



Mouton
de Gruyter

third edition

Paul Hockings, Editor

Principles of Visual Anthropology

Principles of Visual Anthropology



Principles of Visual Anthropology

Third edition

edited by

Paul Hockings

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York 2003

Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)
is a Division of Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin

© Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines
of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

ISBN 3 11 017930 X

Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the
Internet at <<http://dnb.ddb.de>>.

© Copyright 1974, 1995, 2003 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin.
All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this
book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechan-
ical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, with-
out permission in writing from the publisher.
Disk conversion: Lewis & Leins GmbH, Berlin.
Printing: Ratzlow-Druck, Berlin
Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer GmbH, Berlin
Cover Design: Sigurd Wendland, Berlin
Printed in Germany.

Preface to the Third Edition

The origins of this book lay in the second major international meeting devoted to visual anthropology, which was the International Conference on Visual Anthropology. It convened in Chicago as an adjunct to the IXth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, in 1973. That Congress was headed by Sol Tax, who with Margaret Mead proved to be very supportive of our Conference as well. Fortunately the Conference was to have a lasting impact on this discipline when we were able to publish its papers as *Principles of Visual Anthropology* in 1975. That edition of the book was evidently very successful, and for quite some time was one of only three books available in English on visual anthropology. It was the best-selling title in the entire 94-volume "World Anthropology" series which Sol Tax supervised for Mouton Publishers. In this series it was the only title to come out in a Second Edition, in 1995, and now in a Third, and it was the only volume to appear in a variety of versions in other languages: French, Japanese, and now Chinese, each with somewhat varying content. Margaret Mead's introductory chapter, "Visual Anthropology in a Discipline of Words," has been quoted *ad infinitum* ever since it first appeared.

Since those days nearly three decades ago ethnographic film production and analysis have not only become the central endeavour of visual anthropology; they are the only part of the field which has seen the emergence of several alternative trends, even "schools". This particular aspect of visual anthropology has seen a long development, however, beginning early in the 20th Century. It was thus natural that when the First Edition of this book came off the press in 1975 it showed quite

a strong emphasis on ethnographic filmmaking, and that emphasis is still apparent in this Third Edition.

By way of background, we should note that by mid-century technological innovation was making its impact: certainly the role of filmmakers like Jean Rouch and Richard Leacock in developing synch-sound equipment was crucial to the development of ethnographic film. As Peter Loizos succinctly observed,

From 1960 onwards, changes in camera and sound-recorder technology allowed the simultaneous recording of image and speech by one or two persons using equipment so light that it could be hand-held, and known colloquially as synch-sound shooting. The speaking subjects could now be followed and filmed in relatively informal, spontaneous contexts, and when a little later their speech could be translated into another language via the medium of subtitles, any people, no matter how obscure their language, could 'speak to' people they had never seen, and who would never learn their tongue. The impact of these changes was profound. (Loizos 1993: 11)

And so, he continued, "In the ten years from 1960 to 1970, the verisimilitude of ethnographic filming moved almost as far again as it had done since the invention of the cine-camera." (*ibid.*)

During that same decade Observational Cinema grew out of *cinéma vérité*, and it was a new filming style characterized by long takes (some of several minutes), synch-sound, and for the first time a frank admission that the film crew was indeed there, talking to the people, sometimes even getting in the shot (see McCarty, and also MacDougall, this volume).

By the 1980s this observational style, which had by that time produced many fine ethnographic studies on film, was beginning to give way to newer interests. In some countries TV had proven to be a kind of unexpected host to ethnographic films, but eventually and inevitably its own formulaic requirements began to surface; and in fact, by the 1990s, less and less anthropology was being seen on American, British or Japanese TV, while at the same time the advent of video and digital cameras was putting the possibility of lengthy shooting and high technical quality within the reach of more anthropologists than ever before. The number of films on anthropological themes that were shot in the 1980s and 1990s ran into the hundreds, though the number which were made with the active involvement of a professional anthropologist were still relatively few. This has been very evident from the content of recent anthropological "film festivals": lots of documentaries, yes, but theoretically informed ethnographic accounts, seldom.

A quarter of a century ago, North American anthropologists were seeing dual functions for film within our discipline as either "footage"

or as “finished, edited film.” Jack Prost (in this volume) put the distinction nicely when he contrasted record film with “illustrative” film. The film record has in its length a one-to-one relationship with the time taken for the original event to occur, while the illustrative film does something different: it selects pieces from a filmed record in order to illustrate some (otherwise more time-consuming) regularity or theme.

I view this fundamental distinction, about which there was considerable discussion in the 1970s, as one that separates film-as-record from film-as-constructed-text; for that is what any finished film is. One might suspect that I am wandering off the subject here to talk about feature films made in commercial studios; but I am not. I am referring to what have loosely been called “documentaries” for the past seventy-five years, films which purport to show an un-acted reality. As Colin Young has said of these films, quite correctly, “... they were like Hollywood films ...” (this volume).

Ethnographic documentaries in the *cinéma vérité* style such as *The Village* (McCarty, also Hockings, this volume) do uphold certain principles of anthropological veracity: the scenes shown in the film did actually occur there; in the vast majority of cases they would have occurred even without the presence of filmcrew and equipment; and so far as the anthropologist (myself, in this case) could ascertain, very similar scenes had occurred every summer for decades in that particular Irish village, which happens to be the most westerly village in Eurasia. Nobody had a paid role as performer/actor in the film, nobody had a script to shoot from, and nobody told the “performers/villagers” where to stand or what to say and do. The cameraman and soundman (usually Mark McCarty and myself) had to push their way delicately into positions where they could gain workable shots and usable sound. Thus nothing got shot repeatedly, as would regularly happen on a soundstage — unless of course it happened to be a repetitive technical process like scything.

What I have just referred to are in fact the classic features of an observational film, from roughly 1965 to 1980, but I have yet to mention one crucial matter: the editing. Films such as *The Village* or *The Netsilik Eskimo* series were carefully edited in order to create an ethnographically meaningful text from the available footage “in the can”.

MacDougall was one of the first to approach an ethnographic film as a text: “The underlying insight of the film-as-text is that a film is a conceptual space within a triangle formed by the subject, film-maker, and audience and represents an encounter of all three” (1978: 422). His view is that films are open-ended texts since they embody multiple

perspectives: those of the author, of the film's subject, and what may be termed "indigenous commentary." This certainly offers a more satisfactory approach to understanding what a documentary film attempts than the slightly earlier one, dear to communication theorists, that tried to answer Who did/said what, to whom, when, in what context, and with what effect?

Now I will argue here that there was a core period of some eight years, 1967–1974, during which much of the groundwork for visual anthropology was laid down. This period witnessed a rapid development in visual anthropology which has not been paralleled by a comparable spurt at any time since. The number of ethnographic films which we now consider a standard part of the teaching corpus, that were produced during just those eight years, is simply staggering: I could easily use up my allotted space here just speaking about them, and many of them are discussed by Emilie de Brigard (this volume). They include films on many dozens of cultures from all six inhabited continents. We should note that some of these films were made with little help from anthropologists, and quite a few were produced for television.

From just those eight years a core period in anthropological film thus defines itself. There were indeed many notable films from this very short period, and they illustrate several important points about the period: (1) the production of ethnographic films was an international and worldwide endeavour; (2) the influence of *cinéma vérité* was clearly there in the output of Jean Rouch, Peter Watkins, Frederick Wiseman and others; largely unnoticed at the time was the interplay between Rouch and his African friend, Ousmane Sembene, who during this brief period produced three fictional films, *Tauw*, *Emitai*, and *Mandabi*, all deeply informed by an ethnographic understanding of West African societies; then (3) Timothy Asch and John Marshall were well advanced in their experimental project to make educationally useful, short, one-theme "sequence films", and had presented three different cultures in this new format: the Yanomami, the !Kung/San, and the Pittsburgh police force; (4) Robert Gardner had already assumed his somewhat aloof and humanistic stance, working not with one culture but with a different one for each film, and in four continents, to present a quite personal and aesthetic view of each; (5) the recording of rituals on film was now a major activity, though one soon to grind to a halt among the Australian Aborigines; (6) prompted by Asch's work in developing a course curriculum at Brandeis University, near Boston, it was realised that we were jointly putting together a corpus of films on a variety of

traditional cultures that represented a sample of all the main subsistence forms; and in this period Alan Lomax began serious research on a world sample of films; (7) with these pedagogical and archival recording purposes in mind, a new observational style began quickly to emerge. It had grown directly out of the *cinéma vérité* of the 1960s. It was widely felt then that the scholarly commentaries had to go, Vertovian montage had to give way to long takes, and whenever possible people in the film should speak for themselves, even if in translation, rather than just stand there while we academics explained their lives.

