a label for all films of "exotic peoples." At times the field has been isolated, as though it were a discipline unto itself. Yet to the degree that data is complete enough to have value in depicting an aspect of the lives of a people, surely ethnographic film ought to be considered an integral part of anthropology.

Whether we subsume ethnographic filmmaking under visual anthropology, communication or ethnography, what is important (it seems to me) is whether film is part of a serious piece of anthropological research, or how well it stimulates students to explore ethnography and theory more rigorously and with a more acute appreciation of the field situation.

Since progress in any field is made by individuals working in or close to that field, it seems prudent for those of us engaged in filming to make occasional reports to the profession. Here, then, is my report — a working paper from the field, in the sense that I am engaged in a long-range project in which I intend to continue moving back and forth between filming in Indonesia and annotating, editing and sharing films (and arguing with colleagues) in Canberra, Australia.

* * *

In 1976, I applied for and accepted a research position at the Australian National University. I was eager to collaborate with James Fox, an anthropologist who has worked for many years in eastern Indonesia, published and to some degree has crystallized his ideas about what he wants to convey through film.

The position seemed to me to afford an exciting opportunity to continue making ethnographic films while searching
for solutions to at least three problems: (1) professional anthropologists’ lack of commitment to documenting footage in which they had collaborated; (2) a shortage of films suitable for cross-cultural comparison; and (3) the need to combine feedback with increased data collection and deepened insight so filming could become a significant research tool.

These concerns emerged from my participation in the Yanomamo Indian film project, from teaching anthropology in several universities, and from discussions with filmmakers and anthropologists engaged in making or using film.

Even before I worked with Napoleon Chagnon, co-producer of our 39 Yanomamo films, I was determined to try to make educational films rich in ethnographic detail even if, at times, at the expense of beautiful images or elegant cinematic cuts. I had realized that I would do best to collaborate with ethnographers who had completed their initial ethnography and were working on specialized studies. There was always the option that I become the specialist and do the fieldwork myself — but then a single film could become a lifetime’s work, and I would not have the opportunity to develop fully the skills in ethnographic filming that I had begun to acquire many years earlier.

Filming itself is so absorbing that it is impossible simultaneously to take notes, interview participants, anticipate action, and keep in mind the entire social framework in which an event is occurring. For me, at least, I felt it would be extremely difficult as both filmmaker and ethnographer. And I think films are enhanced by the tension between the filmmaker’s desire to record visual events and the ethnographer’s to illustrate ideas that interest him. Further, the massive job of producing a film with accompanying written material is better shared.

Since most ethnographic films deal with the lives of people in a society foreign to the viewer, explanation is often necessary. Heavy narration traditionally has been the solution, but at the expense of other auditory data — and even visual data, as it imposes a particular perspective. If a film presents information that is too dense, or if there is a discontinuity between visual and auditory information, the viewer is likely to retain little.

We used little or no narration in many of our Yanomamo films. Fortunately, Chagnon has several publications that complement the films and help students pursue the many questions they raise. My greatest disappointment in the Yanomamo project is that we still have no well-documented written material, specifically relevant to each film that can be distributed as study guides with each print sold or rented. However, Documentary Educational Resources in Watertown, Massachusetts, is distributing preliminary guides written by students, based on the films themselves and on published material.

Study guides have never been considered legitimate publications, so from a professional point of view, an anthropologist would be crazy to write a study guide when he could be writing an article or a book. This is part of the general attitude that ethnographic films are icing on the cake, not part of serious anthropology. Paradoxically, enough anthropologists spending enough time writing supportive materials for films could help change this attitude. Through a detailed study, an anthropologist could place the filmed segments within the wider context of anthropological literature.

I was convinced that James Fox understood the need for film companions and was committed to writing articles to accompany any films we made together. Fox wanted to make research documents as well, and he agreed to annotate all the footage we would take, translate dialogue, and help place the film within the wider context of the ethnography of Indonesia — particularly eastern Indonesia. ANU seemed to me to be the place where I would be in the best position to demonstrate that ethnographic films could be valuable for research and instruction. If a few well-known anthropologists could be convinced that a film publication was a serious integral part of the ethnography of an area, I hoped that both films and their written documentation would receive broad professional recognition.

While I was at Harvard, Fox and I taught a film-based introductory course in social anthropology. It was through teaching together that we began to design a film project to be carried out in Indonesia. Fox had done his own fieldwork on several small islands in eastern Indonesia, but he is familiar with all the total ethnographic and most of the historical literature on Indonesia.

Many people have recognized the value of using film for cross-cultural analysis or for presenting contrasting ethnographic material to students. Usually these comparisons are the result of accident. For example, the Yanomamo Indian films are often juxtaposed with films of the Bushmen of the Kalahari or the Nentsilik Eskimos. But since almost every aspect of the Yanomamo’s lives differs the Bushmen’s and the Nentsilik’s, the main value of such a comparison is that enough good film exists to immerse the students in contrasting experiences.

We hoped that by filming in Indonesia, within a culture area where there has been well-documented historical contact, we might be able to collect film materials in which contrasts were more obviously significant.

Our grand scheme is to film in about five societies among which religion is one of the important variants. Our initial goal was to film on the islands of Savu and Roti. An indigenous religion is still practiced in parts of Savu, while Roti has been Christian for several hundred years. Problems in obtaining research visas and accidents of timing have meant that so far we’ve only been able to film briefly on Roti, but we are hoping to go to Savu in March 1980.

One major contrast that Fox has noted between Savu and Roti is that the ceremonial life of the first is physical, while that of the second is verbal. The Rotinese use formal ritual language, ordinary speech, or Indonesian depending upon the contexts. This has been one of our focuses in filming — perhaps because our two brief trips to Roti occurred during a prolonged drought when people were unable to perform many of their customary ceremonies. A ceremony can trap the filmmaker. In a strange place, even without understanding a ceremony’s broader significance, one can immediately see it as a bounded experience capable of being filmed. Not having such ready opportunities, Fox and I were forced to think more clearly about how our films could relate to his research on Roti. Still, we have not abandoned our intention to film the contrasting ceremonies of Roti and Savu as evidence of deeper social, political, and
historic differences.

As an example of what we’ll look for, a Balinese trance performance that illustrates through language usage one of the intersections between Balinese social stratification and religion. These language levels — an aspect of all Balinese life — contrast with the separation between ritual language and everyday language in Roti. It seems probable that, as we film within one culture area, more and more interesting contrasts will emerge.

Two linked concerns that emerged from my experience in the Yanomamo Indian film project were the lack of indepth information about certain filmed events and the responsibility to show the footage to the participants — a responsibility I did not fulfill in the Yanomamo case. I felt that at the Australian National University I would have an opportunity to work out a way to combine feedback with documentation.

I am convinced that video tape can provide new access to information. The potential for gaining an understanding of events by immediately feeding the information back to informants is enormous. This might also fulfill some ethical commitments to the people one is working with, because it will help to give them a better understanding of what one is doing when one films them and lives with them.

In 1977, after my first field trip to Roti with Fox, I went to Bali to work with Elizabeth Young, a Ph.D. candidate from the University of California, San Diego. We both had Wenner-Gren grants to explore the use of video feedback. I helped her technically and encouraged her to work in locations where it would have been difficult for one person to work alone. I also explored making films and video tapes simultaneously. Using a Sony Portapak to record feedback, Young was able to pursue a study of Balinese Topeng Drama in far more detail than would have been possible with pen and pencil or even with a tape recorder.

Since our knowledge of social anthropology depends on how well we are able to observe and analyze human behavior, it seems odd that we haven’t made better use of audiovisual materials in our research. It seems particularly appropriate in studying a social interaction where large numbers of people are involved. Playing a video tape of an event to different informants at different times could help sort out any apparent confusion, as well as indicate differences in interpretation, distribution of knowledge, or structural position. Some researchers have begun to explore this potential. For instance, in his study of Sri Lankan healing rituals, Bruce Kapferer found video feedback invaluable as a research tool (even using the poor resolution of a ¼” Aki), although he was often looking at ceremonies that involved only a few participants.

What I hope to explore on Savu is a closer link between video and film. While my goals in video taping are to provide feedback for the participants and the researchers, I assume it will enable me later to make films that are more valuable for instruction, as well as help Fox and Niko Kana (an Indonesian anthropologist who has worked on Savu) to write study guides that provide rich detail about the circumstances surrounding filmed interactions.

In 1978, I filmed in Bali with Linda Connor, a graduate student from the University of Sydney. Our filming, coming at the end of her first prolonged period of field work, has become integrated with her research.

Connor is one of the few anthropologists who have mastered the Balinese language, as well as Indonesian. She has been studying trance and trance curing, about which we are making three short films, all centered on a traditional Balinese spirit medium. The pressure to complete these films is tied to Connor’s professional work, because she intends to use at least two of them as integral parts of papers she is preparing. The written documentation is extensive; we have already annotated all the footage on the trance performance — including a full translation of all the dialogue and prayers.

Before becoming a filmmaker, I was a still photographer, and I am often disappointed by how anthropologists use photography — not for technical or artistic reasons, but because of content. Photographs have not generally been considered either a part of research or a way of conveying anything but the simplest information, mainly about ecology. Yet sequences of slides — especially combined with sounds recorded at the same time — can be an extremely powerful way of providing ethnographic information, and often far more appropriate than film.

While Connor and I were filming, the hamlet where we were working felt compelled to hold a collective cremation. We were quickly drawn into the six-week preparations and decided to take slides and sound, as we had only a few rolls of movie film. Although we were interested mainly in exploring how a hamlet with minimal resources could organize such a complex ceremony, the slides we took also illustrated the creation of the central ritual elements. Whenever something seemed interesting as a developmental process, I filmed it in detail, sometimes taking a whole roll of film in a minute or two. Connors simultaneously recorded the sounds of the work group and then interviewed the participants about what we have just recorded.

As our investment of time, energy and interest mounted, I sent frantic telegrams for movie film. In the end, we had enough footage to film the final days. It may not have been splendid compared to the high-caste Balinese cremations increasingly familiar to Westerners; but to us in the hamlet, the energy of a huge ceremony, the noise, color, smells and sheer human involvement, created their own sense of splendor.

Ordinarily these villagers would not have held this cremation because they were too poor, but they were compelled to do so in preparation for an important Balinese centennial ritual held to purify the island. For the centennial celebration to be efficacious, the Balinese dead must all be cremated, all be released. Everyone must do his share before the final ritual took place at the sacred temple on the slopes of Bali’s highest volcano. We were impressed to see how well these peasants, with little money, performed the elaborate ritual through the ingenious use of a few resources and contacts.

The hamlet was so poor that they hadn’t had a cremation in many years, and they could no longer find the bones of some of the people who had been buried. The villagers constructed effigies of many types to represent dead relatives. Twenty-six effigies were burned, reconstituted, burned and reconstituted again to help the souls to ascend, step by step, toward the home of the gods.

The challenge in making this film will be to integrate the
slides with the film, perhaps refilming elements that are in
the slides to focus attention on selected features. In some
cases an action can be explained while a still photograph is
on the screen; then the slide will dissolve into sound-
synchronous film of the same action, without narration
but with subtitles.

Although our slides will be integrated with film, I hope
that the bursts of slides and sound can be a model of an
effective use of still images for anthropologists with limited
resources.

