ETHNOGRAPHIC FILMMAKING:
Reader Initiated Comments

Australian Ethnographic Filmmaker, Ian Dunlop, Visits the U.S.

Glen Muschio
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On July 17th and 18th at the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia, Ian Dunlop presented two films, showing aspects of an Australian Aboriginal family’s life style. The presentation was part of a larger exhibition featuring twenty eight Aboriginal dancers, musicians and craftsmen from communities in Northern and Central Australia. The group performed in Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, New York and Berkeley. The tour was sponsored by the Mobil Oil Corporation, the National Endowment for the Arts and the Government of Australia.

The films presented were produced by Film Australia (formerly known as the Australian Commonwealth Film Unit) and directed by Ian Dunlop. Film Australia, Australia’s official government film unit, has been involved in the production of ethnographic films for over forty years. Ian Dunlop has directed the unit’s production of ethnographic films since the mid 1960s. His film credits include the series TOWARD BARUYA MANHOOD filmed in cooperation with Maurice Godelier and the Baruya of the Eastern Highlands of New Guinea, 1969. The series is distributed as nine films with a total running time of 7 3/4 hours. He also produced a series of nineteen “archival films” entitled, PEOPLE OF THE AUSTRALIAN WESTERN DESERT (1967). Mr. Dunlop describes this series as “the last extensive film record of people living a traditional nomadic life in Australia.” (Dunlop 1979:117).

According to notes distributed by Mr. Dunlop, the films shown in Philadelphia, NARRITJIN AT DJARRAKPI parts ONE and TWO are from a series which was begun in 1970 at Yirrkala, an Aboriginal Mission Station in northeast Arnhem Land. The long term film project was undertaken with the cooperation of the Yolngu, who in recent years have begun to move from Yirrkala to settlements on their own clan land.

In 1974 Narritjin Maymuru, leader of the Manggalili clan and one of the best known bark painters of northeast Arnhem Land, took several family members and moved from Yirrkala to the clan land at Djarrakpi. The films screened at the Academy, show Narritjin and his family establishing themselves on their sacred land. Sequences include the collecting of wild honey, spear fishing, the gathering of tortoise eggs and the stripping, preparation and painting of tree bark. The films make use of sync sound and a voice over narration by Mr. Dunlop. For information on these and other films distributed in the U.S.A. contact James M. Henry, Australian Film, City National Bank Building, 9229 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90046 or Film Australia, P.O. Box 46, Lindfield, N.S.W. 2070 Australia.

On July 24th, at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, Mr. Dunlop delivered a lecture, amply illustrated with film excerpts, on the history of ethnographic film in Australia. A published version of the lecture appears in Aboriginal History, Volume three, 1-2, 1979 pp. 111-119 under the title, “Ethnographic Film-Making In Australia: The First Seventy Years (1898-1968).” Mr. Dunlop’s Museum lecture included additional information which extends his earlier account to 1978.

Of special historic interest was the screening of nearly four minutes of film made by Anthony Wilkin, cameraman for Alfred Cort Haddon on the 1898 Torres Strait expedition. The film shown is the only known surviving footage from the expedition and is noted as the earliest ethnographic film to be made in a field situation. The film is comprised of four se-
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Toward an Analytical Anthropological Film
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Anthropologists are often faced with aural/visual questions in cultural data which cannot be fully treated in a written journal article. Anthropologists should consider the full potentials of film for presenting the scholarly analysis and interpretation of such questions. It has long been custom to consider anthropological films as being of only two varieties: the “narrative, general audience” film and “data” footage. Many articles in the late 1960s and early 1970s argued about which filming and editing techniques should be used to preserve the most valuable ethnographic material and whether or not data collecting should take precedence over narrative film considerations (Intintoli 1973; MacDougall 1969; Ruby 1971; Rouch 1970, 1974, 1978; Sandall 1970, 1972; Lomax 1975.) While both these film activities deserve attention and have their purpose, there is another alternative form conspicuously absent from the discussion—what I call the analytical anthropological film.