This was definitely a time of ferment and rethinking in American anthropology too, indeed in American society and politics. The first programme in ethnographic film training was started at UCLA by Colin Young in 1966, and it proved very influential. Also highly indicative of a widespread mood at that time, sixteen papers were brought together by Dell Hymes in his influential book, *Reinventing Anthropology* (published in 1972). Among its contributors were such well-known names as Laura Nader, Eric Wolf, Gerald Berreman, Hymes himself, Stanley Diamond, Bob Scholte, and the visual anthropologist Sol Worth. The book served as a wake-up call to many who were still dancing in the arms of Kroeberian trait analysis or Radcliffe-Brown's structural-functionalism. It was a time finally to recognize that what we had always been writing about, or filming, was for us the exotic Other, and that there had to be other more sympathetic ways of understanding cultures around the world, whether in print or on film. Ethnographic filmmakers were already exploring those ways; indeed they were ahead of more conventional print-anthropologists in the search for new voices.

One of the most insightful stylistic shifts we see during this core period is that ethnographic film began to give specific individuals a voice, and this sometimes quite a voluble one. It is something we do not yet encounter in Marshall's film, *The Hunters* (1957), or Gardner's *Dead Birds* (1963), or the Netsilik series of the mid-'sixties. But just a few years later it is a prominent feature of David MacDougall's films, for example *Under the Men's Tree* and *To Live with Herds*; also Robert Gardner's *Rivers of Sand*, Tanya Ballantyne's *The Things I Cannot Change*, Roger Sandall's *Coniston Muster*, and Jorge Preloran's *Imaginario*, to mention just a few examples. It was of course a development that the new synch-sound shooting technology had made possible; and the *succès d'estime* of ethnographic films in the 1970s was to a very considerable extent the result of a shared cinema, of collaborations around the camera by Rouch and his partners, by the MacDougalls and their African friends, by many specialists relying on crucial guides

and spokesmen within the culture being presented on film. As in so much else, Flaherty had shown the way, with his far-reaching collaboration with the man he called Nanook.

During the late 1960s Karl Heider produced three editions of his useful handbook, *Films for Anthropological Teaching*. Over the years this continued to expand, the most recent edition being the eighth. We may also note that in March 1970 the recently established North American Program in Ethnographic Film published its first *Newsletter*. This was in fact a slim periodical devoted to visual anthropology in North America. The Institute for Scientific Film in Göttingen had already been publishing *Research Film* since 1952, however. In 1972 Sol Worth and Jay Ruby, both based in Philadelphia, proposed the founding of the Society for Visual Anthropology (which still exists), and from 1974 the subject was being published in a much more substantial journal, *Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication*, which was to be edited by the same two scholars over the following 11 years. And in 1970 the first meeting was held in Washington to develop a National Anthropological Film Archive at the Smithsonian Institution. This became a reality in 1975, with Richard Sorenson as its first Director.

Another sure sign of the rapidly increasing professionalization of visual anthropology during the late 1960s and early '70s was the occurrence of several conferences on the subject. The first of these was the UCLA Colloquium on Ethnographic Film, held in Los Angeles in the spring of 1968, which brought together many of the world's ethnographic filmmakers, including Balikci, Carpenter, Rouch, Lomax, Brault, Sandall, Marshall, Dunlop, Gaisseau, Collier, Preloran, Heider, Gardner, Merrian Cooper and a dozen others, including Young, McCarty, myself, and local students like Emilie de Brigard, David and Judith MacDougall, and Joan Churchill. The animated discussion set up the framework for the development of ethnographic filming, and also formed a basis for the next international conference on the subject, held in Chicago in 1973. Later in the year 1968, Temple University held the first of its Ethnographic Film Festivals in Philadelphia. Soon these developed into a major conference and film screening venue, during the 1970s. There was also a conference entitled Film in Anthropological Teaching and Research, held at New York University in the autumn of 1969. In Britain a major step forward was the establishment of the National Film School in the autumn of 1971, under the inspired direction of Colin Young, who previously had headed the Film School at UCLA and had been instrumental in setting up its influential Ethnographic Film Program.

With the appearance of the 1975 edition of our book-length survey of the subject, *Principles of Visual Anthropology*, we may say that the establishment of visual anthropology was assured. We had held a series of conferences; there were several university-level teaching programmes in Paris, London, Los Angeles, Philadelphia and elsewhere; we had a respectable-looking journal; and most important of all, we had a very solid corpus of anthropological films that were being screened in numerous festivals, distributed by professional companies, reviewed in academic journals, and used widely in college classrooms. And television beckoned on the horizon.

If I appear to have over-emphasized the North American contribution to the solidification of visual anthropology, then some support is lent to my position by another English anthropologist, Peter Loizos, who wrote: "In the late sixties in the UK the output of serious films about tribal and peasant societies was so small as to be notable. A dozen films a year was already a bonanza" (Loizos 1993: 191). Back in 1966, and unknown to most of us, Junichi Ushiyama, Yasuko Ichioka and Tadao Sugiyama had just launched their anthropological programme "Our Wonderful World" on Nippon TV in Tokyo. This weekly show was to run, almost incredibly, for the next 24 years (see Ichioka, this volume). After Ushiyama's participation in the Chicago conference, there was regular collaboration between the Japanese filmmakers, Jean Rouch, and various North American ethnographic film scholars.

May 2003

Paul Hockings

REFERENCES

- HYMES, DELL (ed.)
 1972 *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- LOIZOS, PETER
 1993 *Innovation in Ethnographic Film: From Innocence to Self-Consciousness 1955–1985*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MACDOUGALL, DAVID
 1978 Ethnographic Film: Failure and Promise. In *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 7: 405–425.

Preface

This book was originally developed by and for the anthropologists of the world, as was described in the original Preface. Its popularity — far exceeding that of any of the other ninety books in the World Anthropology series — proved that anthropology had indeed suffered too long a serious vacuum. The appearance of a revised edition of this book may yet fill that vacuum; and the Editor has carefully added materially to its content. Foremost in the book is the late Margaret Mead's brilliant and much-quoted introductory essay. Then, enriching us all, are eight new papers to carry us forward into new arenas of Visual Anthropology as this millennium draws to a close.

Chicago, Illinois
July 19, 1994

SOL TAX*

* deceased

Foreword

The masterly introduction which Margaret Mead has written for this volume makes it unnecessary for me to emphasize either the promise that visual anthropology offers us today or the reserve with which it has been considered in the past. The present collection of papers will, I trust, serve to put visual anthropology into its proper perspective as a legitimate sub-discipline of anthropology and at the same time a contributor to the history of cinema.

A few words about the editorial procedure may not be out of place here. Nearly all of these papers were written in 1973 for discussion at the International Conference on Visual Anthropology, which was held in Chicago at the University of Illinois as part of the IXth I.C.A.E.S. A few were written or drastically revised afterwards as a result of that Conference. And the brilliant paper by Colin Young was produced six months later.

Visual anthropology is clearly the product of a dozen Western countries. Being familiar with many of the people active in this new field, I solicited nearly every paper with a view to how it would fit into the entire volume. To this end I sometimes suggested alterations and the excision of points duplicated in several of the papers. Where time has not permitted a long editorial dialogue, alternative viewpoints have simply been added as "comment" at the end of some papers. Only three papers were submitted in foreign languages: that by Peterson was translated by Russian experts, and those by Rouch and Lajoux were translated by me.

It is a matter of great satisfaction that nearly all of the key persons in visual anthropology have contributed to this volume. I should add that we are all indebted to the National Endowment for the Humanities, which made the International Conference possible; to Margaret Mead and Sol

Tax for their continuous interest in the project; to Jean Block and her staff for their valuable editing services; to Bill Hintz, the film Librarian at this University, for his help with problems in the Filmography; and to Karen Tkach of Mouton Publishers for easing my way to the press.