* * *

In many relatively isolated societies in the world, the pace
of change has increased rapidly in the past few decades.
Since 1960, some of these societies have been filmed (at
tremendous expense) with the new sound-synchronous
technology. Yet many of these films tell us more about our-
selves and our preoccupations and intellectual fads than
about the people and cultures filmed. Most of these are not
serious ethnography but entertainment of the worst kind,
providing no more than an erotic gape for members of
Western society who hungrily soak up a television one day
and forget it the next. Time and again such audiences have
seen “weird” behavior filmed in foreign cultures as a way
of reinforcing their own cultural prejudices and attitudes of
superiority.

We have lost forever the possibility of recording some
social patterns that were the product of hundreds of years of
relative isolation. The breadth of human social variation has
been narrowed, or at least severely altered by the colonial
experience.

And yet, even if this were not so — even if we were given
the money and a mandate from an organization such as the
United Nations — it is doubtful even now that we would
know how to film these societies satisfactorily, except
perhaps through fictional films. We are individual practi-
cioners, working alone, jealously guarding what little we
have learned. Those of us who practice this profession of
making ethnographic film would do well to share our work
with each other and with interested students. In other
words, I recommend a yearly or at least two-yearly con-
ference composed of filmmakers and anthropologists cur-
rently involved in producing ethnographic films, along with
those whose projects have received funding. A few students
should be included each year. Such a conference would be
small enough to constitute a genuine working group that
could critically evaluate work in progress.

Anthropology will never run out of subjects to study.
There are still a few societies relatively untouched by contact
with the West, but the majority of ethnographic filming in
the next decades will probably concern people whose lives
are undergoing rapid transformations. These societies should
be filmed for their own members as well as for the rest of
us, and the films we make should represent a view that is
recognizable to the participants as one legitimate interpreta-
tion of what occurred. This means the filmmaker must
ensure that events are not chopped up so that — for example
— one ceremony concludes with footage from a quite dif-
terent ceremony or place, and that visual cuts do not
destroy the coherence of a dialogue. In the decades to come,
many societies that are changing rapidly may need and want such
films as historic documents, however fragmented. Those
of us living in the Western world need the films as a mirror
for ourselves and for the perspective that it can give us in
determining the course of our own tenuous destiny.

Special Report . . .

GEORGE STONEY INTERVIEW REVEALS MYTH OF FLAHERTY’S FILM ‘MAN OF ARAN’

By PAULINE SPIEGEL

“1 like the interaction of people,” George Stoney told me,
“1 like team work. 1 just like to go on location with a
team.” With his characteristic blend of low-key enthusiasm,
purpose, and engaging geniality, Stoney has directed and
written film after film on subjects as diverse as agriculture,
health and mental health, law and ecology. He has headed
film departments at the City College of New York and New
York University, and has been instrumental in the develop-
ment of innovative programs such as Challenge for Change,
the Canadian Film Board’s attempt to create a mechanism
for the Canadian people to speak to the government, and
vice versa.

Stoney has worked extensively in the South, where he was
raised and educated. In 1953 he drew on his experience
there to produce, for the Georgia Department of Health, a
classic film about Black midwives titled All My Babies.
Although, like most of the documentaries of the day, it was
scripted — cinema verité had yet to be invented — All My
Babies is remarkable both for its qualities of close observa-
tion and its effort of show the value and dignity of a Black
practice regarded with skepticism by White communities.

Stoney’s more recent film, How The Myth Was Made:

A Study of Robert Flaherty’s Man of Aran tackles Flaherty’s
well known 1934 film. In Man of Aran Flaherty used native
Islanders to enact reconstructed scenes of Aran life. The
film focuses on a family’s struggle to survive in the harsh
climate of the Aran Islands, off the western coast of Ireland.
How The Myth Was Made, a complex and delightful film,
offers insight into Flaherty the man and Flaherty the film-
maker, as it also provides perspective on the social and
political issues of the day, on the island, and on the islanders.

Spiegel: What were the myths you had in mind when you
titled your film How The Myth Was Made?

Stoney: The first is the myth Flaherty created for his
audience, the myth of the Aran Islander, the myth of the
man who must fight nature. You couldn’t call him the noble
savage, but the archetypal man, woman and child, who
survive against the buffets of the world. The buffets of the
world in Flaherty’s term, are always impersonal ones, strong
inevitable forces without any hint of evil. There’s no devil
in Flaherty. Flaherty doesn’t give you the least of hate, or
of blame. That is, in away, a kind of ennobling thing.
Another myth, and one that I probably have much more interest in, is the myth of Flaherty himself. Not Flaherty, but the myth that had been created around Flaherty, first by his widow, who was a very dear friend of mine, and a very powerful woman, but she completely misread her husband. She mystified the filmmaking process, the whole idea of "non-preconception," for example. That was a term she coined to describe "the Flaherty Way" of making films.

Spiegel: It also seems that you were addressing How The Myth Was Made to the Aran Islanders.

Stoney: Yes, to some extent. Man of Aran is about a true Aran Island myth, because as Flaherty discovered after he was there, they had a myth about themselves, about their own heroic stature: the man who could lift more rocks than anybody else, the man who could row longest, and the idea if you killed yourself doing that it was quite all right. It was a hero's death.

Spiegel: How conscious were the Aran Islanders of that myth as a part of their life in Flaherty's time?

Stoney: They were pretty well beaten by the time he got there. People had gradually been leaving the island until the population was way down. A series of government people had come in, tried to improve things, and walked away defeated. At first the filming gave the islanders a feeling of importance because somebody had been there and paid some attention to them, and the first responses off the island to Man of Aran were positive — people admired the island. But the people of the Aran Islands resented being associated with poverty in the film. It happens to poor people all the time. It’s only now that you see the second and third generation coming back, who can look with pride at their history. It’s like the history of the (American) West. The first generation after the West was "won" and made the whole myth of the Wild West, but two generations later, three generations later, they’re having "Wild West Days."

Spiegel: What do you say to someone who claimed that Flaherty distorted the truth by leaving out the serious social and political problems on Aran?

Stoney: There are many truths, and so long as you are looking for a statement of a larger poetic truth, and are not pretending to tie it to a particular place or a particular time, you’re justified in doing that. I think Flaherty was a marvelous poet. He was right in celebrating man’s survival against a hostile world. He was wrong in tying it to the Aran Islands.

Spiegel: Why was it wrong to tie the theme to the Aran Islands?

Stoney: I think it was wrong for two reasons. (1) It diverted the audience from thinking about this as a myth of all mankind, because he tied it to one specific place, so he hurt himself there. (2) It hurt the Aran Islands, because it said to the world, "That’s the way it is on the Aran Islands," rather than, "This is a metaphor which the Aran Islanders can share with all mankind."

He was really creating an abstract truth; he could have used the Aran Islands and he could have done it in half a dozen other places. The misrepresentation comes first from the titles in the film, "The Man of Aran is . . ." instead of "The Man of Aran a long time ago might have been . . ." So what he does is to claim that what you see on the screen was existing at the time. If the titles weren’t there you could read it a different way.

To show you Flaherty really meant you to misread it, you have to see the publicity that came out at the time the film was made. Flaherty himself wrote a series of articles for the London press in which he described the people of the Aran Islands as he described the Eskimos, as being remote primitives.

Spiegel: You say he was a poet. Many people think of him as a documentor of Aran Island life. Or was that only for publicity’s sake?

Stoney: That was only for publicity’s sake. What Flaherty was trying to do was to tell stories. And to tell stories in the abstract, using natural man whenever possible. But he would bend to whatever the critics wanted in terms of justifying himself once he made the film.

Flaherty knew that making a film was only thirty percent of the job; seventy percent was selling it. In an effort to sell the films he took the cast half around the world. Let me tell you a good example which Maggie (the island woman who portrayed a central role in Man of Aran) told me in all seriousness, and without any intent to be pejorative. She was telling us about coming over to America on the boat. She shared a stateroom with someone else, and one night she was invited to have dinner at the captain’s table with Flaherty. Now, she didn’t explain it; she didn’t even realize that she was traveling second class and he was first class. But we understood this when she described it. And so the lady in her cabin said, “Oh, you can’t go dressed like that.” The lady got out of her own dresses and gave it to Maggie. She redid Maggie’s hair in the fashionable style of the time. And when Maggie came to the captain’s table, she told us, “Mr. Flaherty grabbed my arm, and he took me out of the door onto the deck and he said, ‘Who fixed your hair?’ And I said, ‘The nice lady I was with.’ He said, ‘I never want to see your hair done like that.’ ” Maggie told us, “From that day to this I’ve worn it like this.” And she stroked her hair.

Spiegel: We think of Flaherty as a man who evolved his films on site, without developing preconceived ideas, sort of as a forerunner of observational films. Do you think that’s true?

Stoney: Well, I think a lot of that has been exaggerated. Each time he went out to look for materials to tell a story. And each of his films is somewhat different depending upon who edited it. Flaherty was such a charismatic person that he attracted people of first rate talent to work with him, all of whom tried to do their thing under the aegis of Flaherty. The only specifically Flaherty film is Nanook, which he shot, directed, and edited. After that, somebody had a hand in each of his films, though he worked closely with others, as John Goldman, who edited Man of Aran explains in How The Myth Was Made. Flaherty had a whole string of half-made films and failures.

Spiegel: You’ve also mentioned that you aimed your film, to some extent, at students, because you found that your classes actively disliked the Flaherty films you showed them.
Stoney: Yes. A great many of my students have been hung up on the Wiseman, Ricky Leacock, verité approach. They think that anything not done in that fashion—or the way they imagine these people operate—is not an honest film. They don't realize that no camera is honest anyway, that you get the surface of truth and not get what's underneath, and that you have to use all kinds of film artifact in the process of getting truth on the screen. I was hoping my film would clear away those ideas, so students could enjoy Man of Aran for what it is, seeing that Flaherty didn't intend to do a superficially truthful film.

Spiegel: Is it Flaherty's technique of reconstruction that the students dislike the most?

Stoney: Oh yes. Students hate the idea that you should tell anybody to do anything in front of a camera, not realizing, for example, that a demonstration is an arranged event.

Spiegel: What do you think about the recent objections to verité film style?

Stoney: Nobody ever meant to say that verité was quite as simple as students have taken it to be. Every verité filmmaker I know throws the theory out the window when he starts editing.

Spiegel: So does that mean you think the manipulations of verité editing call into question its value as a film form?

Stoney: Not exactly, but given the manipulations, you are liable to have less truth than if you deliberately set out at the beginning to make these manipulations. Here's an example. You decide arbitrarily at the beginning of a film not to have any narration. So then you do your best to get your story told, using sync-sound and filming lots of people. But finally you find you can't get the whole story told because no one person ever says it right. So you piece the film together in a kind of awkward fashion, and eventually the truth doesn't come out. But if you'd just given the line to somebody, they could have said it, and it would have been there. I see films over, and over, and over again that take twenty minutes to say what could have been said in three, if the filmmaker just had the good sense to say, look, will you please explain to the audience how you do this and this? How you get from here to here?

Spiegel: It sounds as if you would like to go back to reconstruction.

Stoney: At times, sure. I'll tell you the times when I yearn to do it. When I'm dealing with subject matter so personal, that I'm going to expose people, hurt the people involved if I have to deal with the material in a (verité) documentary fashion. That happens very often. Another time is when I can't get anything like the truth unless I use the techniques of reconstruction, and sometimes written lines.

Spiegel: How do you go about working with the communities where you're filming?

Stoney: I have learned that the nature of your local contact can determine your view; it can limit you; it can be a tremendous help, or not. Choosing the right person to work with can be a key thing. I've often found that I could work with one person only to a certain extent. Before long I would discover that some people didn't like him, or people would respond to me in a certain way if they knew I was associated with him, so I had to declare my independence. You just learn to play the community, as it's a way of working with characters, knowing that, in documentary, you're having to take most of the people you include in your film pretty much as they are on the surface. You're not going to change them; you're casting for type, or you're choosing different points of view, certain positions. Your ability to get to those people depends very much upon how they accept you, and how they see you.