Basically, an analytical anthropological film is one which presents a descriptive overview of the subject to be analyzed, and then a visual and aural analysis structured so as to present specific arguments of interpretation. I am not the first to see this potential use of film, but the lack of such films suggests the need to push the issue to the fore. Brian Weiss argued in 1977 that anthropological films should go beyond description and present “from an etic perspective the interpretations, understandings, and analyses of the anthropologist” (1977:299). Jay Ruby, in his 1975 review of the film THE PATH, points out that the filmmakers “attempted to go beyond the descriptive level of most documentaries and constructed a ‘filmic’ tea ceremony in a manner which displays the filmmakers’ interpretation of the event’s cultural significance” (1975:464). He concludes: “This film is visual anthropology in the true sense of the phrase” (1975:465). It also seems possible that this potential use of film in anthropology is what Gregory Bateson tried to point out in his conversations with Margaret Mead (1976).

A closer look at the films which led me to the notion of the analytical anthropological film will help clarify what I mean by this term and allow a discussion of the potentials of such films. These films include three ethnographic films and one Japanese theatrical film: THE FEAST (1970) and A MAN CALLED ‘BEE’: STUDYING THE IVANOMAMO (1972) by Timothy Asch and Napoleon Chagnon; THE PATH (1973) by Donald Rundstrom, Ronald Rundstrom and Clinton Bergum, and RASHOMON (1951) by Akira Kurosawa.

THE FEAST introduces the alliance feast between two Yanomamo groups to the viewer through stills and narration, then repeats the presentation using live-action footage and dialogue with subtitle translation. The viewer is provided an initial exposure before being asked to sort out what is happening in the events of the feast. RASHOMON’s structure also involves repetition. The story of rape and murder are told to the priest three times by three different individuals, the story varying each time according to that individual’s subjective point of view.

For THE PATH, the Rundstroms and Bergum analyzed the structure and symbolic elements of the Japanese tea ceremony, then planned the filming and editing so as to embody these same structural and symbolic elements within the film itself, striving to make the film experience replicate the actual ceremony experiences as much as possible (Rundstrom, Rundstrom and Bergum 1973.) Their production decisions designed to capture the symbolic aspects of the ceremony sacrificed many of the social aspects of the ceremony (Beardsley 1975; Heider 1976:56) but this in no way negates the value of what they tried to do.

A MAN CALLED ‘BEE’ is largely a narrative film. But it contains an exciting multi-level soundtrack/subtitle combination which provides the viewer several different levels of information simultaneously. The viewer hears the narrator explain the actions, hears the conversation of the people as they interact, to which subtitle translations are provided, and hears the natural rhythm of village sounds. The viewer is also provided subtitle footnotes to explain specific details without sidetracking the overall progression of the film.

Each of these films directed my attention to analysis and structure. How would an anthropologist/filmmaker structure the film so as to show aural/visual material for a specific argument? The answer defines the analytical anthropological film. The filmmaker/anthropologist selects a specific topic about which he has a specific scholarly argument to present. He gives an initial descriptive presentation of the visual event(s) to be analyzed, then builds his argument by repeating the presentation as many times and in as many ways as necessary to present its full complexities and his analytical statement. Analytical anthropological films, therefore, are analytical in their method and structure, and anthropological by their subject matter.

For an example, an event might be shown in one uninterrupted shot taken with a wide-angle lens
which allows the viewer to see all the participants and observers of the event who were located in one specific area and their physical surroundings. This is shown with sync sound, dialogue translated in subtitles, and without narration. The viewer now has a general familiarity with the event, its natural time frame, and the movement of people within the main area in which the event occurs. Now the anthropologist/filmmaker can repeat the presentation of the event in an infinite variety of ways so as to clarify, raise questions, and make specific claims pertinent to his analysis of the event. Perhaps he will choose to show the event again, this time cutting in to show close-ups of particular hand movements, facial expressions, objects which could not be seen before due to camera distance or camera placement but which offer new information about the event. Perhaps he will show it again but rather than stay with actions occurring in the main area of the event he cuts to shots in the adjoining room--to which the viewer saw various participants in the event retire during the first viewing of the events; now the viewer sees the important actions which occurred behind this wall and is able to synthesize this with the knowledge he already has about what was occurring "out front" during this time. Such a treatment would allow the anthropologist/filmmaker to discuss the differences between what some participants experience (those who remain only in the main area) from that which others experience (those who are allowed into this separate area.) This example is admittedly general but the specific nature of the repetition and perspectives chosen will depend on the anthropologist/filmmaker's subject of analysis. It should be stressed that he is freed from the "either-or" dilemma of choosing only one manner of presentation.