University of Illinois, Chicago
May 1974

PAUL HOCKINGS

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------|
| Preface | |
| by <i>Sol Tax</i> | xiii |
| Foreword | |
| by <i>Paul Hockings</i> | xv |
| INTRODUCTION | |
| Visual Anthropology in a Discipline of Words | |
| by <i>Margaret Mead</i> | 3 |
| ETHNOGRAPHIC FILMING AND THE CINEMA | |
| The History of Ethnographic Film | |
| by <i>Emilie de Brigard</i> | 13 |
| Feature Films as Cultural Documents | |
| by <i>John H. Weakland</i> | 45 |
| McCarty's Law and How to Break it | |
| by <i>Mark McCarty</i> | 69 |
| SOME RECENT APPROACHES TO ANTHROPOLOGICAL FILM | |
| The Camera and Man | |
| by <i>Jean Rouch</i> | 79 |
| Observational Cinema | |
| by <i>Colin Young</i> | 99 |
| Beyond Observational Cinema | |
| by <i>David MacDougall</i> | 115 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Idea and Event in Urban Film | |
| by <i>John Marshall</i> and <i>Emilie de Brigard</i> | 133 |
| Research Filming of Naturally Occurring Phenomena: Basic Strategies | |
| by <i>E. Richard Sorenson</i> and <i>Allison Jablonko</i> | 147 |
| VISUAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE PAST | |
| Ethnographic Film and History | |
| by <i>Jean-Dominique Lajoux</i> | 163 |
| Reconstructing Cultures on Film | |
| by <i>Asen Balikci</i> | 181 |
| The Role of Film in Archaeology | |
| by <i>Stuart Struever</i> | 193 |
| Ethnographic Photography in Anthropological Research | |
| by <i>Joanna Cohan Scherer</i> | 201 |
| Our Totemic Ancestors and Crazy Masters | |
| by <i>Jean Rouch</i> | 217 |
| SOME SPECIALIZED USES OF FILM AND VIDEOTAPE | |
| Photography and Visual Anthropology | |
| by <i>John Collier Jr.</i> | 235 |
| Videotape: New Techniques of Observation and Analysis | |
| in Anthropology | |
| by <i>Joseph H. Schaeffer</i> | 255 |
| Filming Body Behavior | |
| by <i>J. H. Prost</i> | 285 |
| Audiovisual Tools for the Analysis of Culture Style | |
| by <i>Alan Lomax</i> | 315 |
| Film in Ethnographic Research | |
| by <i>Timothy Asch</i> and <i>Patsy Asch</i> | 335 |
| THE PRESENTATION OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL INFORMATION | |
| Ethnographies on the Airwaves: The Presentation of Anthropology | |
| on American, British, Belgian and Japanese Television | |
| by <i>Faye Ginsburg</i> | 363 |
| The First Videotheque | |
| by <i>Yasuhiro Omori</i> | 399 |
| Funding Ethnographic Film and Video Productions in America | |
| by <i>Sabine Jell-Bahlsen</i> | 413 |
| Ethnographic Filmmaking for Japanese Television | |
| by <i>Yasuko Ichioka</i> | 441 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Table of Contents</i> | xix |
| Matters of Fact by <i>Roger Sandall</i> | 457 |
| THE FUTURE OF VISUAL ANTHROPOLOGY | |
| The Tribal Terror of Self-Awareness by <i>Edmund Carpenter</i> | 481 |
| Visual Records, Human Knowledge, and the Future by <i>E. Richard Sorenson</i> | 493 |
| Conclusion: Ethnographic Filming and Anthropological Theory by <i>Paul Hockings</i> | 507 |
| APPENDICES | |
| Resolution on Visual Anthropology | 533 |
| Note on Filmography | 535 |
| Biographical Notes | 539 |
| Index of Films | 545 |
| Index of Names | 548 |
| Index of Subjects | 554 |

Introduction

Visual Anthropology in a Discipline of Words

MARGARET MEAD

Anthropology, as a conglomerate of disciplines — variously named and constituted in different countries as cultural anthropology, social anthropology, ethnology, ethnography, archaeology, linguistics, physical anthropology, folklore, social history, and human geography — has both implicitly and explicitly accepted the responsibility of making and preserving records of the vanishing customs and human beings of this earth, whether these peoples be inbred, preliterate populations isolated in some tropical jungle, or in the depths of a Swiss canton, or in the mountains of an Asian kingdom. The recognition that forms of human behavior still extant will inevitably disappear has been part of our whole scientific and humanistic heritage. There have never been enough workers to collect the remnants of these worlds, and just as each year several species of living creatures cease to exist, impoverishing our biological repertoire, so each year some language spoken only by one or two survivors disappears forever with their deaths. This knowledge has provided a dynamic that has sustained the fieldworker taking notes with cold, cramped fingers in an arctic climate or making his own wet plates under the difficult conditions of a torrid climate.

In the light of this record of devoted, tedious, often unrewarded work under trying and difficult conditions, it might be expected that each branch of practitioners of anthropology would eagerly avail itself of new methods which could simplify or improve its fieldwork. Thus, methods of dating became progressively available to archaeologists; phonograph, wire, and tape recording to musicologists and linguists; and still and moving pictures and video to ethnologists. The fantastic advances that have been made in each field when the new instrumentation became available (as

carbon 14 replaced tree rings, tape recorders replaced wax cylinders, sync-sound and filming replaced the wet plate camera) would seem to be so self-validating that a world congress in 1973 would only have to concern itself with a discussion of the latest theoretical advances, based upon the newest instrumentation, coupled with exhibits and demonstrations of the most trustworthy instruments — an approach exemplified by Joseph Schaeffer's article on videotape in this volume. Instead, we are faced with the wretched picture of lost opportunities described in Emilie de Brigard's article and the picture of what can still be done in the face of many lost possibilities in Alan Lomax's worldwide survey and synthesis.

All over the world, on every continent and island, in the hidden recesses of modern industrial cities as well as in the hidden valleys that can be reached only by helicopter, precious, totally irreplaceable, and forever irreproducible behaviors are disappearing, while departments of anthropology continue to send fieldworkers out with no equipment beyond a pencil and a notebook, and perhaps a few tests or questionnaires — also called “instruments” — as a sop to scientism (Plate 5). Here and there, gifted and original filmmakers have made films of these behaviors, and here and there anthropologists who could make films or arrange for them to be made have appeared, labored, been complimented and cursed in the perverted competitiveness of the unstable and capricious market place... but that is all. What we have to show for almost a century's availability of instruments are a few magnificent, impassioned efforts — the Marshall films on the Bushmen, Bateson's Balinese and Iatmul films, the Heider-Gardner expeditions to the Dani, Jean Rouch's tireless efforts in West Africa, some films of Australian aborigines, Asen Balikci's Netsilik Eskimo series, the Asch-Chagnon series of the Yānomamö, and, on the archival and analytical side, the gargantuan efforts of the Columbia Cantometrics Project, the Child Development Film Project of the National Institutes of Health, the Research Unit at the Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute, the Encyclopaedia Cinematographica, and the Royal Anthropological Institute in London.

I venture to say that more words have been used, spoken and written, disputing the value of, refusing funds for, and rejecting these projects than ever went into the efforts themselves. Department after department and research project after research project fail to include filming and insist on continuing the hopelessly inadequate note-taking of an earlier age, while the behavior that film could have caught and preserved for centuries (preserved for the joy of the descendants of those who dance a ritual for the last time and for the illumination of future generations of human scientists)

disappears — disappears right in front of everybody's eyes. Why? What has gone wrong?

A partial explanation of this clinging to verbal descriptions when so many better ways of recording many aspects of culture have become available lies in the very nature of culture change. Much of the fieldwork that laid the basis of anthropology as a science was conducted under conditions of very rapid change, where the fieldworker had to rely on the memory of the informants rather than upon observation of contemporary events. The informant had only words in which to describe the war dance that was no longer danced, the buffalo hunt after the buffalo had disappeared, the discontinued cannibal feast, or the abandoned methods of scarification and mutilation. Thus ethnographic enquiries came to depend upon words, and words and words, during the period that anthropology was maturing as a science. Lévi-Strauss has devoted all of his mature years to an analysis of that part of myth and folklore caught with a written translation of a written text. Lowie, working on Indian reservations, demanded how you could know that an individual was someone's mother's brother unless someone "told" you so. Relying on words (the words of informants whose gestures we had no means of preserving, words of ethnographers who had no war dances to photograph), anthropology became a science of words, and those who relied on words have been very unwilling to let their pupils use the new tools, while the neophytes have only too often slavishly followed the outmoded methods that their predecessors used.

Another explanation has been that it takes more specialized skill — and gift — to photograph and make films than it does to set a tape recorder going or to take written notes. But one does not demand that a linguist, carefully tape recording in the field, be able to construct a symphony out of his materials when he returns. Samples of filmed behavior can be made, just as adequately as can taped texts, by any properly trained ethnologist who can load a camera, set it on a tripod, read an exposure meter, measure distance, and set the stops. Surely any ethnologist with the intelligence to pass examinations based on a critical knowledge of the current sacred texts and worthy of being supported in the field can learn to make such records, records which can then be analyzed by our steadily developing methods of microanalysis of dance, song, language, and transactional relations between persons. We do not demand that a field ethnologist write with the skill of a novelist or a poet, although we do indeed accord disproportionate attention to those who do. It is equally inappropriate to demand that filmed behavior have the earmarks of a work of art. We can be grateful when it does, and we can cherish those rare combinations of artistic ability and scientific fidelity that have given us great ethnographic

films. But I believe that we have absolutely no right to waste our breath and our resources demanding them. That we do is the unfortunate outcome of both the European tradition of the overriding importance of originality in the arts and the way in which the camera has replaced the artist's brush and so developed film as an art form.