One of the things I have found of most help is not depending just on myself. For example, we were working in Canada for a full summer, in Challenge for Change, trying to find some accommodation between the Indians and the White summer-cottage people on Lake Island and Amherst Island. I had working with me a woman from the Canadian Film Board, who could relate to the Indian women particularly well. I had my daughter of fifteen, Lulu, who could relate to the young Indian people. I had a young cameraman and his assistant who could relate to the Indians of their age. I could then relate to the older Indians and the cottagers. I could have all these other people, then, introduce me to the people they knew. This is a way of working that I've found very successful.

Spiegel: When you visited Aran, over a number of years, and while you were filming, you stayed with an Island family, the Fahertys. How helpful were they to you?

Stoney: Extremely helpful. In the first place, I was just dog-lucky getting to know them, because it was through them that my social position was set. You see, when Flaherty was there, he represented the top social structure. Flaherty just couldn't imagine himself being anything but the kingpin. As Grierson said, he was a baron with the serfs. And this is the way people saw him. People did things because he hired them. Even though I was going to pay them, I wanted people to respond to me and my camera in a much more independent way. The first thing anybody asks you on the Aran Islands is: "Who are you stopping with?" The Fahertys were among the poorest people on the island.

Spiegel: How did you approach the question of religion, since you're a Protestant and Aran is, of course, a very Catholic island?

Stoney: Well, when I first met Kate and Peter Faherty, Kate showed me over the house. I saw all the crosses and the saints up, so I felt I had to declare myself, and Kate gave me an opening. She said, "Well, you're traveling," I said, "Yes, my father was born here." And she said, "Ah, perhaps we're of the blood." I said, "There's no doubt about that. My family were Protestants." Just a slight pause, then she said, "How do you know I'm not Protestant and not telling anybody?" We both laughed. So the facts were known, and from that point, the kidding went on, with no hard feelings and no doubts.

Spiegel: You've spent a good bit of your life working in the South, on racially sensitive material, even before integration became a national issue. How did you see the problems of community relations there?

Stoney: When I came into Georgia to make All My Babies (1953), I knew I couldn't expose my sponsor, the Health
News from the Northeast...

1980 Conference of Visual Anthropology Sponsored by Temple University

Temple University will hold its 8th Conference on Visual Anthropology on March 12-15, 1980. The Conference brings together scholars, practitioners, and all people interested in exploring the human condition through visual means. COVA is a place where people can screen and discuss films and videotapes, exhibit still photographs, attend technical exhibits and workshops, and have conversations with photographers, filmmakers and videomakers.

COVA is sponsored by Temple University’s departments of Anthropology and Radio-Television Film, and the Lectures and Forums Committee, The Society for the Anthropology of Visual Communication, and The Center for Visual Communication.

The Director of the Conference invites participation in the following categories: (1) Motion Picture Film — Standard and Super 8mm (sound or silent), 16mm (silent, magnetic or optical). A large variety of films is anticipated, but short ones can be more readily included in the program. (2) Still Photographic Exhibits — Photo essays rather than isolated pictures are sought. (3) Videotape — ½” reel and ¾” tape will be considered. Do not send materials. Write for application, and you will be contacted as to directions on submitting any materials accepted. All persons are encouraged to submit productions and ideas.

Deadline for submission of all application forms is November 2, 1979. Previewing will begin in early September. The Selection Committee will meet in early December to make selections and to compile a Preliminary Program. All persons invited to submit material will be notified in January.

This is not a competition or festival. No prizes are to be awarded. However, within the confines of a limited budget, a small stipend will be given to some of the invited participants. For further information, please contact Jay Ruby, Director, COVA-80, Department of Anthropology, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122. (215) 787-1414 or 7513.

‘Women and Anthropological Film’ Symposium Featured at Pennsylvania 1980 COVA


The day-long Symposium will include screenings of films by and about women, and an evening panel discussion with noted anthropologists and filmmakers. Both visual and written materials are being solicited for consideration. If you wish your work to be considered, send a description of the work, along with information about how and why it was made as well as who was involved in its development and production, to the Symposium Coordinators:

Melanie Wallace, 17 St. Peter St., Jamaica Plain, MA 02130
(617) 522-0748
Rachel Field, Polyglot Productions, 135 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, NY 11238 — (212) 636-6026
Do not send films. Deadline for receipt of materials is October 15, 1979. For COVA registration materials, write to COVA, Department of Anthropology, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122.

News from the Midwest...

Illinois and Missouri Video Documentary Programs Covering Archaeological Projects

The Illinois Information Service is in the midst of video taping all phases of the archaeological research along Interstate 270. The two programs that have been completed thus far cover the history of the area, the discovery of the sites, the selection of sites for further investigation, and the recovery and analysis of artifacts and other archaeological materials. Another video tape will be available in the fall, and a longer documentary will be released when the project is completed. This summer, on the FAP-Route 408 Project, the Illinois Information Service will undertake a second video project, in which one documentary will be produced. Both video projects are funded by the Illinois Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration as part of a multi-media effort to inform the public about archaeological investigations and what is learned from them. More information about this work can be obtained from Earl Bowman, Bureau of Location and Environment, Illinois Department of Transportation, 2300 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois 62764.

The Extension Division and the American Archaeology Division of the University of Missouri-Columbia is producing a half-hour video documentary on Missouri archaeology. The program to be released this summer, will take the viewer from the beginnings of systematic archaeological research in Missouri to current archaeological research at the University of Missouri.
News from the Northwest . . .

‘The West On Videotape’ Highlights Western History and Folk Culture Collection

By STEVE FISHER

“The West on Videotape” documents 40 interviewees who have been significantly involved in the history and folk culture of the Western United States. The intention of the collection is to demonstrate the value of videotape in preserving local history. The recent advent of high quality, portable video equipment makes it possible to record historical information in the most remote and rugged areas of the West.

The collection consists of unedited, original master videotapes, most of which are in color. Thirty-five tapes are included, with a total playing time of seventeen hours. These videotapes were originally shot as interview and visual material for historical and social documentary television programs.

A broad range of topics is covered, including water, politics, cowboys, winemaking, and electric trains. The collection reflects the innovative technological themes so characteristic of the West. Alden Oliver explains an Archimedian screw pump windmill used in salt production; Bud Garin talks about his father’s old patented tomato planting machine, master nurseryman Toichi Domoto shows a new trailing azalea he is developing.

Many of the interviewees speak of disappearing life styles and folk cultures of the West. Five of the speakers were born in the late 1800’s; the oldest is Emma Garrod, born in 1882. Most of the other interviewees can recall the early years of this century. Their stories tell of a rural West undergoing rapid technological change.

A number of the videotapes make full use of the visual potential of oral history television. Whenever possible, historic locales, machines, and processes are documented. Old cowhand Frank Castro is seen participating in a Livermore Valley round-up; the disappearing ghost town of Drawbridge is seen from various visual perspectives. The intention is to convey a sense of place, a feeling for the geographical and technological factors which help determine historic changes.

The collection is designed for archival use, and a primary concern is providing the researcher with both supplementary written documentation and rapid retrieval techniques. Videocassettes are easy to handle and store (the entire collection could be carried in an orange crate), making them ideal for archival use. Quick retrieval of an indexed portion of a videotape may be accomplished using a variety of techniques, several of which are demonstrated in the collection. These techniques can utilize videotape recorder tape counters, elapse time visually superimposed over the picture, or digital computer codes.

Some examples of the collection subjects are:

- Ghost Town — Brenda Catannich: Drawbridge, The Bay Area’s Sinking Ghost Town
- Paiute Medicine Man — Ray Stone: Water, the Land, and Paiute Religion
- The Age of the Electric Train — Charles Savage: Central California Electric Railroads
- California Winemaker — Ernest Wente: Livermore Valley Wine Grower
- Japanese Horticulurist — Toichi Domoto: Sixty Years of Innovative Plant Development
- Solar Salt Industry — Alden Oliver: The Last Salt Maker
- Life in a Victorian Mansion — Gladyd Volkman: Growing Up on the Meek Estate
- Pioneering in the Santa Cruz Mountains — Emma Garrod: Roots of the Sunsweet Cooperative
- Water War (Owens Valley vs. Los Angeles) — Aubrey Lyon: The Transformation of Owens Valley
- Disappearing Agricultural Communities and Rising Suburbs — Lorin Eden and Irene Munster: From Farm to Shopping Center
- The Ancient Landscape — Wesley Gordon: The Boy Paleontologists of Hayward
- The Roots of a Regional Park — Bud Garin and Janet (Garin) Settle: Life on the Garin Ranch
- Cowboys and Rodeos — Frank Castro: The Skills of a Cowboy
- Building the San Francisco Bay Area — James d’Antonio: Mining for Sand and Gravel

The collection is non-circulating and is presently held by the Regional Oral History Office at Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley. For further information contact Steve Fisher or Willa Baum, Director.

News from the Southwest . . .

Albuquerque Symposium Features New Directions in Native American Art

In order to stimulate discussion and to present new approaches to research in Native American art history, a three-day symposium, with formal papers, panels, and open discussion sessions, will be held at the University of New Mexico, in Albuquerque, October 24th to 26th, 1979.

Session topics include criticism in Native American art, contemporary art and economics, ethno-aesthetics, and Native American architecture. Additional topic suggestions were welcomed, as were papers on any general aspect of the field. The presentation of each formal paper was limited to twenty minutes. It is expected that a collection of selected papers will be published.

Information about scheduled presentations, hotel accommodations, Pueblo and museum visits, as well as other special events will be mailed. Contact: J. J. Brody, Maxwell Museum of Anthropology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131.
Moving Image Laboratory Offers Nine-Month Filmmaking Program in New Mexico

The Moving Image Laboratory, directed by Carrol Williams, and located in Santa Fe, New Mexico, offers an intensive nine-month program in filmmaking for the social sciences. Enrollment is limited to 12 students, with a M.A. degree available through a joint program with the Department of Anthropology, Temple University.

Courses include: Social Science Film Part One: Production Lab (17 weeks); Social Science Film Part Two: Advanced Theory, Production and Independent Projects (17 weeks).

The Moving Image Laboratory programs are open to undergraduate and graduate students, teachers, researchers and practitioners with special interests in film, social and humanistic studies. It is not necessary to be enrolled in the joint Temple M.A. program to attend the MIL courses.

Tuition and costs: Part One—$3,000, Part Two—$1,800. For inquiries and applications contact Carroll Williams, Director, Moving Image Laboratory, Box 493, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501. Phone (505) 983-4127.

National...

Native American Public Broadcasting Consortium Offers Media Services

The Native American Public Broadcasting Consortium is a resource for public television stations, schools, community groups and tribal organizations to distribute high quality programs about Native Americans; develop and produce programs by, for and about Native Americans; consult about the development of media training programs for Native Americans, and work with public television officials to increase employment of Native Americans in the broadcast industry; and to seek help for problems through NAPBC’s media center.

NAPBC is a non-profit organization dedicated to the expression of the Native American heritage. It grew out of a need for a resource center to pool and exchange high quality Native American programming.

NAPBC is funded by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and began operation at its national headquarters in Lincoln, Nebraska, in August, 1977. Consortium Membership is open to public television stations, tribal organizations and educational institutions. Current membership extends from the East to West Coast and Alaska to the Southern U.S.

For more information, write or call: Native American Public Broadcasting Consortium, Inc., P.O. Box 83111, Lincoln, Nebraska 68501. Tel (402) 472-3522.