Repetition is not the only tool available. The full potential of film technology can be utilized in the analytical structuring of the film argument. Several examples can be suggested:

(a) Certain objects or events could be shown first in black-and-white then again in full color. For example, in art it seems conceivable that light-and-dark differentiations may sometimes have a symbolic content independent of the specific color combinations. This treatment allows the discussion of the separate elements.

(b) In a repeating segment, the anthropologist/filmmaker may show the action to a specific point and then freeze the frame while narration points out details of body position, diagnostic clothing details, or other elements important to his analysis. He may then resume normal motion until a second point is reached at which time we return to freeze frame, and so forth.

(c) Perhaps the important issue is the precise manner in which particular movements are made. Action may proceed at normal film speed, changing to slow motion when the critical point is reached. This may be repeated, still in slow motion, from another critical angle.

(d) Perhaps the objective is to show the correspondence between two movements, or between the lines in an art piece and the lines of movement in the dance in which the art piece plays a part. To simply say they match doesn't capture the quality of that correspondence. To show the correspondence, the mask art might be shown first, then the dance movements, but this still requires the viewer to estimate the actual correspondence. The answer might lie in showing the art work first, then the dancing, then superimposing the two. If the lighting and contrast made this unsatisfactory, an alternative might be to show them side-by-side in split-screen.

(e) The possibilities of soundtrack combinations along with subtitles offer many little explored possibilities as well. The use of footnote subtitles in A MAN CALLED 'BEE' is one good example. There is also no reason to assume that sounds cannot be repeated for purposes similar to those discussed for visuals. Such a use might arise in efforts to show 'real' versus 'ideal' behavior, showing the correspondence or lack of correspondence of actual behavior in several activities to the comments made by an informant during an interview.

The possibilities are numerous. My point is that editing and laboratory techniques, when properly used, can help to clarify, rather than necessarily distort, our understanding of human social behavior. They can be important tools for building discussions around aural/visual materials which cannot be dealt with adequately in written or still photograph form.

The anthropologist/filmmaker's use of these tools must be as scholarly as in any journal article. That is, he must present sufficient evidence to support his thesis. He must present complete evidence, anticipating objections or questions which might be raised and filming these aspects to show they do not contradict his thesis. To the best of his knowledge, it must be an honest presentation of the material, without
intentionally distorting the evidence or ignoring unintentional distortions. The film should provide detailed description and analysis, relate specific observed behavior to cultural norms, and place the objects/events in their social and cultural context (Heider 1976:5-8). These are standards all scholarly anthropological works should maintain.

The anthropologist/filmmaker is expected to make acceptable, ethnographically sound, choices of material and the manner in which he presents them. But his integrity in this should be judged in the same way the work of anthropologists is judged in their written work. To demand the anthropologist/filmmaker prove the validity of his choices in each film by making his raw footage available would be like asking the ethnographer to submit his fieldnotes with each ethnography and journal article he writes.

Several other points can be made about analytical anthropological films. First, written materials, such as the companion guide to THE PATH, would enhance the usefulness of the film. But the specific arguments of the film should be as self-contained as possible, without undue reliance on written material.

Second, unintentional distortions probably occur in every film effort. The narrative ethnographic film can leave notation of these distortions to a written accompaniment. But the maker of an analytical anthropological film must address the distortions within the body of his film. That is, he can only build a convincing argument if the distortions are accounted for and shown not to invalidate his thesis.