Thus the exorbitant demand that ethnographic films be great artistic productions, combined with the complementary damnation of those who make artistic productions and fail in fidelity to some statistically established frequencies of dramatic events, continues to clutter up the film scene, while whole cultures go unrecorded.

A second explanation of our criminal neglect of the use of film is cost. It is claimed that the costs of film equipment, processing, and analysis, in both time and money, are prohibitive. But as every science has developed instrumentation, it has required more expensive equipment. Astronomers did not give up astronomy because better telescopes were developed, nor did physicists desert physics when they needed a cyclotron, nor did geneticists abandon genetics over the cost of an electron microscope. Instead, each of these disciplines has stood behind its increased and expanded efficiency, while anthropologists not only have failed to support their instrumental potentialities but have continued to use questionnaires to ask mothers how they discipline their babies, words to describe how a pot is made, and a tangle of ratings to describe vocal productions. To add insult to injury, in many cases they have disallowed, hindered, and even sabotaged the efforts of their fellow research workers to use the new methods.

I think that we must squarely face the fact that we, as a discipline, have only ourselves to blame for our gross and dreadful negligence. Much of this negligence has resulted in losses that can never be regained. But there is still time, by concerted, serious, international effort, to get at least adequate samples of significant behaviors from every part of the world and to underwrite more full-scale records of whole cultures to add to the paltry few that we have.

There is, then, a second issue, and one variously addressed in the pages of this volume — how best to train ethnologists to understand filmmaking and film analysis, how best to train those who start as filmmakers and wish to learn ethnographic filming, and how to organize teams for massive fieldwork. A half century of inspired and unrewarded stabs at this problem has provided us with a fair amount of usable experience. It is possible to direct a cameraman who has no real knowledge of the significance of what he is filming, especially when much scene-setting has to be done, as in the kind of participatory reconstruction used by Asen Balikci in his

Eskimo series. It is possible for the filmmaker to use the work of an ethnographer who precedes him in the field, as Gardner did with Heider's work and as Craig Gilbert and his team did with my work on Manus. But I believe the best work is done when filmmaker and ethnographer are combined in the same person, although in many cases one interest and skill may outweigh the other. We have long insisted that the cultural ethnologist learn to take into account aspects of a culture in which he lacks personal interest and specialized technical training for recording. If he learns a language, he is expected to bring back texts; if the people make pots, he is expected to record the technique; whatever his problem, he is expected to bring back the kinship nomenclature. The requirement that certain minimum tape recording, filming, still photographic records, and video (where technically practicable) be brought back from every field trip can be added quite simply to the single field expedition. Such a requirement will not produce magnificent, full-scale, artistically satisfying, humanistically as well as scientifically valuable films — these, perhaps, will always be few in number. But recent work in New Guinea, such as the fieldwork of William Mitchell and Donald Tuzin, has demonstrated that it is possible to combine good traditional analytical ethnography with photography, filming, and taping. Assembling, mastering, transporting, maintaining, and using the equipment do add extra burdens. But in the past, the fieldworker had to contend with a great deal of illness that is now preventable with vitamins and minerals, and with immense gaps in communication between home base and field station that have now shrunk from months to days. The diaries of earlier fieldworkers like Malinowski (in the Trobriands), Deacon (who died of blackwater fever in the New Hebrides), and Olsen (ill days on end in the Andean highlands) are quite sufficient to document the savings that modern technology has given us. The time and energy made available by modern medical and mechanical technologies can now be diverted to using that same technology to improve our anthropological records.

A third problem is that of the relationship between the ethnologist, filmmaker, or team and those whose behavior (so precious and so trembling on the edge of disappearing forever) is being filmed. Although no film has ever been made without some cooperation from the people whose dance or ceremony was being filmed, it has been possible, in the past, for the filmmaker to impose on the film his view of the culture and people that are to be the subject of this film. This cannot, I believe, ever be entirely prevented. Still, the isolated group or emerging new nation that forbids filmmaking for fear of disapproved emphases will lose far more than it gains. In an attempt to protect a currently cherished national image, they

will rob of their rightful heritage their descendants, who (after the recurrent spasms of modernization, technological change, and attempts at new forms of economic organization) may wish to claim once more the rhythms and handicrafts of their own people. Not only the whole world of science and the arts, but their own future generations will be impoverished. However, there are contemporary steps that can be taken by the ethnographer, by those who are filmed, and by governments newly alerted to the problems of culture change in a world arena. Agreements can be made so that neither book reproductions of stills nor prints of films of ceremonies that are either sacred and esoteric, or illegal and therefore rejected under the new governmental system, may be shown within that country. Filming for television may be forbidden; in such cases, films may be restricted for scientific use only. This is one set of safeguards.

There is a second set of safeguards which does not (although it is often sentimentally claimed to do so) replace these formal safeguards on dissemination or use. This is the articulate, imaginative inclusion in the whole process of the people who are being filmed — inclusion in the planning and programming, in the filming itself, and in the editing of the film. We have just the beginning of such activities, not yet fully integrated, in Adair and Worth's films made by Navaho Indians; in the types of participation accorded Peter Adair in *Holy Ghost People*; in the training of local assistants and critics (such as those we trained in Bali, who could view the films in the field, for example, and discuss whether or not they believed that a trance dancer was "in trance"); and in the filming being done by some of Jean Rouch's former assistants in Niger. An ideal toward which we might set our sights would be a combination of films made by ethnographic filmmakers from different modern cultures — e.g. Japanese, French, American — combined with sequences photographed and edited by those who dance or enact the ceremonies or sequences of everyday life that are being filmed. The hazards of bias, both in those who film from their own particular cultural framework and in those who see their own filmed culture through distorting lenses, could be compensated for not by shallow claims of culture-free procedures, but — as in all the comparative work which is the essence of anthropology as a science — by the corrective of different culturally based viewpoints.

We must, I believe, clearly and unequivocally recognize that because these are disappearing types of behavior, we need to preserve them in forms that not only will permit the descendants to repossess their cultural heritage (and, indeed, will permit present generations to incorporate it into their emerging styles), but that will also give our understanding of human history and human potentialities a reliable, reproducible, reana-

lyzable corpus. We need also to consider that we would have no comparative science of culture without the materials generated by comparative work in all parts of the world (studies of the isolated peasant skills and movement styles in literate cultures as well as of the preliterate peoples who have maintained very ancient forms of behavior); the human sciences would still be floundering, as is much of our culture-bound, specialized social science, within an inadequate framing of experience which assumes that history and civilization as inaugurated by the Greeks form the pattern of culture.

As we approach a planetary communications system, there will inevitably be a diffusion of shared basic assumptions, many of which will be part of the cultural repertoire of members of all societies. We may hope, and it is part of anthropology's task to see to it, that before such planetary systems of thought are developed, the Euro-American tradition will have been broadened and deepened by the incorporation of the basic assumptions of the other great traditions and by the allowance for and recognition of what we have learned from the little traditions.

Nevertheless, the time will come when the illumination of genuine culture shock will be harder to attain, when the cultural diversity will be far more finely calibrated, and when greater and subtler educative experience will be required to perceive it and make constructive use of it. How then, in the future, will we be able to provide materials as contrastive as those from Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Americas today and as comprehensive and comprehensible as the entire culture of an isolated Eskimo or Bushman group? It is by exposure to such differences that we have trained our students to gather the materials on which we have then developed our body of theory. The emerging technologies of film, tape, video, and, we hope, the 360° camera, will make it possible to preserve materials (of a few selected cultures, at least) for training students long after the last isolated valley in the world is receiving images by satellite.