News from Canada...

Film Study of McBride Mennonite Community Explores Unique Mode of Life

By BERNARD DICHEK
University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

In an isolated end-of-the-road valley near the town of McBride in Western Canada, a community of 150 persons is attempting to relive their vision of original New Testament Christianity. The group broke away from a Pennsylvania Mennonite community in the early sixties with the belief that the majority of the world’s half million Mennonites had “abandoned the true faith” and that they alone carried out the faith of their Anabaptist forefathers.

Since then, under the leadership of Bishop “Papa” Baer, they have worked the land, operated their own schools and organized their society according to their view of the way of life of the Early or Primitive Church.

During this summer the first film study of this distinct group is being produced by David Stewart, an anthropologist at the University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada. Stewart has researched the McBride Mennonites over the past ten years and as a neighbor, has established the rapport that has allowed him to obtain their consent to be filmed.

The film will explore a pattern of life where the function of discipline and authority, the role of women, and the ultimate goals of life are as completely different from the societal modes which surround them as could be possible.

International...

10th ICAES Symposium on Visual Anthropology and New Bulletin Affirm India’s Growth as Center

India continues to develop as a center of visual anthropology. The 9th and 10th I.C.A.E.S. Symposium on Visual Anthropology took place there, and the new Visual Anthropology Bulletin is being published from Ranchi in Bihar State. Dr. K. N. Sahay of Ranchi University is to be commended for his energy and leadership, both as coordinator of these important international events and as editor of the Bulletin. Readers interested in the Bulletin should write to Dr. Sahay, Editor, Visual Anthropology Bulletin, P.O. Box 71, Ranchi 834001, India.

The highlights of the 10th Symposium included Dr. Ferchicago’s analysis of the state of North African cinema, Dr. Rouch’s observation on the possible relationship between fiction films and ethnography, and Dr. Omori’s description of the National Museum of Ethnography in Osaka, Japan. Dr. Ferchicago explained that North Africa is more concerned with the problems of economic development than with its cultural heritage, and that the young North African cinema turns its back on the traditional past, which is considered painful and backward. Dr. Rouch discussed the fact that feature fictional films have been too long neglected as visual anthropology, although some of them faithfully depict certain aspects of cultural life. Dr. Omori described the success of the “Videotheque” exhibition at the Osaka museum, where 37 video booths are provided to show ethnographic films.
March Paris 'Cinema du Reel' Awards Highlights of 2nd Ethnographic and Sociological Festival

By KATHLEEN MODROWSKI

The Second International Festival of Ethnographic and Sociological Film was held at the Georges Pompidou National Art and Cultural Center, Paris, from March 17th through 25th under the title theme “Cinema du Reel” (Reality Film) which attempted to emphasize the “separation between this type of film and fiction film.” The festival was organized by La Bibliotheque d’Information au Centre Pompidou, and Le Service d’Etude de Realisation et Diffusion de Documents Audio-Visuels, in collaboration with the Centre National de la Cinematographie, Cinematheque Francaise, Comite du Film Ethnologique, Institut National Audio-Visuel, and the office Culturel Audio-Visuel.

The wide range of subject matter and film styles in the more than 100 projected film hours from 24 countries spurred a final attempt to define “new” documentary film during the round table discussion March 24th, on the subject “Staging Reality”. While filmmakers and critics tried to reach a consensus as to the significance behind the terms “cinema direct”, “cinema verite”, “free cinema”, etc. and decide to what extent non-fiction film reflects reality, the debate never fully materialized because of the difficulty to integrate the primary concerns of many of the participants such as production costs, distribution, political intervention and manipulation.

American filmmaker, Fred Wiseman, expressed one of the dominating attitudes concerning film and reality, stating “All this scholarship should not go into something which is no longer a question . . . films are completely fiction but the effort is to make the illusion as it has really happened.”

French filmmaker Jean Rouch argued that the camera is an intervention in the lives of people and therefore, nothing can be filmed as “it really is”. He insisted on the importance of the moral concern of the filmmaker which lies in his total and conscious knowledge of the effect of his presence behind the camera and the risk he takes in becoming involved with his subject. “I work with my heart more than my head. When the relationship with someone of another culture goes beyond a strictly objective one then something interesting can take place . . . I am constantly spontaneously directing. I know that during the shooting with Margaret Mead (she) said things to me she never would have said had there not been the camera. In this way the camera always serves as a stimulant. This is a moral question . . . How far can we go?”

On the contrary, Fred Wiseman felt that his presence as a filmmaker did little to alter the situation, responding, “I don’t know how you (Rouch) can be so sure that the situation changes because of the presence of the camera. When you feel you are being conned you stop shooting. Most of the time when you are making a film you’re hanging around so you get to know how things are.”

While this question of morality and reality was the concern of many western filmmakers, representatives of Third World countries felt other problems were more urgent. Nigerian filmmaker Inoussa Ousseini felt that the technically underdeveloped countries need to learn “how to make film technology work to change the country”. Tayeb Houssini, a Palestinian filmmaker, stated that the countries involved in revolutionary struggle are limited by a monopoly in the distribution of information and therefore it is necessary to “appropriate the reality that has been taken from them.”

Enrico Fulchignoni, president of the Film Committee of UNESCO, challenged the filmmakers of these saying, “. . . You do not have the courage to use the camera in a new way . . . there is an incredible passivity in view of this problem.” Several participants suggested that little has changed with regard to the philosophy and technique of intervention films since the development of the Soviet philosophy of the ‘30’s and the introduction of the new technique of cinema verite. Joris Ivens, octogenarian and spiritual leader of the European documentary film movement closed the discussion in saying, “The cinematographic language is a marvelous one and it must be spoken with eloquence. There is a triangle within the reality of film which is made up of the people in front of the camera, the viewing public and the camera. This is an enormous responsibility.”

Six films were selected in the final running for the festival’s award, which include: Jacques Godbout’s Derriere l’image (Behind the Picture) of Canada; Jean Arland and Philippe Senechal’s Les fusils jaunes (Yellow Rifles) of France; Anne Wheeler and Lorna Rasmussen’s Great Grandmother of Canada; Judith and David MacDougall’s Lorang’s Way of the U.S.A.; Frank Diamant’s Nicaragua September 1978 of the Netherlands; and Genevieve Bastide’s Si pres, si loin-Montrissou ou l’enfance retrouve (So Near, So Far-Montbrison or Childhood Rediscovered) of France. The jury decided to divide the prize between the directors of Lorang’s Way and Nicaragua September 1978.
AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND: The Status of Ethnographic Film Production

By DAVID MacDOUGALL

(David MacDougall, ethnographic filmmaker and SAVICOM contributing editor, is Director of the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. His report covers AIAS activities, and other Australian and New Zealand film productions.)

In July and August Kim McKenzie, with anthropologist Les Hiatt of Sydney University, filmed a mortuary ceremony of the Anbarra at an outstation near Maningrida in Arnhem Land. One focus of the film is the interaction of the two main ritual leaders in organizing the ceremony; another, the anthropologist's role in the ceremony and his efforts to interpret what is going on.

At Aurunkun, an Aboriginal community on the western coast of Cape York peninsula, David and Judith MacDougall have spent twelve months making four long films and several shorter ones, all based on requests from people in the community. These range from a film on political events surrounding the abolition of the Aurunkun Aboriginal Reserve by the Queensland State Government (for what many regard as largely mercenary reasons connected with bauxite mining) to a film about a house-opening ceremony. There will also be films about the mapping of lands belonging traditionally to certain Aboriginal clans and lineages and about Aborigines returning to these lands to live. One such film concerns three generations, an old man, a middle-aged man, and a boy who belong to the same extended family but have experienced quite different upbringings. All these films are now being edited, and a number should be completed by the end of 1979.

David and Judith MacDougall have completed Lorang's Way, the second feature-length film in the trilogy Turkana Conversations about the seminomadic Turkana of northeastern Kenya. First in the series is The Wedding Camels, which treats a Turkana marriage and the family interactions and negotiations that accompany it. Lorang's Way is a portrait of Lorang, a man who has come to see his own culture as vulnerable and whose traditional role in Turkana society is heightened by this realization. The film won the Prix Georges Pompidou for best ethnographic film at the second "Cinema du Reel" meeting in Paris.

This past year, the AIAS has moved all its holdings of original film materials on Aboriginal society into a newly-built temperature and humidity controlled vault. They are endeavoring, through the Institute Resource Centre, to make increasing numbers of study prints of archival material available for research and teaching.

In May the Film Unit took on an Aboriginal trainee to learn film-making techniques. The unit is participating in the filming and analysis of Torres Strait dances — an activity begun by A. C. Haddon over eighty years ago.

Timothy Asch has returned to the Australian National University (ANU) from Indonesia, where he has been filming on Bali and Roti in collaboration with anthropologist James Fox. Professor Anthony Forge, head of the Anthropology wing of the Department of Prehistory and Anthropology at ANU, and his wife Jane have shot footage of a Balinese cremation. Patsy Asch has been helping to edit this footage, and she has recently returned from preliminary anthropological research in Bali. John Darling and Ron Blair have taken excellent footage of the cremation of a 126-year-old Balinese artist of high caste.

Andrew Pike, a Research Fellow in the Department of Southeast Asian History at ANU, has completed a history of the Australian cinema to be published by Oxford University Press. He is preparing to make a film on the impact of World War II on the people of Papua New Guinea, using much old footage of anthropological interest — work that is expected to take several years. Readers of this newsletter are encouraged to write to Mr. Pike if they know of any film materials that should be brought to his attention.

Address: Department of History, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

* * *

Ian Dunlop of Film Australia is editing a series of films from materials shot at Yirrkala in northeast Arnhem Land over the past nine years. The first film to be completed is Madarpa Funeral at Gurka'wuy, which had its first public screening on March 29, 1979. The hour and a half long film, subtitled "A Way of Coping with Death in Northeast Arnhem Land," shows the funeral of a young child at Gurka'wuy, the Aboriginal homeland settlement of the Marrakulu clan on Trial Bay in the Gulf of Carpentaria.

Early in the 1970's members of several clans began leaving Yirrkala, formerly a Methodist Mission station, to establish their own settlements at important sites on their own clan land. The clan homeland movement, which has now spread through northern and central Australia, had begun.

In 1976, Dunlop was invited by Dundiwuy Wanambi, a leader of the Marrakulu clan with whom he had worked closely over the years, to Gurka'wuy on Trial Bay in the Gulf of Carpentaria. He wanted Film Australia to record the first major Marrakulu ceremony to be held at Gurka'wuy since its establishment as a clan settlement. While the filmmakers were there, a baby boy died. The Madarapa men and Dundiwuy asked the filmmakers if they would film the funeral of the child.

Mortuary rites of the Yolngu (Aboriginal people) of northeast Arnhem Land are extremely complex. Every part of the ritual is rich in symbolism and has many meanings. The deeper meanings are secret and could not be revealed in this film, but with the help of Dundiwuy Wanambi, Narritjin Maymuru, anthropologists Howard Murphy and Nancy Williams, the film indicates some of the complex connections that link people of different clans and their land together through their religion.

A booklet giving ethnographic background and further describing events in the film is being prepared to accompany the film. Distribution contacts: United States — Jim Henry, Australian Film Commission, City National Bank Building, 9229 Sunset Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90046, U.S.A.; in U.K. — Australian Film Commission, Canberra House, 10-16 Maltravers Street, London, WC2R 3EH, United Kingdom; in other countries, contact Australian Embassy or Consul.