Third, the structure of the analytical anthropological film is ideally suited for dealing with the presence of the ethnographer since one segment of the film could deal with this directly. An important point should be made concerning the ethnographer’s presence. The kind of intensive filming required for an analytical anthropological film will vary and some situations will not be conducive to the multi-camera setup with its large number of personnel necessary to document everything required. Such situations may require the anthropologist/filmmaker to find several occurrences of the same activity, validating their comparability as well as possible, and build his argument from these.

Fourth, all films must address an audience. Audiences vary in the demands one can reasonably make of them. The narrative ethnographic film traditionally addresses a general audience with limited or no familiarity with the group being portrayed and with limited anthropological background. The analytical anthropological film, however, would address trained professionals—an audience of fellow scholars.

Summary

The analytical anthropological film is not tied to the narrative form. Full use is made of film technology and techniques to structure an anthropological argument. The film addresses an audience of professionals as do scholarly journal articles. Ideally, the anthropologist/filmmaker presents analytical arguments centered around aural/visual data which journal articles cannot handle as effectively.

The exciting growth of work in the field of visual anthropology provides an excellent climate within which to work toward analytical anthropological films. Hopefully, organizations such as the Society for the Anthropology of Visual Communication will use in the future with the “publishing” of such scholarly films in addition to their current journals and thereby stimulate the synthesis of knowledge contained in the written and the filmed.

Notes

1 Ethnographic films generally present interpretive descriptions to a general audience in narrative form. They “tell a story.” It is hoped the audience will go away with a greater understanding of the people’s way of life than they had at the film’s beginning. Anthropologists have also considered the ethnographic content available in narrative films made by non-anthropologists such as Robert Flaherty. (See the Summer 1980 issue of Studies in Visual Communication which is devoted to discussions of Flaherty’s work.) Data footage forms but one part of the anthropologist’s field data for later analysis. If made available to others beyond this, it is usually as data for their analysis as well. Such footage is considered ‘ideal’ if it is composed of uncut shots, of long duration, in the original sequence they were filmed.

The Navajo films made during Sol Worth and John Adair’s study (1972) seem to fall between these two categories. The Navajo made them for an audience; Worth and Adair included them as data in their study of the cognitive aspects of structuring films.

2 One film which, unfortunately, I have not seen and which sounds as if it fits my description of an analytical anthropological film is THE AXE FIGHT (1971) by Timothy Asch and Napoleon Chagnon. They seem to be moving further and further in this direction.

3 See also Heider 1976; Beardsley 1975; and Ruby 1975 for discussion of this film.

4 It should by apparent that analytical anthropological films can only be constructed after the analysis of the field data. Time for follow-up filming must therefore be included in the research design.

5 This opening format is only one of many possibilities. For example, some activities will be too complex and long for one uninterrupted introductory shot.
Such repetition may require filming “similar” events for the necessary footage. If this is done, it should be identified as such and the comparability of the events validated.

An allusion to such a correspondence is made in the film AFRICAN CARVING: A DOGON KANAGA MASK by Elsöfen and Blakely with Robert Gardner, but no visual portrayal of this correspondence is made.

The intrusion of narration, notes, and footnotes to cover this will not be a major problem since it can be dealt with in different segments of the film.
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A Need for Common Terms

David MacDougall
Director, Film Unit, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies

Critical debate about visual studies of human society is often hampered by divergent or interchangeable uses of the terms “ethnographic film,” “anthropological film,” and “visual anthropology” (as well as a number of less common expressions and neologisms like “anthropology film” and “ethnofilm”). At best this leads to a tolerant vagueness, at worst to unnecessary semantic arguments and attempts to appropriate a term to a particular theory or professional interest. I should like to suggest a set of meanings for these terms that we can use in common. In this way they may become, on the one hand, less volatile as sources of misunderstanding and, on the other, more useful as labels to describe a broad range of related activities.

I believe we are fortunate in that these terms already furnish us with a set of progressively more specialized and precise categories. My aim has therefore been to focus attention upon the primary sense in which they have been used rather than burden them with new technical meanings. I hope this is an approach that will be acceptable to many.