Finally, the oft-repeated argument that all recording and filming is selective, that none of it is objective, has to be dealt with summarily. If tape recorder, camera, or video is set up and left in the same place, large batches of material can be collected without the intervention of the filmmaker or ethnographer and without the continuous self-consciousness of those who are being observed. The camera or tape recorder that stays in one spot, that is not tuned, wound, refocused, or visibly loaded, does become part of the background scene, and what it records did happen. It is a curious anomaly that those against whom the accusation of being subjective and impressionistic was raised — those, in fact, who were willing to trust their own senses and their own capacity to integrate experience

— have been the most active in the use of instrumentation that can provide masses of objective materials that can be reanalyzed in the light of changing theory. Those who have been loudest in their demand for “scientific” work have been least willing to use instruments that would do for anthropology what instrumentation has done for other sciences — refine and expand the areas of accurate observation. At the present time, films that are acclaimed as great artistic endeavors get their effects by rapid shifts of the cameras and kaleidoscopic types of cutting. When filming is done only to produce a currently fashionable film, we lack the long sequences from one point of view that alone provide us with the unedited stretches of instrumental observation on which scientific work must be based. However much we may rejoice that the camera gives the verbally inarticulate a medium of expression and can dramatize contemporaneously an exotic culture for its own members and for the world, as anthropologists we must insist on prosaic, controlled, systematic filming and videotaping, which will provide us with material that can be repeatedly reanalyzed with finer tools and developing theories. Many of the situations with which we deal, situations provided by thousands of years of human history, can never be replicated in laboratory settings. But with properly collected, annotated, and preserved visual and sound materials, we can replicate over and over again and can painstakingly analyze the same materials. As finer instruments have taught us more about the cosmos, so finer recording of these precious materials can illuminate our growing knowledge and appreciation of mankind.

Ethnographic Filming and the Cinema

The History of Ethnographic Film

EMILIE DE BRIGARD

Ethnographic films have been produced ever since the technological inventions of nineteenth-century industrial society made possible the visual recording of encounters with other societies. Since its beginning, ethnographic film has been burdened with the expectation that it will reveal something about primitive cultures – and ultimately, all of culture – which can be grasped in no other way. The fulfillment of this expectation is what concerns us here. It is usual to define ethnographic film as film that reveals cultural patterning. From this definition it follows that all films are ethnographic, by reason of their content or form or both. Some films, however, are clearly more revealing than others.

Since the simultaneous inventions in Europe and America of motion pictures, shortly before the turn of the century, almost every people in the

I am indebted for information about Haddon to Peter Gathercole and James Woodburn. Many others have generously helped me in countless ways. Among those not named in the text are: Charles Weaver and the staff of the American Museum of Natural History; Jacques Ledoux and the staff of the Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique; Ernest Lindgren and the staff of the British Film Institute; and Tahar Sheriaa, Executive Secretary of the Journées Internationales Cinématographiques de Carthage. This paper has benefited from discussions with Erik Barnouw, Jean Rouch, and Richard Sorenson, who called certain inaccuracies to my attention; and from the editorial scrutiny of Paul Hockings and Timothy Thoresen, the chairmen of the sessions on Visual Anthropology and the History of Anthropology. I alone am responsible for the views expressed, and for errors of fact and omission. I am especially grateful to the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, The Museum of Modern Art, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Choreometrics Project of Columbia University for support, and to the Directors of these bodies for their encouragement.

This paper is a précis of the forthcoming illustrated volume, *Anthropological cinema*, to be published by the Museum of Modern Art (New York). Copyright © 1973 by Emilie Rahman de Brigard.

world has been filmed in one way or another, and a few groups have been filmed repeatedly, intensively, and brilliantly.¹ Examination of the corpus of ethnographic film and its literature shows that filmmakers have been guided (and also limited) by the technical means available to them, by the theoretical formulations of anthropology and cinematic art and by the intended and actual uses of their films. The history of technical progress, theoretical advance, and increasing sophistication in the use of film runs counter to a long-standing reluctance on the part of social scientists to take film seriously. The overwhelmingly verbal bias of anthropology was naively, and ineffectually, challenged by the innovators of ethnographic film in the years before World War I. The period between the wars saw solid if isolated achievements in theory and application, and, outside the academic sphere, the creation of an audience for social documentary films; but ethnographic film became an institutionalized scientific field, with recognized specialists and a body of criticism, only during the 1950's. In 1973, on the twenty-first anniversary of the formation of the International Committee on Ethnographic and Sociological Film, its members recognized that their discipline was in process of reinterpretation and unprecedented growth.

It is no accident that respect for film in the scientific community in recent years has been equaled by interest in the concerns of anthropology among the viewing public. The postwar revolution in communications technology is responsible for this. Today's young citizens have grown up with the new freedom of 16-mm synchronous sound filming, the impact of television transmission, and the possibility of computerized videotape storage of records. This technological revolution has facilitated development of ethnographic film from the fragmentary and idiosyncratic to the systematic and thorough; it has also caused the disappearance of much of its traditional subject matter. But the irony of the situation is superficial. Although the inclination to capture "the conspicuous, the traditional and the bizarre" is still present, both in scientific and in commercial films, it has gradually been giving way to a more thoughtful tendency to try to record, as coherently as possible, items of unspectacular but significant behavior. We now turn our cameras on ourselves for a good hard look at our own societies, thus redressing an imbalance which the "native" subjects of ethnographic films have found highly offensive.

¹ A definitive filmography of ethnographic films, invaluable for determination of filming priorities, has not yet been published. The International Committee on Ethnographic and Sociological Film has to date completed catalogues of ethnographic films of Subsaharan Africa (1967), the Pacific (1970), Asia and the Middle East (in press), and is assembling material on films of Latin America.

Ethnographic film began as a phenomenon of colonialism, and has flourished in periods of political change: socialist revolution, democratic reform, independence for developing nations. Its problems bear comparison with those of the new cinemas in former colonies: like these it enjoys an essential seriousness (sometimes ideologically tinged) and suffers from technical and financial handicaps by comparison with the established film industry. Like these it struggles to overcome Hollywood conventions; and it does without mass acceptance. But a few ethnographic filmmakers have influenced important movements in the cinema, and thus shaped the way in which generations of viewers saw life on the screen (cf. Young's paper, *infra*). Moreover, there are indications that some films have aided cultural renewal. The most exciting possibility of ethnographic films is to enable many who would not otherwise do so — amongst them, those whose specialized knowledge directs men's affairs — TO SEE, newly and richly, the range of patterns in the behavior of man. Its essential function, however, was stated by its very first practitioner and remains unchanged today. Film "preserves forever all human behaviors for the needs of our studies" (Regnault 1931:306).

The first person to make an ethnographic film was Félix-Louis Regnault (Plate 2), a physician specializing in pathological anatomy who became interested in anthropology around 1888, the year in which Jules-Étienne Marey (Plate 1), the inventor of "chronophotography," demonstrated his new camera, using celluloid roll film, to the French Académie des Sciences. In the spring of 1895, Regnault, aided by Marey's associate, Charles Comte, filmed a Wolof woman making pots at the Exposition Ethnographique de l'Afrique Occidentale. The film showed the Wolof method of making pottery, using a shallow concave base which is turned with one hand while the clay is shaped with the other. Regnault claimed that he was the first to note this method, which, he said, illustrates the transition from pottery made without any wheel at all to that made on the primitive horizontal wheel used in ancient Egypt, India, and Greece. He wrote up his experiment, including several line drawings taken from the film, and published it in December, 1895; the same month that the Lumières gave the first public projection of "cinématographe" films, a successful commercial experiment which launched the motion picture industry (Lajard and Regnault 1895; Sadoul 1966: 11).

Regnault's subsequent films were devoted to the cross-cultural study of movement: climbing a tree, squatting, walking, by Wolof, Fulani, and Diola men and women (Regnault 1896a, 1896b, 1897). He championed the systematic use of motion pictures in anthropology, and proposed the formation of anthropological film archives (Regnault 1912, 1923a,

1923b). Toward the end of his life he seems to have felt that his urgings had not been effective. In fact the Anglo-Saxons and Germans soon overtook the French in ethnographic filming; nonetheless, Marey's countrymen continued to excel in filming physiology (Michaelis 1955: 87).

One of the events marking the transformation of nineteenth-century speculative anthropology into a discipline with standards of evidence comparable to those of natural science was the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Straits, which Alfred Cort Haddon, a former zoologist, mounted in 1898. The expedition was conceived as a team effort of systematic salvage ethnography covering all aspects of Torres Straits life, including physical anthropology, psychology, material culture, social organization, and religion. A whole battery of recording methods was used, some of them new, such as W. H. R. Rivers' genealogical method, which has since become standard, and photography, together with wax-cylinder sound recording and motion pictures. Haddon's ethnographic films, for which a Lumière camera was used, are the earliest known to have been made in the field. What remains of them (several minutes' worth) shows three men's dances and an attempt at fire-making.