* * *

Philip Robertson is finishing the second of three projected sociological films on Australian society for Film Australia. The first, Belonging . . . , was released in 1978. The second,
is a study of the interests and activities of different groups that either inhabit or have influence over a run-down inner-city neighborhood in Brisbane. The third film will be about people in a planned company mining town. Sociological consultant on the first two films was Kate Gillen.

Belonging . . . is an intimate study of the lives of four men in a New South Wales country town. Ross is a minister, Col a social worker, Tony a saddler, and Bernie drives the Wellington Shire backhoe. The four are mates and the film is a study of their relationship to each other and to other townspeople.

Because three of the men are relatively recent arrivals in Wellington, to some extent they are considered outsiders. But like newcomers to any community, they have created a network of friends and acquaintances which gives them a sense of belonging.

Through their daily activities, broader themes are raised: "belonging . . ." suggests that in country towns there are clearly those who "belong" and those who don't — women, Aborigines, the poor, the unemployed; and the film demonstrates that social life in the town has a pattern based on status, class and sexism.

Belonging . . . is accompanied by a twenty-minute film called Talking About "Belonging . . ." that records the main subjects in a discussion of the film after it has been screened for them the first time.

* * *

Professor William Geddes, of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Sydney, returned from Sarawak with 20,000 feet of film of the Dayaks, whom he has been studying for over thirty years and whom he first filmed in 1961. He would like to make three films on their ritual as it relates to the agricultural cycle. Geddes was one of the first anthropologists to make a professional-looking ethnographic film and he is one of the few people who has taken film back to show the participants: in 1968 he returned to the Blue Miao with his film, Miao Year, taking a 1,000-watt generator over rugged mountain terrain. In 1974 Geddes made a film in Fiji called Vatulele, edited for ABC television as The Island of the Red Prawn.

Geddes and Roger Sandall run the Ethnographic Film Unit of the Department of Anthropology. For many years Sandall has been involved in collaborative filming of Australian Aboriginals — with Nicholas Peterson, Jeremy Long, and others. His most recent aboriginal film, Lawari and Walkara was filmed in collaboration with Stephen Wild. Several years ago Sandall and a graduate student from his department, Sharon Bell, completed a film on white Australians, called Weddings.

In January 1978, Geoffrey Burton and Sharon Bell began filming a series of three fifty-minute documentaries in Sri Lanka. The project was partially funded by a $34,000 loan from the Australian Film Commission — the largest ever given by them to support a documentary project.

The three films, shot over a period of nine months, center on three distinct communities. The first, Four Women, produced by Roger Sandall, presents individual portraits of four Sri Lankan women whose economic positions and attitudes vary greatly. All live in the agricultural village of Kanewala. The village is within commuting distance of Colombo, the capital of Sri Lanka, and reflects the impact of foreign in-
fluences dating back to the establishment of large British-owned rubber plantations in the area. The women's activities center mainly on work, both inside and outside the home. They are preoccupied with their economic situations, their hopes for their children and their perceptions of the way in which the village has changed.

The second film, Fishermen of Duwa, looks at a group of Christian fishermen from a West Coast village. Attention is focused on two aspects of this community: the fishermen's lives as devout Roman Catholics in a predominantly Buddhist country and their lives as migratory fishermen, forced by the pattern of monsoonal rains to leave their home village of Duwa for six months of every year and live in camps on the East Coast of the island, some 250 kilometers away. Every year at Easter, the fishermen return to Duwa for the performance of a Passion Play.

The third film, Dancers Were Only Allowed to Dance, is the story of Pelpitigoda, a small colony of people of very low caste. Ranhotige Juse has formed a traditional dancing school for the village children in the hope that their training may some day provide them with employment. He tells the story of the villagers: their traditional role as exorcists, their exploitation on the neighboring British rubber plantations, and their lack of opportunity in a society governed by those of high caste. The situation of his pupils is contrasted with the prospects of one high caste boy who is a member of Juse's dancing troupe.

The aim of the filming in each case was to make available to the villagers themselves film as a medium for communication. "Directed" interviews (all in the Sinhalese language) are used extensively in conjunction with "observational" material. The interviews are used as a means of re-exploring areas of interest that the people raised in non-filming situations. Where common themes arise, they originate from the process of communication with an outsider: a process that was extended to film and thereby to a wider audience.

* * *

Paul de Dekker of the University of Auckland Department of Sociology says he has raised NZ$60,000 so far to make a film A la recherche du temps perdu Polynesien by translating Proust to French Polynesia. He says it will have an ethnographic emphasis.

* * *

Lawrence Foanaota of the Solomon Islands, who has been making videotapes of Solomon Island dances, is now in New Zealand to take a degree in archeology.
THE SECRETS OF FUNDING (PART II) AND BUDGETING GRANT FUNDED FILM
© 1978 STEVE PENNY

Here's the last installment of Steve Penny's two-part article "Secrets of Funding", followed by his valuable introduction to the difficult task of budgeting funded films. Both pieces are reprinted from Penny's "How to Get Grants to Make Films" available from Film Grants Research, P.O. Box 1138, Santa Barbara, California 93102.

Three hundred and fifty of the larger foundations publish annual reports which can usually be obtained by writing or calling the funding source. When available, an annual report is the best single source of information about a particular foundation, listing recent grants, officers, guidelines, preferred method of contacting the foundation and the time of year to apply. Some of these larger hardback books can be found in the reference section of a good public library. Several of these guides have a “How to Use This Book” section. Find it and read it before you dive in!

Your search will usually begin by combing the “Subject” or “Key Words and Phrases” index. Draw up a list of all the subjects that your film touches upon; then find the foundations giving in your particular area of interest.

Learn everything you can about funding sources that look like good prospects. Important items to note include the size of the foundation, who it has given money to in the past, and how much. What is the average size grant awarded in a recent year? What is the ratio of applicants to recipients? Are the foundation's fields of interest broad or narrowly defined? Has the foundation supported organizations with similar goals as your own? Does your project fit into a pattern you can discern from the foundation's past giving? How does the foundation prefer to receive applicants, and at what time of year?

As you comb these reference guides you'll find entries that will make you pause and speculate. A $70,000 grant was recently given to study the odor given off in perspiration by Australian aborigines, together with an award of $12,000 to build a device to measure that odor. The Pentagon gave a $500,000 research grant to explore military adaptation of the Frisbee. The National Institute of Health gave a $19,000 grant to find out why children fall off tricycles, and a $6,000 grant has been given to study Polish bisexuality among girls.

Situations do sometimes occur in grant programs where there is more money to be given away than there are qualified recipients, but generally film grants are quite competitive. Every foundation receives far more worthy projects than it could ever fund. Favorable ratios of applicants to recipients run four or five to one. Large private foundations, such as the Ford Foundation, sometimes have ratios of thirty to one. It's important to realize, however, that many applicants eliminate themselves by failing to adequately research a funding source before they apply. This prevents them from fully understanding the activities of the granting organization and supplying a proposal that fully meets the foundation's needs and goals.

While much of your preliminary research can be done with the reference books found in a good public library, in-depth researching of funding sources should be done at one of the Foundation Center's national or regional libraries. The Foundation Center is a non-profit organization that gathers, analyzes, and disseminates factual information about philanthropy. The center maintains a number of research libraries around the country to facilitate fund raising. A list of these libraries together with brochures on the services offered by the center may be obtained by writing: The Foundation Center, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

On file at these grant research libraries are specialized sources of information such as a complete selection of the major reference books, annual reports, microfiche records of foundation IRS returns, bibliographies of publications pertinent to fund raising, newspaper and magazine articles on foundations, as well as a variety of computer services.

Grant administrators are people who go to work each day and are faced with piles of applications, dedicated humanitarians dealing with an inhuman amount of paper work.

Good grantsmanship is making your transaction as simple for the foundation staff as possible. Your project must be easy to understand and provide the persuasion for the reviewing staff members to support it at board meetings.

Your first contact with a foundation frequently takes the form of a brief, one page letter of introduction. Because this letter is the first contact, it is often the most important. This letter must inform the foundation of who you are, the nature of your project; point out what is innovative about your film and why it is needed. Let them know how much you are looking for and finish the letter asking if they would like to receive more detailed information.

Keep it short and simple! You have to be prepared to communicate concisely on paper to survive the elimination process. If you can't distill your project down to a one paragraph abstract, you can't expect the staff worker to do it for you before the Board of Directors!

Foundations vary immensely. There is nothing very standard about what will happen after the foundation receives your introductory letter. You may get a letter back three months later graciously declining your offer to send more detailed information.

You may be asked to submit a proposal which varies from foundation to foundation, but will inevitably contain certain elements. Your proposal should answer all of the following questions:

What is the purpose of your film? Why is it needed? What will be the benefits of your project? Who is the intended audience and how will the film reach that audience? Who sponsors or endorses this project? What type of support has the project received to date? Why are you qualified to undertake this project? Usually the last few pages of the proposal is the project's budget.

When you get a letter asking for more detailed information, it's a good idea to get on the phone to be sure you're
supplying exactly what is needed to evaluate your proposed film. An inability to supply the foundation with the desired material tells them you probably don't have the organizational capability to execute your project.

Remember you're working with people whose orientation is towards giving. They are experienced proposal readers, so don't exaggerate the benefits of your project or you'll appear dishonest.

Getting grants to make films is no instant process. It usually takes six months to a year from the time you apply before you're spending the money.

Grant funding is attractive for several reasons. It's one situation in life where your aspirations and qualifications are clearly documented and you are judged with an unusually high degree of impartiality. What's more, a film produced with a grant usually gives the filmmaker far more independence and freedom than any comparative type of financing.

It takes a lot of work to write an application, but can you think of very many easy ways to acquire large sums of money to make films? The ratio of applicants to recipients for some of these programs demand that you view rejection as merely a routine inconvenience. In the long run, your ability to learn from your mistakes and bounce back with a refined technique will make you a survivor!

**BUDGETING GRANT FUNDED FILMS**

Filmmakers first becoming involved with grantsmanship frequently believe that if they are recipients of a non-repayable grant, that the funding agency must expect them to execute the project on a charitable basis, i.e., receive little or no compensation for their work. This is a mistake! The people administering the grant programs are often receiving salaries for their work, and they expect you to as well. The eligibility requirements for the National Endowment for the Arts goes so far as to stipulate that only organizations that compensate its workers at the prevailing minimum compensation level are eligible for funding. The labor you put into your project is valuable, and there are several ways of arranging your budget so as to be compensated for this work.

First, it's important to understand certain terminology commonly used in philanthropy, for there are some important differences between writing a budget for a grant funded film as compared to other types of film financing.

Many federal agencies and some private foundations give what are called matching grants. Matching grants are funds which are usually awarded on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis. In other words, at least one-half of the total project budget must come from sources other than the granting agency. An example would be the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) awarding a $10,000 matching grant for a project that has a total production budget of $20,000. The grantee is expected to raise the remaining $10,000 through contributions from other, non-federal sources.

Contributions which are used to satisfy matching requirements fall into two categories, cash contributions and inkind contributions. Cash contributions are where money changes hands. An example would be a private foundation awarding a grant of $10,000 to match an NEA grant of $10,000 for a project with a total production budget of $20,000.

Inkind contributions are where no money changes hands, but rather services or something of value that would ordinarily cost money is donated. For example, if you own a camera which ordinarily rents for $50.00 a day, and you donate the use of this camera to the project for ten days, this may be listed as an inkind contribution of $500.00. Your own salary, the salaries of people working on the film, or a percentage of these salaries may be donated as inkind contributions. Anything of value contributed to a project, whether it be money, equipment, or services, may be used to help satisfy the matching requirements, and will be listed as either a cash contribution or an inkind contribution.