The term ethnographic film has been widely used since 1948 when Andre Leroi-Gourhan applied it to an obscure sub-genre of films linked, if not by a common objective, at least by a common impulse. These films were of special interest to social scientists because they set out to explore human cultures - usually foreign ones but occasionally the film-maker’s own. They did so from widely different viewpoints and included travelogues, fiction films, documentaries, educational films and scientific records. “Does ethnographic film exist?” asked Leroi-Gourhan. “It exists,” he concluded, “because we project it.”
The term is still useful in this general sense. It covers a variety of films for which no other name seems to exist. At the very least these films all show some awareness of the possibility of cultural variation, if only in the intensity of their interest in a particular way of life. From one perspective or another (scientific, popular, artistic, historical) all attempt to convey aspects of how human life is patterned by culture. Ethnographic film, we may say, is film made to describe culture.

It has sometimes been argued that “all films are ethnographic” because all reflect the culture of their makers and their subjects. But this is to widen the term so that it finally evaporates. Films that reflect culture unconsciously, however well, belong to the larger realm of cultural artifacts. We must also abandon the much more limited conception of ethnographic film as, exclusively, a rigorous form of film ethnography. Ruby has already made the point that few ethnographic films fulfill the necessary anthropological criteria to be considered film ethnographies. Rather, “ethnographic” is used here with a sense of its historical juxtaposition with film and its etymological roots, just as we use similar terms like “oceanographic” and “geographic.” (It can also, of course, be applied to the other visual media—still photography, video recording, and so on.)

A more specialized category than ethnographic film is anthropological film, which also describes culture but which attempts to do so from an anthropological perspective. It follows that such films are generally made by anthropologists, or in collaboration with anthropologists, or by persons with knowledge of the discipline of anthropology. (Although it does not necessarily follow that all films made by anthropologists are anthropological.) These films may stem from any of the sub-disciplines that make up anthropology, presenting behavior or material culture, inventories or theories, experiments or observations. Their usefulness to anthropology itself changes. The definition is necessarily circular. Short of defining anthropology itself, one can only say of anthropological film that it is film made to describe culture anthropologically.

The last and most specific category, visual anthropology, is distinguished not only by the particular perspective that separates anthropological film from ethnographic film, but also by a particular method. Visual anthropology is distinct from anthropological film in that it is not merely the expression of anthropological concerns in a visual medium: it is in fact the practice of anthropology in a visual medium. Nor is it merely the study of the visual codes of human culture, for such studies have long been treated by conventional anthropology, but rather it is a branch of anthropology that conducts its investigations and expresses itself through visual codes. It provides another way of knowing about human society beyond the communications of words, extending the range of anthropology into the realm of visual knowledge. It may do this using any of the visual media: diagrams, drawings, still photography, video recording or film.

Summing Up:

Ethnographic film is film made to describe culture.

Anthropological film is film made to describe culture anthropologically.

Visual anthropology is the practice of anthropology in a visual medium.

It will be seen that although these categories become progressively more restrictive, they are also concentric, visual anthropology (at least that part of it conducted through film) being a variety of anthropological film, and anthropological film a variety of ethnographic film. Their relations are therefore exclusive towards the center but inclusive outwards from the center, an arrangement that may help to discourage squabbles over professional territory. It should also be evident that although these categories have been presented as being made up of entire, characteristic works they are in fact often present simultaneously on different levels of the same work. Thus, many elements of an anthropological film may be found to owe less to anthropology than to a broader humanistic tradition that draws upon historical or literary or philosophical descriptions of culture. It also sometimes happens that ethnographic films draw upon analytical methods used in anthropology, or anthropological concepts that have become generalized in popular culture.

One further complication must also be taken into account. Film today is an audio-visual medium in which spoken and written language almost invariably play some part. There can be few efforts in ethnographic film that do not involve words to some degree, whether in their subject matter or their modes of analysis. In predicting the future of visual anthropology it would be foolish to suggest that words will not remain important. But the final test of visual anthropology will lie in its willingness to accept as anthropological knowledge visual information that can neither be quantified nor reduced to an illustration of some verbal concept.
quences, three of which show dancers dancing. Another scene presents images of three men sitting in a field, one man is rubbing sticks together to make a fire.