Haddon encouraged his colleagues to array themselves for fieldwork with photographic equipment (Plate 5). In 1901 he wrote about filming in a letter to Baldwin Spencer, who was about to undertake an expedition to Central Australia. Spencer and his associate, F. J. Gillen, spent the next thirty years studying the Australian Aborigines, and they produced monumental ethnographies copiously illustrated with photographs, but Spencer filmed on only two occasions, in 1901, and in Northern Australia in 1912. Despite flies, difficulties of transport, and the shyness of the Aranda, he collected over 7,000 feet of film, chiefly of ceremonies, and a number of wax cylinders. The scale of this effort (running time more than an hour) was large for its time, and the films are still legible enough to be used in research today. One long sequence of a Bugamani ceremony on Bathurst Island is even eerily beautiful. Notwithstanding the merit of what had been done, Spencer apparently made no further use of his films once they were housed in the National Museum at Victoria. Another colleague of Haddon's, Rudolf Pöch of Vienna, saw the Torres Straits films at Cambridge in 1902, and then took motion picture and stereoscopic cameras on his field trips to New Guinea and Southwest Africa in 1904 and 1907. Pöch's attempts at filming met with mechanical snags – underexposure and loosening of the lens through rough handling. Nearly half of the footage exposed in New Guinea failed to come out. Pöch ruefully advised developing film in the field whenever possible, or

at least testing a strip from each roll, in order to catch and correct technical problems as they came up. He managed to film dance in Cape Nelson, girls carrying water and children playing in Hanuabada (Port Moresby), and a man being shaved with an obsidian razor (Pösch 1907: 395 ff.).

Pösch's films were restored and published by the University of Vienna in 1960, and Spencer's were shown in a retrospective of Australian ethnographic films which attracted world-wide attention in 1967. To be unused and unknown has been the fate of all too many ethnographic films stored in the vaults of museums or in the garages of anthropologists' families. Many were destroyed as fire hazards, and others will soon be beyond saving, unless the programs of restoration which have been carried out on an *ad hoc* basis since the 1950's are rationalized, centralized, and well funded.

Of the pioneers of ethnographic film, only Regnault is known to have made use of it over a period of years. Why were the efforts of others without a sequel? Filming has always been far more expensive than writing, and it was, relatively speaking, even more so in the early years of the century.² There was real danger in working with highly inflammable nitrate film; gruesome fatalities occurred as late as the 1950's, and taking the necessary precautions, for example building a fireproof projection booth, added expense and inconvenience. Filming in the field resembled a wrestling match with protean equipment: cumbersome cameras fixed on tripods, with or without panning heads, viewfinders, or extra lenses, and using film whose low exposure index demanded shooting in broad daylight. These technical difficulties were serious enough; when problems of theory were also taken into account, the prospects for ethnographic film seemed bleak indeed (Plates 6 and 7).

Regnault had a theoretical focus for his filming: "the study of physiology proper to each ethnic group" (Regnault 1931: 306). Haddon's motive was apparently the urgent one of salvage, and cannot be faulted as such; but ethnographic salvage, however valuable, is not a substitute for a program of scientific inquiry. Moreover, interest in the material expressions of culture, which occupied Haddon's generation, began to be supplanted, early in this century, by emphasis on psychologistic traits and the intangibles of social structure. For many years it was beyond the technical capabilities of cinematography to follow this shift.

Up to this point the exposition has been concerned with ethnographic research films, which were made by scientists and were not intended to be

² For examples of budgets, see Hilton-Simpson and Haeseler (1925: 330) and Collier (1967: 127-135).

seen by laymen. But if we were to limit ourselves to what has been filmed by scientists, our history would appear poorer than it is. Comparative study of human behavior on a global scale, by means of the World Ethnographic Film Sample, would be severely hampered if all commercial and sponsored films were excluded.

Edgar Morin (1956) has described the transformation of motion pictures, the plaything of inspired *bricoleurs*, into the cinema, the dream machine of the masses. From its earliest days, two tendencies in the cinema can be made out: the documentary or *actualité* film, originated by the Lumières, and the fiction film, invented by Méliès in 1897 to win back to the box office a public which had speedily become bored by motion pictures (Sadoul 1966: 32). Actuality is generally less expensive to film than fiction. At various times and places, producers and public have preferred one of these tendencies to the other, but the distinction is often blurred to take advantage of both. The hybrid *documentaire romancé* – the story film set in a genuine exotic background – made its appearance by 1914.

Among the earliest commercial films were some autobiographical documentaries of the Lumière family: *Le déjeuner de Bébé*, *La partie d'écarté*, *La pêche à la crevette*, etc. (1895).³ In 1896–1897, their *opérateurs* fanned out across the globe, showing films to curious crowds on all continents and shooting items to be sent back to Lyon for the Lumière catalogue (Sadoul 1964). The American firm of Edison sent cameramen to film Samoan dancers at Barnum and Bailey's Circus, Walapai snake dancers in the pueblo (Plate 7), and Jewish dancers in the Holy Land. From 1905, Pathé Frères produced and distributed 35-mm *actualités* with an average length of 300 feet on a variety of subjects in Europe and abroad; other firms engaged in this activity were Warwick, Urban, Kineto, and Gaumont.⁴

Georges Méliès' firm, Star Film, which was known for its fantastic productions (as a trip to the moon was then considered), suffered chronic financial difficulty after an initial period of success. In 1912, Gaston Méliès, a brother, sought to cash in on the vogue for films of faraway places by producing melodramas in the South Seas. He assembled cameras, film, and a troupe of actors, and took ship for Tahiti and New Zealand. On his return to New York in 1913, Star Film released five two-reel *documentaires romancés*, none of which has survived. The best of

³ For further information on the films cited, see the item on "Filmography" in this volume.

⁴ The national archives of many countries contain film catalogues which repay close study.

them, from the point of view of ethnographic production values, was probably *Loved by a Maori Chieftainess*, in which an English explorer of the 1870's, about to be killed by a headhunter, escapes to an island with the help of a beautiful princess, marries her, and is accepted as her husband by the Maori. The action took place against a background of genuine village life, dancing, and war canoes (O'Reilly 1970: 289–290). Méliès planned to distribute a whole series of these tropical entertainments, but he discovered that most of his film had been ruined by a year of South Seas humidity. Star Film never recovered from the blow. Georges Méliès sold his company and eventually died a pauper (Sadoul 1966: 39).

Apart from entertainment, what is the value of nonscientific films of peoples and customs? Availability of information supplementing the film is of critical importance. *Actualités* and newsreels, often short and sometimes falsified, seldom give a systematic view of anything, although dance fares better than most categories. Human behavior in documentary and fiction films is subject to directorial distortion to such an extent that the film may be scientifically worthless. However, authenticity can be found on levels untouched by dramatic action (cf. Weakland's paper, *infra*).

A case in point is Edward Curtis' remarkable 1914 film, *In the Land of the Head-Hunters*. (The beginnings of visual ethnography of the American Indian, incidentally, are not in the films of Edison or Thomas Ince, but in still photography [Taft 1938: 249 ff.]⁵ The photographers of the Indians were not trained anthropologists, but the best of them did their work with enthusiasm, extraordinary dedication, and sensitivity.) Curtis, a prolific still photographer, spent three seasons with the Kwakiutl filming a drama of love and war in settings painstakingly reconstructed for precontact authenticity. Curtis had learned the same lessons as D.W. Griffith, and he handled suspense well. What gives his film its lasting appeal is the way in which Indian elements are used to tell the story visually. Its plot, which concerns a wicked sorcerer, a hero, and their respective factions battling for a girl, was to recur twenty-five years later, in H. P. Carver's Ojibwa melodrama, *The Silent Enemy*.

Toward the end of the pioneer period of ethnographic film came the first use of film in applied anthropology, the origin of the colonial cinema. By 1912, it had occurred to the Americans who administered the Philippines that films might serve a purpose in native education: where a language barrier prevented giving lessons successfully by word of mouth,

⁵ For surveys of photography in anthropology, see Rowe (1953); Mead (1963); and Collier (1967).

films would convey the message. Worcester, the Secretary of the Interior for the Philippines, devised a program of sanitary education for the provinces. To hold the interest of the Bontoc Igorot, Ifugao, and Kalinga between health films, Worcester's subordinates projected scenes of native and foreign life. The program achieved the desired result; when shown moving pictures of better conditions, the people showed a disposition to change. Moreover, Worcester reported, "the old sharply drawn tribal lines are disappearing... At the same time that all of this has been accomplished, the goodwill of the people has been secured" (Donaldson 1912: 41–42).