Another term used in budgeting grant funded projects is indirect costs. Indirect costs are the expenses incurred in doing the administrative and accounting tasks in executing a project. The figure is commonly arrived at as a percentage of the project's total budget, generally five to thirty-five percent for motion picture projects. Indirect cost rates are assigned to an organization with its first federal grant, and this rate is adhered to for all subsequent federal funding.

Indirect costs add to the total amount requested from the granting agency making it one consideration for a filmmaker seeking a sponsoring organization. For this reason, it sometimes makes sense to shop around for a sponsoring organization with a low indirect cost rate. Keep in mind, however, that an organization with a relatively high indirect cost rate, such as a PBS Station, may have technical help and contacts that will be compensating factors.

The partnership which exists between the filmmaker, or project director, and the sponsoring organization varies tremendously. It's important to discuss and agree upon certain details of this relationship before you prepare your budget.

Get a clear idea of what the relative contributions of the project director and the sponsoring organization will be to the completed film. As project director, you will be responsible for the day to day execution of the project. This is work for which you should receive compensation in the form of a salary, proceeds from the distribution of the film, or both.

The sponsoring organization will be contributing its good name to the project. This can be a significant contribution, for it's not unusual for a grant to be awarded on the basis of an organization's name and reputation rather than on the merits of a specific project. Since the sponsoring organization is the grantee, it is responsible for the manner in which the award is spent, so most sponsoring organizations handle the work involved in accounting and disbursing funds. Almost all foundation grants are non-repayable, i.e., the granting organization does not seek reimbursement for the grant, so the revenue which is generated through distribution of the film is usually divided between the sponsoring organization and the project director. Determine who will own the copyright of the finished film and how proceeds from the distribution of the film will be split. Some foundations will stipulate the copyright be held by the sponsoring organization, but this point is usually negotiable.

It is not unusual for the project director to receive all proceeds from the distribution of the film, with the sponsoring organization being satisfied with the fees received...
through indirect costs, and the recognition that comes with good mention in the credits. Other sponsoring organizations will ask for a percentage of the revenue generated by the project, and under certain circumstances will expect all of the proceeds from the finished film. Factors which will influence this arrangement will be the policies and past activities of the sponsoring organization, the relative contributions of the project director and sponsoring organization to the completed project, and the bargaining power of the project director. There is no standard percentage as to how these revenues are split, making it a matter that should be negotiated before the project is presented to a funding agency.

Another point to discuss is how the cash flow will work. Since films often involve large expenditures, it should be determined how funds will be disbursed from the sponsoring organization for production expenses incurred by the project director.

How you arrange your own salary may vary with different funding sources. In most circumstances you should receive a producer’s fee if you are responsible for the execution of the project. This is especially true if you are working with an agency that has certain stipulations as to how the proceeds from the finished film are used. The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), for example, stipulates that 50 percent of the proceeds from the finished film must be returned to NEH until the grant is repaid, and 50 percent must be retained by the grantee under the condition it is used for another humanities oriented project. Under this type of arrangement, it is important to get your salary up-front, as you may never see any money from the finished work.

Different funding sources like to receive their proposed project budgets in different forms. If you are applying to a federal agency you will generally receive an application form with categories and blank spaces to be completed. Private foundations are generally more free-form, asking simply that certain items be listed in your proposal.

A list of expenses that will probably appear in your budget is covered at the end of this chapter in my book. This list of items is not intended to be all inclusive for all types of filmmaking, but rather to aid filmmakers with little experience in budgeting, and to be a check list for quick estimates.

Several excellent publications are available to aid in detailed script breakdown and budgeting. These include:

**FILM BUDGETING AND SCRIPT BREAKDOWN** by Danford Channess. Available from the author at P.O. Box 2237, Toluca Lake Station, North Hollywood, CA 91602, $20.00.

**BROOKES STANDARD RATE BOOK** by Stanley J. Brookes. Available from the author at 1487 Glendan, Los Angeles, CA. Lists wage scales for complete Hollywood, theatrical, television, film and video salary schedules for studio and location shooting. $20.00.

**BROWN’S LOW BUDGET FEATURES** by William O. Brown. Available from the author at P.O. Box 2641, Hollywood, CA 90028. Describes in a step by step fashion the production of a low budget film, including budgeting. $20.00.

Remember, you must be prepared to justify any figure you list in your budget. Your figures will be reviewed by experienced filmmakers and an inability to budget realistically will tell the funding agency you probably don’t have the organization capabilities to execute your project.

The question always arises as to whether one should budget at union scale or non-union. The best approach here will depend on several factors.

An essential part of your research outlined in the last edition of SAVICOM Newsletter is discovering what a particular foundation’s high, low, and average grant size is. It’s a waste of everyone’s time to ask for a $50,000 grant from a foundation that never gives grants over $10,000. As funding sources vary tremendously in the size grants they consider, budgeting at union scale may well push your request far beyond what the prospective foundation is willing to give.

On the other hand, if your prospective funding source considers grant amounts that permit you to budget at union scale, this may be your best practice as union rates are at the high-end of the pay scale, and can be justified by pointing out that union rates will insure the best, most professional job will be done on the film. If the foundation is truly interested in seeing your film produced, they will want it to be a good film.

Since funding sources vary tremendously in the nature and the size of grant requests they consider, you will undoubtedly prepare different proposals and budgets for the various funding sources you will be contacting. Create a project that will grow by adding additional footage as money becomes available. Write ideal budgets and bare bones budgets. Your ability to construct different proposals and project budgets that meet the giving interests of the various funding sources will bear strongly on your ultimate success in fund raising.

Some grant programs stipulate that money cannot be disbursed for costs incurred before the beginning of the grant period. However, a necessary ingredient of almost every film proposal is a script or treatment which can involve a large investment of time. How can you be compensated for the work that goes into your project before it is funded? One way is to copyright your script, then include in your budget a release for the script’s copyright. In this way you have incurred an expense after the beginning of the grant period for work that went into the project before you received the grant.

Contact your prospective funding source to find out its policy regarding reimbursement for other costs involved in preparing the proposal, such as research and development or location scouting. All work contributed to the project preparing the proposal should be itemized and recorded on an hourly basis if you expect to be reimbursed for it.

The shooting ratio you budget will depend upon the nature of your film. When Walt Disney set out to make wildlife films, shooting ratios of 200 to 1 were budgeted. Andy Warhol’s shooting ratios are often 1 to 1, so your project should fall somewhere between these two extremes. Ratios of 5 to 1, or 10 to 1 are common, and it’s doubtful any granting agencies would challenge ratios in this range which are basically industry standards.

Don’t forget to budget wear and tear on your car at the current rate allowable as a tax-deduction by the Internal Revenue Service. Other expenses frequently overlooked are sales tax and fringe benefits, such as insurance for people working on the production. Remember that promotion and distribution of the finished film are expenses which should be covered by your grant since no film is of any worth unless it reaches its intended audience. Include a fee for a
photographer to shoot production stills to aid in promotion and distribution.

If possible, it is generally advisable to budget at least ten release prints. If asked to justify this expense, point out that the more preview prints available the faster the film will reach a wide audience. Release prints are one of the last expenses incurred in a production, and having this extra margin of safety can be invaluable. It is better to budget ten release prints and then discover at the end of the project that you only have the funds for two release prints rather than run out of money before you finish your sound mixing. Even if you only finish with two release prints, you still have a finished film to show!

Getting grants to make films is not an instant process. At least a year usually elapses from the time you’re writing your budget before you are actually spending the money. Since inflation seems to be a continuing fact of life, include an inflation factor so your budget will still be realistic a year and a half from now.

Include a 15 percent contingency in your budget. A contingency is a “Fudge Factor” which covers unforeseeable expenses. Some foundations unfamiliar with filmmaking will challenge 15 percent as excessive. In the event this occurs, impress upon the foundation staff that motion picture production is a high risk enterprise. The American Film Institute Independent Filmmaker’s Program funded by the National Endowment for the Arts is one grant program that deals exclusively with filmmaking, and its budget forms permit a 15 percent contingency.

If any questions should arise as to what are allowable expenses, get on the telephone and discuss the matter with the foundation staff before submitting a final budget. If you are dealing with a private foundation it sometimes helps to contact the grants officer of a large federal agency like NEA and find out its policy on certain expenditures. Generally, what are acceptable accounting procedures for NEA will be acceptable for most private foundations.

A factor that will bear strongly on your success in receiving a matching grant from a federal agency is the likelihood of your acquiring matching contributions from private sources. Few filmmaking granting agencies like to feel as though they are footing the entire bill for a project. Ideally the NEA matching requirement demonstrates the support of the community in which the project will be executed.

NEA will award a matching grant and allow you to begin spending it before private matching contributions are received. The situation frequently arises where a proposal is approved for a matching grant, but the request for matching contributions from a private funding source will not be approved until several months later when the private foundation’s board meets. Since you can never depend on money that is not in your hands, how can a filmmaker use the NEA award to begin work on a production without a firm commitment of matching contributions from a private source?

A farsighted filmmaker will take several steps to minimize risk in this situation. The basic rule of thumb is never spend more of the NEA grant than you are in a position to match.

First determine the maximum amount you can generate through inkind contributions of services and equipment donations. Since films are labor intensive, it’s not unusual for salaries to represent a substantial portion of a film’s total budget. Remember that NEA permits the grantee to retain 100 percent of the proceeds from the finished film. In some circumstances it makes sense to donate your own salary, or a portion of it, to generate matching contributions if they are needed. This enables you to use the cash available in the NEA grant for production purposes so that the project can continue. Under these circumstances, the filmmaker may have to rely on his own compensation coming from revenues generated by print sales and public showings.

If the filmmaker spends more than he is in a position to match, the sponsoring organization may be called upon to contribute funds to satisfy the matching requirement. This, of course, can be an unexpected and undesirable expense for the sponsoring organization which takes this risk as the grantee if the filmmaker is irresponsible in the use of grant funds. In the event the sponsoring organization has to “bail out” the project by contributing funds to satisfy the matching requirement, the sponsoring organization is entitled to greater compensation from the project. In several instances, filmmakers have had to sign away practically all rights to their work in exchange for a sponsoring organization contributing funds to satisfy the matching requirements. It’s the responsibility of the filmmaker to prevent this situation from developing by using good judgment and not spending more than can be matched.

Another way to minimize risk with a matching grant is to make your grant period last as long as possible. NEA stipulates that matching contributions must be received sixty days prior to the end of your grant period. Even though your project may take only three months to execute, make your grant period last a year so as to buy time to acquire matching funds. If necessary, this will enable you to use revenues received through public showing or print sales to generate matching funds. In a pinch, NEA permits a 20–25 percent leeway in the matching requirement.

Although Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) funds have their basis in federal legislation, they may be used to satisfy NEA matching requirements because they are administered at the county level. Over 90 percent of a CETA grant must be spent in the payment of salaries to workers who qualify for CETA funding as a result of being unemployed for a certain length of time. A great deal of public service oriented broadcasting is being produced with a combination of CETA funding for salaries and production expenses being donated from other sources.

Budgets can change during the course of a production necessitating the transfer of funds from one budgetary category to another. For instance, you may need to take money originally designated for location expenses and use it to buy more film stock. Contact the funding source to find out its policy on this type of transfer. NEA permits you to transfer up to 25 percent of the funds from one budget category to another before a revised budget must be submitted for approval.

Finally, in passing, in the rare circumstance that there is some compelling reason that you must receive funds immediately for a project, you should know that foundation presidents generally have $5,000 to $10,000 funds which may be released with their signature.