The Haddon expedition material and excerpts from Sir Walter Baldwin Spencer's 1901 Central Australian footage were filmed from a fixed camera position. The footage does not differ in style from the more popularly known Lumière films. Performers are filmed at a distance, there is no use of close-ups. In some of Spencer's footage performers occasionally approach the camera, then move out of frame. These early moving picture records represent events set up expressly for filming. Dunlop read from Spencer's writing, that while certain Aranda tribe ceremonies were performed during the night, Spencer requested they be repeated in daylight so that they could be filmed. Spencer added the dance material filmed in daylight could not adequately convey the picturesque night ceremonies where dancers were encouraged by shouting groups of women sitting around open fires.

The films of Wilkin and Spencer stood in striking contrast to those of Brooke Nicholls, a Melbourne dentist and travel lecturer on Australian Aborigines. In 1922 Nicholls filmed the Wanggaruru of northeastern South Australia, of this material four three minute edited films have survived. The films are made up of long shots cut with medium shots and close-ups and interspersed with titles. Dunlop found the titles to be "at best fanciful and at worst objectionable." He chose not to screen "objectionable" titles or sequences, but did show a "fanciful" segment. The title read, "The Ladies of the Ballet" and was followed with a long shot, cut with a close-up of six women dancers. Other excerpted titles and sequences tended to be more descriptive, for example, "Flamer stones are used for shaping pieces of flint" preceded images of a man flint knapping. Despite Nicholls' extensive use of medium and close-up shots, the material is devoid of a feeling of humanism. Dunlop maintains that unlike the filmmaker - social scientists who came before, Nicholls' work tends to view the Aborigines as objects of curiosity. Reacting to the images on screen the audience at the Museum seemed to concur with Mr. Dunlop's sentiments.

Excerpts from Charles P. Mountford's 1940 film, WALKABOUT (not to be confused with Nicholas Roeg's 1971 film with the same title) were also shown. Dunlop believes this film to be the first Australian ethnographic film produced in color. It is also the first to have a sound track added to it in the editing stage. The sound track is composed of western music and a voice over narration delivered in travelogue style. Mr. Dunlop stated that the film is one of the most popular ever produced in Australia.

Other pre-1970 work excerpted and discussed by Mr. Dunlop included a film sponsored by The Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies (AIAS) made by Cecil Holmes entitled, DJALAMBU (1963) and Ian Dunlop's own PEOPLE OF THE AUSTRALIAN WESTERN DESERT.

Dunlop views the 1970's as a turning point in ethnographic filmmaking in Australia. Prior to this date, with few exceptions, the relationship between filmmakers and the Aborigines was "one of mutual trust and respect. . ." However, according to Mr. Dunlop, it "was unmistakably the filmmaker who guided the force of the film." Dunlop added that in today's filmmaking situation ethnographic cinematographers work in close association with the people they film. Furthermore, the ethnographic films of today are often made at the Aborigines' initiative. To illustrate this type of filmmaking Dunlop showed excerpts from Roger Sandall's 1972 film about daily activities of an Aboriginal stockman (cowboy) working on a cattle ranch in Australia's Northern Territory. He also showed clips from his own MADARRPA FUNERAL AT GURKA'WUY (1976). This film was made at the request of the father of a deceased child. Two excerpts from films produced by the AIAS made by David and Judith MacDougall: GOOD-BYE OLD MAN (1975), a Pukumani ceremony filmed at the request of the Mangatopi family of Snake Bay, and TAKEOVER (1978), a film which shows the actions of the Aurukun Council to counter moves by the Queensland Government to take over the management of the Aurukun Aboriginal Reserve. (For more information on these two films write: The Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, P. O. Box 533, Canberra City, Australian Capital Territory, 2601, Australia).