The generation before World War I was a time of innovation; the period between the wars was a time of popularization. In 1931, Regnault surveyed the status of film in anthropology, formulated a typology of film according to its use for entertainment, education, or research, and asserted that the importance of film in scientific research had been forgotten (Regnault 1931: 306). In fact, this was not the case; film had an established place in the laboratory (Michaelis 1955). But until Mead and Bateson's work of 1936–1938, the films made by anthropologists in the field, though intrinsically valuable, were not original in conception. What was new was the spread of film in anthropological teaching, fostered by museums and universities. Alongside the development of the teaching film, educational motion pictures, in the broadest sense, found a new dimension in the documentary. The technical advance of miniaturization of the 16-mm teaching film made possible the unprecedented fluency of Mead and Bateson's visual research. The aesthetic development of the documentary profoundly influenced the shape of the ethnographic film when it came into its own after World War II (cf. Young's paper, *infra*).

The history of the teaching film can be traced from the origins of motion pictures, but its great spurts occurred during the World Wars and in the periods following them, when film equipment and personnel were diverted to civilian life (Anderson 1968). By the mid-1920's, the anthropological teaching film evolved its canonical forms: the single-concept film of ceremonial, crafts, and the like; and the filmed cultural inventory, more or less complete. Another form, the comparison film (of houses of the Arctic and the tropics, for example) was less common. In format the anthropological teaching film was from ten minutes to over an hour long, silent, with intertitles which sometimes took up more than half of the film. After the adoption of sound in 1927, voice-over narration gradually replaced titles.

Museums were well-suited to produce films on anthropological subjects, since they had the possibility both of sending cameramen on their expeditions and of attracting steady audiences to their programs. An ex-

cellent series about the Zuñi was made in 1923 by F. W. Hodge, ethnologist, and Owen Cattell, cameraman, for the Heye Foundation-Museum of the American Indian. An overview film, *Land of the Zuñi and Community Work*, shows planting, threshing, water carrying, children at play, and gambling, by men, women, and children who appear to be going about their daily occupations with complete absorption, oblivious of the camera. Three films of ceremonials show dancing and the planting of sacred wands. The rest of the series covers hairdressing, housebuilding, baking bread, and tanning and wrapping deerskin leggings. Despite occasional awkwardness in the technical process films, these compare favorably with the series directed by Samuel Barrett at the University of California more than thirty years later.

Sensing the possibility of profit, commercial film producers entered into association with museums and universities; the Harvard-Pathé project produced a number of short, straightforward films on the *Battacks of Sumatra*, *Mongols of Central Asia*, *Wanderers of the Arabian Desert*, etc. (1928), before the relationship was dissolved. Nordisk Films Kompagni and Svensk Filmindustri coproduced the *Svarta Horisonter* (Black Horizons) series (1935–1936) directed in Madagascar by Paul Fejos, the Hungarian director. Later, as Director of Research of the Wenner-Gren Foundation, Fejos trained film crews in anthropology (*Nomads of the Jungle*, 1952) and anthropologists in filming (at Yale and Columbia Universities), but his excellent anthropological documentaries (*A Handful of Rice*, 1938; *Yagua*, 1941) are not as well known as his theatrical films, *Lonesome* (1928) and *Légende hongroise* (1932) (Bidney 1964; Dodds 1973).

Eastman Kodak developed the 16-mm format (1923) expressly for the school market, but by the 1950's most educational films were still being filmed in 35-mm and reduced for distribution. A certain stiffness marred even the best of these films. And the format of the visual lecture, now in color, is with us still.

However successful teaching films might be (and it should be remembered that Eastman Teaching Films was a subsidized operation, designed to bolster the parent firm's sales of film stock), they were surpassed in visibility and profitability by explorer films and by fiction films set in exotic locations, which enjoyed great popularity between the wars. Among explorers, Martin Johnson was the durable producer of *On the Borderland of Civilization* (1920), *Simba*, *Congorilla*, *Baboona*, and *Borneo* (1937). Frank Hurley's *Pearls and Savages* (1924) was probably the first film made in New Guinea. The makers of *Grass* (1925), Merian Cooper and Ernest Schoedsack, went on to film Lao villagers and elephants in

Chang (1927), before their greatest success, *King Kong* (1933). Léon Poirier's *Croisière noire* (1926), the first feature-length French film made in Africa, did its job (advertising Citroën trucks) so well that it was released in a sound version in 1933. The Marquis de Wavrin's *Au pays du scalp*, record of an Amazon expedition edited by Cavalcanti and with music by Maurice Jaubert, appeared in 1934. Fiction films of the period include episodes of the *Perils of Pauline*, filmed in the Philippines in the 1920's, and Cecil B. de Mille's remake of *Squaw Man* (1931), which is all the more poignant since it is unclear which locale is meant to be more exotic, the studio interior of an English country house or the Wild West. W. S. Van Dyke directed the singularly offensive *Trader Horn* (1930), which was partly filmed in Africa, and *Tarzan, the Ape Man* (1932). Jean Mugeli's *Rapt dans la jungle* (1932) was the first Melanesian talking picture. And André-Paul Antoine and Robert Lugeon produced what was to become the first publicly exposed ethnographic film hoax, *Les mangeurs d'hommes* (1930). Antoine and Lugeon engaged a village of Christianized Small Namba to enact a terrifying drama of cannibalism, supposedly set in the "unknown region" of the interior of Malekula, where the authority of the white man was "entirely nominal." The deception was unmasked by their host in the field, the Bishop of Port Vila, but not before a celebrity-studded première had taken place in Paris (Le-prohon 1960).

Although he transcended these genres, Robert Flaherty began his filmmaking career as an explorer, and he continued by directing a South Seas love story for Hollywood. *Nanook* (1922) was described by a spokesman for the Asia Society as "drama, education, and inspiration combined"; and of *Moana* (1926) John Grierson wrote: "*Moana*, being a visual account of events in the life of a Polynesian youth, has documentary value." Both films were technically innovative. For *Nanook*, Flaherty used a tripod with gyro-movement, which allowed him to follow and anticipate his subjects with the delicacy which became his trademark; and while filming *Moana* he discovered that the panchromatic film intended for his special color camera gave excellent skin tones in black and white, and his improvement became industry standard. (Unfortunately, Flaherty's interest in the problems of sound did not equal his visual gifts.) As an artist, Flaherty is of the first rank; as an anthropologist (which in any case he did not pretend to be) he leaves much to be desired (Plates 3 and 6). Iris Barry's attack on the authenticity of *Nanook* can never be well answered, since Flaherty, always the raconteur, did not leave a systematic record of its making. Mrs. Flaherty's 1925 account of the conditions under which *Moana* was filmed is sufficient to dismiss its value as a

record of interpersonal behavior, although its sequences of crafts are acceptable. Alas for Flaherty! *Man of Aran* (1934) was denounced for being escapist, for ignoring the political realities of the tenant system; *The Land* (1942) was shelved because it was considered too pessimistic, too grimly realistic to be circulated in wartime. Flaherty's gift was not that of a reporter or recorder, but rather that of a revealer.

The social documentary film, which came into being in the 1920's and flourished in the 1930's, was a mass education medium sensitive to the needs of government policy or of opposition politics in various countries. "Of all the arts," Lenin told his Commissar of Education, Lunacharsky, "for us the cinema is the most important" (Leyda 1960: 161). "I consider *Las Hurdes* one of my surrealist films," remarked Buñuel (Taylor 1964: 90). Scientific data are to be found amidst the actuality, but they are clothed in argument more subtle than fiction. If the explorer film cannot escape its exploitative nature, neither can the documentary desist from visionary exhortation.

Concern with the transformations in society is a trait common to Soviet anthropologists and filmmakers; as Marxists, they have tried not only to describe social change, but also to cause it to happen (Debets 1957; Krupianskaya, *et al.* 1960). What is striking about the first generation of Soviet filmmakers is the closeness of their ties to science, as well as to the *avant-garde* in art. Theoretical explicitness and candor about how they produced their effects distinguished Eisenstein, Pudovkin, and other Soviet filmmakers from their Western contemporaries, from whom they had learned much (cf. Temaner's paper, *infra*). Dziga Vertov, the pioneer of Soviet documentary, directed the *Kino-pravda* series (i.e. "cinema truth"; "*cinéma vérité*") (1922) and expressed the following theory of montage, or "the organization of the seen world":

1. Montage during the observation period (immediate orientation of the naked eye at all times and places).
2. Montage after observation (logical organization of vision into one or another definite direction).
3. Montage at the time of filming (orientation of the ARMED eye — the moving picture camera — during the search for the appropriate camera position, and adjustment to the several changing conditions of filming).
4. Montage after filming (rough organization of the filmed material according to main indications, and ascertaining what necessary shots are missing).
5. Judgment of the montage pieces (immediate orientation to link certain juxtapositions, employing exceptional alertness and these military rules: judgment — speed — attack).
6. Final montage (exposition of larger themes through a series of smaller

subtler themes; reorganization of all material while keeping the rounded sequence in mind; exposure of the very heart of all your film-objects) (Belenson [1225] quoted in Leyda [1960:178–179]; cf. Rouch's paper, *infra*).