Keep in mind that philanthropy is administered by
sophisticated people. Most financial transactions are conducted on the honor system with follow-through on the part of private foundations generally weak. Most funding sources would rather give away their money than spend it administering the awards.

If any impropriety does occur in the use of grant funds, it is remarkable how quickly word of it spreads through the foundation world. There is no “blacklist” of organizations who have not completed projects or misspent funds, but foundation presidents do get together a great deal over lunch seeking advice and comparing notes. Not only will misuse of grant funds lessen the credibility of the motion picture community (resulting in support being shifted to other fields) but it can effectively prevent a sponsoring organization from receiving any future grant funding.

New Films...

THE CHILDREN OF SANCHEZ

Reviewed by ALEXANDER MOORE

The film “Children of Sanchez” is of great concern to visual anthropologists because it is a significant popular interpretation of a major anthropological classic. Alexander Moore, who reviews the film here, is Professor of Anthropology at the University of Southern California, and a distinguished Latin Americanist whose extensive work has covered the fields of anthropology and education, political anthropology, modernization and urban life.

THE CHILDREN OF SANCHEZ, produced and directed by Hall Bartlett, Lone Star International Pictures release, screenplay by Cesare Zambattini and Hall Bartlett, cinematography by Gabriel Figueroa, music by Chuck Mangione, starring Anthony Quinn.

Based on Oscar Lewis’ “autobiography” of a Mexican family, filmed in Mexico with Mexican actors, The Children of Sanchez is not really a Mexican movie. Chuck Mangione’s music is blaring urban rock, the on-location shots do not impart a sense of Mexico City, and the film is distinctly not anthropological. The Sanchez screenplay is a somewhat literal, if condensed, rendition of Lewis’ book, which is a series of narratives told by the motherless children of Jesus Sanchez. In it each recalls events starting from the death of the mother through their unsuccessful attempts at adulthood and separation from their father. The book ends with an epilogue by Sanchez, who comments on the failings of his children and of Mexico. A central figure in the book, he is not a major narrator but a doer who believes “there is nothing better in this world than upright work”.

Casting Anthony Quinn to play Jesus Sanchez was, in plain terms, a miscarriage. The Sanchez of the book was short, dark, and very Indian in appearance. He was quiet, stern and forbidding with his children whom he punished physically, they tell us, only with cause. Quinn, although Mexican born, is tall, fair, of Irish ancestry, whose most characteristic pose in the film is his lashing daughter Consuela with a belt. This “Zorba the Mexican” is a fundamental distortion of Sanchez, reading into him a kind of Mediterranean machismo which he never possessed.

The central figure after Sanchez is Consula (Lupita Férer, who is Hall Bartlett’s wife). This is not because she was the most eloquent in the book, but because she was the natural figure to oppose Quinn’s machismo. In the book she graduated from 6th grade, got secretarial training and some jobs but finally returned to her father’s house, malnourished and overworked. Of them all, her failure was the most tragic. In the movie, however, she is seen as a liberated urban woman, not the social rebel Lewis described. The failure of her “marriage” is shown as a woman’s rebellion to men. Her accidental miscarriage is transformed into a contracted and grizzly abortion performed graphically by a midwife. Finally, at the film’s climax, Consula, now a stewardess, confronts Sanchez at a party to celebrate the construction of his little house. Raging, her father again lashes at her with his belt and she ends the movie a whipping girl.

The decision to portray Sanchez as a Mediterranean macho, rather than a Mexican mestizo proletarian is tied to the film’s down-playing of poverty. This attitude is seen again in the portrayal of the maternal grandmother. In the book, she was a loving substitute for the mother after her death, who lived by selling cake crumbs on the plaza; when Sanchez remarried she took refuge with “Aunt Guadalupe”, another sidewalk vendor who somehow managed to survive in the most abject poverty.

Instead, in the film we see the home of a former aristocrat who is dying dramatically on lace pillow cases. Grandmother (Dolores del Rio) and Aunt (Katy Jurado) are exalted as stars although as accomplished actresses they might have portrayed the dignity of the poor in the midst of material degradation.

In short, this film is a trivial melodrama: its only interest to anthropologists is for us to warn the public not to confuse it with the original.

The problem remains, then, as to how a moving and human document in print became melodrama on the screen. The answer, I believe, lies with the producer’s having relied on the star system as a means of financing the movie, which was made with a “low budget” of under two million. The screenwriters were writing not a social science document, but an Anthony Quinn-piece intended as a break for Lupita Férer. Anthropologists who want a film to portray the culture of poverty in Mexico must avoid this one, and go instead to Luis Bunuel’s Los Olvidados. In Bartlett’s Children of Sanchez, the Mexican urban poor remain just that, los olvidados, “the forgotten ones”.
New Sources . . .

National Women’s Anthropology Newsletter Highlights Film Production

The National Women’s Anthropology Newsletter, originally intended as a communication mechanism for the National Women’s Anthropology Caucus, has grown to provide an important network of communication for women in the discipline. The newsletter now has about 400 subscribers. New subscribers and editorial groups are invited to submit articles on all areas of the country to offer their insights and energy to the only existing national medium for disseminating information to women in anthropology.

The last issue (Vol. 3, No. 3), is a valuable special on women and ethnographic film. It contains editorials on film about women and production of films by women; columns on Perception and Film, Sequence Films, Women in the San and Yanomamo Films, Mead’s Legacy, Ousmane’s Films, Anthro on Television, Film Reviews, and Announcements covering new films and materials available. The newsletter is produced by an Editorial Group including Melanie Wallace, Roberta Giansfortoni, Madeleine Hall-Arber, Katherine Marcoccio, Emily McIntire, Pam Sankar, and Carol Wolfe.

For subscriptions or copies please contact Pam Sankar, Department of Anthropology, Boston University, 232 Bay State Road, Boston, MA 02215.

Rates are $3.50 for students and unemployed, $5 for professionals and faculty, and $10 for institutions.

‘KINESIS’ — New Quarterly Journal Features Nonverbal Communication

A quarterly news journal “Kinesis” reports on research news and information of interest to clinicians and researchers in the field of nonverbal communication. Published by the Institute for Nonverbal Communication Research Inc. (INCR), a recently formed nonprofit organization which provides an information and educational resource center in the New York area. In addition, the INCR holds weekly seminars on topics in nonverbal communication, sponsors workshops and conferences.

For additional information contact: Eden Gruber, Editor, Kinesis, 5 W. 86th Street, New York, NY 10024.

Lawyers Quarterly Offers Information to Media Artists

ARTlaw WEST is published quarterly by the Bay Area Lawyers for the Arts and provides advice and information useful to artists in all media. Subscription-memberships are $15 annually and may be sent to BALA, 25 Taylor St., San Francisco, CA 94102.

‘Media Mix’ Newsletter Details Small Format TV, Arts, Education

Media Mix is an 8-page newsletter edited by Jeffrey Schrank, detailing ideas on cheap rentals, equipment in the classroom, critical reviews of film study teaching guides, and media kits. Monthly, $9.00 a year. Write: Media Mix, 221 West Madison St., Chicago, IL 60606.

Rentals, Equipment, Reviews Presented in ‘Videoscope’ Quarterly

Videoscope is a new quarterly magazine that explores all facets of small format television, with special emphasis on the arts, education and journalism. Incorporating Radical Software, an early video art journal, Videoscope is under the editorship of John Reilly, director of the Video Study Center of Global Village. Videoscope, Suite 1520, One Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016, $9.50 a year for individuals, $19.50 institutions.

Civil Rights Commission Supervises TV Networks for Discrimination

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission says that TV’s portrayal of women and the TV industry’s EEO record is awful. A 181-page report, “Window Dressing On the Set: Women and Minorities in Television,” blames the networks for continuing the stereotypes. It also attacks the FCC for allowing both the programs, and the practices, that foster discrimination.

The study includes statistics on white males’ appearances – 65.3% of major and minor characters, 88% of all newscasters — and station employment records. The report also makes recommendations for correcting the gross discrimination it now sees as visible. For the report, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in Washington, D.C.

International & Intercultural Communication Annual Published

Volume IV of International and Intercultural Communications Annual is off the press. Edited by Nemi C. Jain, Arizona State University, the Annual is sponsored by the SCA Commission on International and Intercultural Communication. Publication of this volume was in part supported by the Department of Communication, Arizona State University.

Copies of the printed Annual may be secured at $5 per copy ($5.50 for nonmembers) from the Speech Communication Association. 5020 Ledges Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041. All four volumes of the Annual (1974-1977) may be purchased at a special discount price of $10 for SCA members and $11 for nonmembers. Payment must accompany orders of less than $10.

British Universities Film Council Newsletter covers Audio-Visual Media

The British Universities Film Council Newsletter, published three times annually, contains news and comment on audio-visual media in higher education. Reports of conferences, notices of new publications, descriptions of technical services, letters, reviews and articles make up the bulk of the Newsletter. For more information, write Publications, British Universities Film Council, Royalty House, 72 Dean Street, London W1V 5HB, England.

EFLA, AIVF Publications Include 16mm Distribution Pointers

16mm Distribution Handbook — EFLA, 43 W. 61 St., New York, NY 10023. $6 postpaid ($5 EFLA members). An anthology of articles on 16mm distribution, especially geared for independent filmmakers. Less detailed and specific than the following:

Doing It Yourself: A Handbook on Independent Film Distribution — AIVF, 99 Prince St., New York, NY 10012. $5.50 postpaid ($3.75 AIVF members). Written by Julia Reichert, based on the experience of New Day Films; a comprehensive guide to setting up your own non-theatrical distribution system.

Bi-monthly INTERMEDIA Presents International Media Source

The International Institute of Communications, formerly the International Broadcast Institute, is a private international organization that sponsors meetings and publications for the new class of media academics and professionals. Its international conference was held for the first time in the U.S. in early September with co-sponsorship by PBS, CPB and NPR. Proceedings will eventually be published in book form. 132 W. 42 St., New York, NY 10036. Excerpts and summaries will be presented in the IIC’s excellent bi-monthly Intermedia (which is useful to keep track of research reports and trends, conferences and multi-national meetings). For the cost of xeroxing, IIC will also send you copies of the papers delivered in Washington, and a list of what’s available. Write IIC, Tavisock House East, Tavisock Square, London WC1H 9LG, Great Britain.

NEA Bibliography Covers Arts Management

“Arts Management: An annotated Bibliography” is published by The National Endowment for the Arts, Cultural Resources Development Project (1978), and compiled by Linda Coe and Stephen Benedict ($3.00). To order, write Publishing Center for Cultural Resources, 152 W. 42 St., New York, NY 10036, or call (212) 221-6055.
Reach A Wider Audience...

Films, Videotapes Solicited for Historical Archaeology Conference

Films and videotapes are being solicited for screening at the international meetings of the Society for Historical Archaeology—Conference on Underwater Archaeology to be held in Albuquerque, New Mexico from January 8th to 11th, 1980. Suggestions are welcome from any informed source, and contributions will be particularly encouraged from producers, directors, or research scholars involved in the production of entries. Films may have general or specific application to historical archaeology or ethno-history, from which a representative sample of disciplinary subareas and regional concerns is sought.

Examples of possible topics include, but are not limited to: historical material culture, crafts production and industry; theory, method and technique (especially emphasizing disciplinary cross-over); museology, public interpretation, and conservation; or the archeology of military, maritime or underwater historical settings.

At this time, only suggestions are solicited; filmed material should not be submitted until requested. Write Ronald Light, SHA Film Program Coordinator, Center for Anthropological Studies, P.O. Box 14576, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87191.