Ian Dunlop stated the lecture was not meant to be a definitive account of ethnographic filmmaking in Australia. Rather, it intended to present a visual impression of the work carried out over the last eighty years. To this end it was very successful. Mr. Dunlop's insights as a filmmaker and his knowledge of ethnographic film history were aptly combined making his presentation a scholarly and exiting introduction to the wealth of Australian material.

The next issue of the SAVICOM NEWSLETTER will direct its attention to international ethnographic film festivals. There will be comments on ethnographic film festivals in the United States, Japan, France, and Australia. There will also be information on the SAVICOM elections that will be held at the annual meeting in Los Angeles in December.
ANNOUNCEMENTS AND NOTICES...

MARGARET MEAD FILM FESTIVAL

The 1981 Margaret Mead Film Festival will be held on Saturday, October 17 and Sunday, October 18 at the American Museum of Natural History, Central Park West at 75th Street. A complete schedule of the festival program has been published. For additional information, call (212) 873-1070.

Annual Meeting Announcement

The Annual Business Meeting of SAVICOM will be held on Friday, December 4th from 5:30 to 7:00 in the Olvera Room of the Los Angeles Hyatt Regency. This meeting is open to all SAVICOM members and interested others. In addition to the normal course of events, we will be electing 3 Directors and 3 Advisors at the meeting. Only SAVICOM members may vote.

The Meeting of the SAVICOM Board of Directors will be held on Friday, December 4th from 12:00 to 2:00 in Room 309B of the Los Angeles Hyatt Regency. This meeting is open to all members of the Board of Directors and Advisory Committee.

A session entitled "Historical and Critical Perspectives in Visual Anthropology" will be conducted on Saturday, December 5th from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00, and from 1:30 p.m. to 3:00. It will be held in the Los Angeles Hyatt Regency Ballroom East and will include papers by Jay Ruby, George I. Quimby, Steve Feld, and Bob Aibel, with Jack R. Rollwagen as discussant. Film screenings will accompany each paper and will include films by Franz Boas, Edward Curtis, Jean Rouch and Georges Rouquier's feature length "Farrebique."

NEW SAVICOM BUSINESS ADDRESSES:

At the 1980 meeting of the SAVICOM Board of Directors in Washington, D.C. on 5 December 1980, the Board unanimously approved the following resolution:

"It is resolved that SAVICOM continue and reaffirm its affiliation with the American Anthropological Association, but discontinue its business relationship with the AAA due to present fiscal hardship. The Secretary-Treasurer of SAVICOM is empowered to negotiate and implement a new business relationship with whomever can provide SAVICOM with a more satisfactory fiscal arrangement. It is suggest that the Secretary-Treasurer first attempt to negotiate such an arrangement with The Annenberg School of Communications."

As of 1 July, Secretary-Treasurer Bob Aibel had begun the transfer of business affairs from the AAA to The Annenberg School. As our membership/business agent, The Annenberg School will perform the following functions: (1) maintain membership records; (2) produce and mail renewal notices (an initial notice and two reminders); (3) collect fees; (4) provide monthly reports on membership activity; (5) provide mailing labels to SAVICOM as needed. For these services, The Annenberg School (ASC) will charge SAVICOM $3.00 per member per year for the coming fiscal year. Under this arrangement the SAVICOM Secretary-Treasurer will maintain the SAVICOM bank accounts and books, and will hire an independent auditor at a cost of $600.00 or less. Under this new arrangement, SAVICOM administrative costs for the 1981-1982 fiscal year will not exceed $2,400.00 (based on 600 members). Under our past arrangement with the AAA our cost for these same services in the fiscal year 1980-1981 was $3,860.00 (based on 600 members).

All membership renewals and inquiries, all address changes and NEWSLETTER subscriptions should be sent to the following address:

SAVICOM, ATTN: Chris Wessel
3620 Walnut Street, 675
Philadelphia, PA 19104 U.S.A.

Bob Aibel
Secretary-Treasurer

SAVICOM NEWSLETTER
Jack R. Rollwagen, Editor
Department of Anthropology
SUNY College at Brockport
Brockport, N.Y. 14420 U.S.A.