Grant Opportunities...

NEA Media Centers Assists Major Centers in Film and Video

To advance the appreciation by a wide public of the arts of film, video and radio, and to assist film and video makers, and radio producers in practicing their respective arts, the NEA assists major media centers in undertaking a variety of programs including: (1) exhibition of quality film and/or video work, and publication of associated activities; (2) in-residence programs involving film and video makers, radio producers, and critics of national significance; (3) provision of production and post-production facilities for film, radio producers, and/or video producers; (4) provision of services including teaching, dissemination of information, and access to study and research facilities; (5) maintenance of film and video collections for exhibitions and study; (6) integration and coordination of media resources and services on a regional basis; and (7) distribution of quality film and/or video work. Matching grants to $50,000 are awarded.

Eligibility: A media arts center is defined as a tax exempt, nonprofit organization that has carried out four or more of the above functions for at least one year. The center may be independent or affiliated in another organization such as a museum, university, city or state arts agency. Media centers are expected to serve a wide public, to provide public services, and to have an operating budget of at least $100,000 for one year.

Deadline: None specified.

For further information contact: Media Arts: Film/Radio/Television Program, National Endowment for the Arts, Mail Stop 552, Washington, DC 20506; telephone (202) 634-6300.

Cooperation Column...

I am a student at MIT and am planning on going to South America this coming fall for a year. I am presently looking for a job down there. I am an experienced photographer and speak Spanish. I understand that many anthropologists do not have the time nor the expertise to take good pictures relevant to their studies. As I am basically interested in the experience of living in a South American village, I would be willing to work as a volunteer.

-- DANIEL GROSSMAN
4 Ames Street, 302 R
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Wigand Seeks Articles for Journal Published by German Society

Authors from all empirical areas of human communication are invited to submit articles for review and potential inclusion in Communications — International Journal of Communication Research.

This journal has been published three times per year since 1975 by the German Society for Communication Research and the International Association for Communication Sciences.

Each article is published in either English, French or German. Abstracts always appear in all three languages.

Editors are Professors Alphons Silbermann and Joseph Kurt Meinl, both from the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany).

Potential contributors from the North American continent are asked to submit three copies of their original articles (not to exceed 40 pages) in English, German or French for review to: Dr. Rolf T. Wigand, Communication Program, 472 Stauffer Bldg, Arizona State University, Temple, Arizona 85281.

Last Minute Report...

New ‘ODYSSEY’ Series PBS Programs to Feature Anthropology and Archaeology Subjects

In our last issue we reported on PBS's forthcoming series "Odyssey," produced by one of our most productive members, Michael Ambrosino. Here is an update on the series.

Michael Ambrosino, creator of NOVA, the most successful science series on television, is producing the first American series on anthropology and archaeology for broadcast on the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) next March. The 13-week program, called ODYSSEY, will cover current ethnography, the history of anthropology, and will attempt to bring to life a number of past cultures through the work of archaeologists.

The series has received major support from the National Endowment for the Humanities ($1.2 million) and additional funding has been provided by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting ($750,000) and Polaroid Corporation.

"It was my curiosity about the nature of the world and the way it works that led to NOVA," says Ambrosino. "My curiosity about the nature of man and the diversity of the
human experience inspired ODYSSEY. Who are we? How did we get here? Where did we come from? How are we different from other people? How are we alike? And how are the archaeologists and anthropologists finding answers to these and many other questions?"

With a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, Ambrosino spent two years researching and planning ODYSSEY. He consulted with many of the nation's most eminent anthropologists and archaeologists, nine of whom now form his advisory committee.

One ODYSSEY program will focus on the role of women among the Masai of Kenya, while another will explore how the lifeways of the Cree Indians in Canada are now being threatened by the demands of modern civilization. Other programs will trace the life and work of the irascible Franz Boas, one of the founders of American anthropology, and the fascinating story behind the deciphering of the Egyptian hieroglyphs. A program on historical archaeology will demonstrate the written accounts of our history are often inaccurate and even untrue!

ODYSSEY will use the same 60-minute documentary format Ambrosino developed for NOVA in 1974. Five of the programs will be filmed by Public Broadcasting Associates, the company he formed earlier this year in Boston, Massachusetts. One program will be the result of a collaboration with the anthropologist-filmmaker John Marshall, and another will be a co-production with the BBC. The remaining six programs will be acquired from existing sources such as the British "Disappearing World" and "Chronicle" series. The 1981 season of ODYSSEY is projected to include 16 new programs.

PBA is now planning a full-color, 64-page viewer magazine to be distributed by libraries across the country. The magazine will give viewers additional insight into the series and our human heritage. It will contain production stories, photographs, maps, and articles written by experts on anthropological issues. PBA will also publish a poster and a descriptive brochure about ODYSSEY.

In addition to the Peabody Award-winning series NOVA, Ambrosino organized and ran the Eastern Educational Network, the nation's first regional public television system, and was a senior programming executive at WGBH-Boston for 20 years.

Other staff members of PBA include Graham Chedd, Senior Producer; Dr. Sanford Low, Senior Researcher; Christy Moore, Director of Promotion; and Eric Handle, Production Manager. ODYSSEY has an advisory board consisting of Drs. James B. Griffin, University of Michigan; Ross Holloway, Brown University; Heather Lechtman, M.I.T.; Sidney Mintz, Johns Hopkins University; Richard Price, Johns Hopkins University; Jay Ruby, Temple University; Douglas Schwartz, School of American Research; William Sturtevant, Smithsonian Institution, and Stephen Williams, Harvard University.

---
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SAVICOM NEWS UPDATE AND ELECTION BALLOT
STUDIES IN THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF VISUAL COMMUNICATIONS
TO BE PUBLISHED BY THE ANNENBERG SCHOOL PRESS, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

STUDIES IN THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF VISUAL COMMUNICATION (SAVC), founded by Sol Worth, is now in its sixth year. We feel very proud of the high standards that STUDIES has maintained, but we have long recognized the budgetary and disciplinary limitations imposed by our current situation.

Consequently, in November 1977, we obtained the agreement of SAVICOM's Board of Directors to enter into negotiations with the Annenberg School Press, an activity of the Annenberg School of Communications at the University of Pennsylvania, for the publication of STUDIES. These negotiations have been successfully concluded and our new issue—Vol. 6, No. 1—will appear in January 1980, under the name STUDIES IN VISUAL COMMUNICATION (SVC).

The new title and auspices will make more apparent our existing commitment to solicit and publish materials from a wide and diverse range of disciplines. We will publish qualitative and quantitative, theoretical and empirical studies of visual communications, drawing from authors in such fields as communications, anthropology, sociology, psychology, philosophy, photography, media studies, film, television, art history, American studies and history.

Among the primary areas of continuing interest to us are: the study of human behavior in context through visual means; the study of image-producing technologies and other pictorial and visual means of communication; the analysis of visual symbolic forms from a cultural-historical framework; visual theories; technologies, and methodologies for recording and analyzing behavior; and the relationships among the different modes of communication; the analysis of reality as evidenced by visual productions and artifacts; the cross-cultural study of art and artifacts from a social, cultural and visual perception; the study of the forms of social organization surrounding the planning, production and use of visual symbolic forms; and the use of media in cultural feedback.

We have already assembled most of the material for the first issue of SVC, which will include an obituary and photo-essay on Margaret Mead, Sol Worth's paper on MARGARET MEAD AND THE SHIFT FROM VISUAL ANTHROPOLOGY TO THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF VISUAL COMMUNICATION, and a chapter from Howard Becker's forthcoming book, ART WORLDS. We are well on the way towards filling the second issue which will feature previously unpublished materials on Robert Flaherty. The issue following that will be the first of two issues of contributions honoring Sol Worth. We already have papers and commitments from numerous authors including Gregory Bateson, Howard Becker, Dan Ben-Amos, Howard Gardner, and Elihu Katz.

As you can see, we have an ample supply of first-rate material and we expect that this state of grace will continue and improve. Our new publication situation will provide us with the funds to initiate triennial issues in our first year and move towards quarterly issues in the near future. We will also have the resources to engage in promotion for the first time—to make SVC visible to the large and varied potential audience who have not previously encountered SAVC.

SVC will continue under the present co-editors the tradition of SAVC being a refereed journal that offers scholars a place to publish innovative and original works which deal with visual communications. We will serve the needs of SAVICOM members by presenting them as well as to other interested persons the finest examples of scholarship in our field. As we are currently in the process of redesigning the journal, we welcome your comments and suggestions.

LARRY GROSS and JAY RUBY
OFFICIAL SAVICOM BALLOT FOR 1979 ELECTIONS

BIOGRAPHIES OF NOMINEES

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
To serve from 1979 to 1981

ERVING GOFFMAN
Benjamin Franklin Professor of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania. His areas of interest are face-to-face interaction and Public order. His recent publications: RELATIONS IN PUBLIC (1972), FRAME ANALYSIS (1974), GENDER ADVERTISEMENTS (1976).

NELSON GRABURN
Attended Cambridge, McGill and University of Chicago (Ph.D. 1963) and has taught at UC Berkeley since 1964. Since 1959 he has done fieldwork with the Canadian Inuit (Eskimo) with additional fieldwork among the Naskapi-Cree (1964-68), white Americans (1961-63) and in Japan (1978-79). His long term research has focused on the arts of minority peoples, ETHNIC AND TOURIST ARTS, UC Press (1976). Additional research interests include the study of tourism, museums, and the impact of television on non-Western peoples.

JAY RUBY
Associate Professor of Anthropology and Director of the Conference on Visual Anthropology at Temple University. He is past president of SAVICOM and currently Co-Editor of STUDIES. His research interests include the anthropology of visual communication and the communication of anthropology. His last published article: THE AGGIE WILL COME FIRST THE DEMYSTIFICATION OF ROBERT FLAHERTY.

ANNETTE B. WEINER

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
To serve from 1979 to 1982

ALLEN GRIMSHAW
Professor of Sociology, Indiana University (Bloomington), A.B., M.A., Missouri, Ph.D. (1959) University of Penn. He is currently involved in a project (the Multilingual Analysis Project) in which a number of researchers (anthropologists, linguists, psychologists, and sociologists) are independently analyzing a common data corpus (frame-numbered color film, stereo audio, etc.) from a naturally occurring speech event. An Associate Editor of LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY (and current editor of THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGIST), he is also editing a special issue of SOCIOLINGUISTIC METHODS AND RESEARCH on uses of visual and aural data in sociological work. He has published on sociolinguistic topics in anthropological, linguistic, and sociological journals.

BENNATTA JULES-ROSETTE
Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of California, San Diego, B.A. (1968) in Social Relations at Radcliffe College. M.A. and Ph.D. (1973) at Harvard University in Social Relations. She has conducted a series of field studies in southwestern Zaïre and Lusaka, Zambia on religious movements and popular art and culture change and film and videotape as research tools.

SANFORD H. LOW
Ph.D. Harvard 1974. Senior researcher and producer for ODYSSEY public television series on anthropology to be aired nationwide in March, 1980. Before joining the ODYSSEY staff, he produced public television programs and directed locally produced programming at a cable television station in Maine. He has taught courses in ethnographic film at Harvard and Bowdoin College and has used ethnographic films extensively in his courses at Hunter College. Currently on the editorial staff of PRACTICING ANTHROPOLOGY and the SAVICOM NEWSLETTER.

RHODA METRAUX

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
(to serve from 1979-1981)

VOTE FOR THREE CANDIDATES

☐ ERVING GOFFMAN
☐ NELSON GRABURN
☐ JAY RUBY
☐ ANNETTE WEINER
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