Three Songs of Lenin (1934) is considered to be Vertov's best film. It ends with a lyric section on the progress "from past to future, from slavery to freedom" of the Soviet Union's Central Asian ethnic minorities. The Soviets encouraged the development of regional filmmaking in Uzbekistan, Armenia, Georgia, and elsewhere. Mikhail Kalatozov's *Salt for Svanetia* (1930) shows past hardships of life in the Caucasus ("tormenting hunger for salt") overcome by Soviet technical aid (tractors construct an all-weather road). The Svans took offense at the film, and denied that the old customs portrayed in it had ever existed. Another "before and after" film, Viktor Turin's *Turksib* (1928), shows the building of the Turkestan-Siberian railway and the reactions of people along its path.

In Eastern and Central Europe, documentary filmmakers approached traditional life with a reverential attitude. Karel Plicka directed *Za Slovensky ludem* [Games of Slovak Youth, 1931], *Večna piseň* [The Eternal Song, 1941], and *Zem spieva* [Earth in Song, 1933], which he considered to be his "hymn to the Slovak people." Drago Chloupek and A. Gerasimov filmed a Croatia *zadruga* in 1933 (*Dan u jednoj velikoj hrvatskoj porodici* [A day in a large Croatian family], anticipating later peasant symphonies by Henri Storck in Belgium and Georges Rouquier in France. German filmmakers were also attracted by folklore and ethnographic subjects, which they fashioned into *Kulturfilme*. The more ambitious of these trace the development of a trait from primitive beginnings to its advanced form. Wilhelm Prager's *Wege zu Kraft und Schönheit* (1925) compares Greco-Roman with modern German athletics, and illustrates the development of dance from Hawaiian and Burmese, through Spanish and Japanese, to Russian ballet and the dance dramas of Rudolf Laban. It concludes with shots of famous sportsmen, including Lloyd George golfing and Mussolini on horseback. The UFA publicist claimed that this film would promote "the regeneration of the human race" (Kracauer 1947: 143).

French documentary, unlike Soviet and German documentary, was individualist, largely anti-establishment, and undeveloped (cf. Rotha *et al.* 1963: 268). Noteworthy, even brilliant beginnings were made, but they were to mature later or elsewhere. In 1926, Alberto Cavalcanti made *Rien que les heures*, the first of the city symphonies. In 1929, Georges Rouquier made *Vendanges*, forerunner of *Farrebique* (1946) and his other films of peasant life. An obscure film, *Coulibaly à l'aventure* (1936), made by G.

H. Blanchon in French West Africa, preceded Rouch's *Jaguar* by twenty years, both in theme (migrant labor) and treatment (improvised acting). Documentary techniques found their way into fiction films, such as Jean Renoir's *Toni* (1934).

In Spain, Luis Buñuel used money won in a syndicalist lottery to produce that succinct masterpiece of dreamy outrage, *Las Hurdes* (1932). The stuff of Buñuel's argument is not only the misery of the inhabitants of Cáceres, but also our curiosity, never innocent, because human.

No such dark scruples are to be found in British and American documentaries, which were meliorist in tone and popular in scope.⁶ A film of North Sea herring fisheries, John Grierson's *Drifters* (1929), was the beginning of the British documentary movement, which had as its purpose the formation of a more aware citizenry by means of the "creative treatment of actuality" (Hardy 1966). Production was supported by government and industry, and dealt with the broad topics of Empire capitalism, domestic social reform, and (with the coming of war) colonial propaganda. Rotha (1936) describes two stages of British documentary: the first, "impressionistic" stage peaked with Basil Wright's exquisite *Song of Ceylon* (made for the Ceylon Tea Propagation Board in 1935), with its symphonic structure and Eisensteinian views of Sinhalese working the fields. The second, or "realist," stage quietly anticipated the social reporting of the 1960's, by making use of spontaneous, unrehearsed speech, filmed with synchronous sound. In *Housing Problems* (produced for the British Commercial Gas Association in 1935), Edgar Anstey and Arthur Elton took camera and microphone into the working-class districts of South London. The residents pointed out the vermin and other signs of dilapidation "without prompting" (Rotha 1936: 255). In this way the film not only gained credibility but disarmed potential criticism of the makers' motives: "When the subjects raised more obvious social issues, facts and people were made to speak for themselves" (Broderick 1947: 50). To Rotha's stages must be added a third, beginning with the formation, in 1939, of the National Film Board of Canada, under Grierson, and the Colonial Film Unit (CFU), directed by William Sellers. Both were propaganda organizations, concerned with the war effort, Grierson from a stance inside European culture, Sellers from the outside. The CFU, for example, made a film designed to present the British way of life to Africans, *Mister English at Home* (1940). In the decade after the war,

⁶ Until McCann (1973), the British movement was the better documented, thanks to John Grierson and his editor, Forsyth Hardy. Grierson's writings, when collated with an account of Britain's domestic situation between the wars, constitute a primer on the politics of film.

Sellers and his group were instrumental in developing television in Anglophone Africa.

Whatever the ideological angle of filmmakers in the 1920's and 1930's, their films share a new quality: for the first time since the Lumières, ordinary people in their everyday surroundings were seen on the screen. At the same time, the mass medium of cinema was becoming demystified through technology. Amateur filming in 16-mm was no longer an oddity. Armed with the ciné-Kodak, Major P. H. G. Powell-Cotton and his family filmed systematically in Africa during the 1930's and 1940's. In a single year, 1937–1938, the impresario, Rolf de Maré, collected an estimated 49,000 feet of 16-mm film of dance, in Sumatra, Java, Bali, and the Celebes. Film, the toy of scientists and the instrument of fantasists, was coming of age.

In anthropology, the middle of the 1930's was the watershed between film's unimportance and its acceptability. To W. D. Hambly, Melville Herskovits, Patrick O'Reilly, and Marcel Griaule, film was an illustration, not an integral part of research to be used in understanding and cited in publication. Quality, in this kind of filming, still meant 35-mm and, if possible, a trained cameraman. (But Norman Tindale, in Australia, and Franz Boas, in British Columbia, took their own 16-mm films.) By contrast, Gregory Bateson and Margaret Mead's decision to use cameras in Bali and New Guinea, in 1936–1938, was dictated by the needs of their research. They innovated both in the scale of their filming and photography (22,000 feet of 16-mm film, 25,000 stills) and in its aim, the description of the "ethos" of a people.

The shift in scale was directed primarily at recording the types of non-verbal behavior for which there existed neither vocabulary nor conceptualized methods of observation, in which the observation had to precede the codification (Mead 1963:174).

Harris states that Mead turned to photography as a direct result of criticism of her previous works, challenged over their "soft" unverifiable data (Harris 1968:417). Mead's own account of the events leading to the "quantum leap" of research in Bali and Iatmul emphasizes personal and intellectual factors (Mead 1972). Whatever its causes, the effect of methodological originality in *Balinese Character* was to make photography a respected tool in anthropological research (Bateson and Mead 1942).

The expedition to Bali was financed by the Committee for the Study of Dementia Praecox, who recognized an opportunity to cast some light upon the etiology of schizophrenia. The anthropologists brought complementary abilities to the project: Mead's unsurpassed note-taking skill

and her interest in babies and family life, Bateson's grounding in natural science (he had been a student of Haddon, another former zoologist) and interest in communication and context. His was the task of taking pictures, while Mead and a Balinese secretary, equipped with chronometers, recorded events verbally, and carefully cross-referenced the pictures and notes. They were without means of recording sound.

We tried to use the still and the moving picture cameras to get a record of Balinese behavior, and this is a very different matter from the preparation of a "documentary" film or photographs. We tried to shoot what happened normally and spontaneously, rather than to decide upon the norms and then get the Balinese to go through these behaviors in suitable lighting (Bateson and Mead 1942:49).

For the greater part of their two years' stay, Mead and Bateson lived in the mountains at Bajoeng Gede, where "everything went on in a kind of simplified slow motion," owing to the poverty and hypothyroidism of the villagers. Bateson took pictures "as a matter of routine," without asking special permission. Habitually he directed attention to his photography of small babies, and the parents came to overlook the fact that they were included in the frame as well, so that the angular viewfinder, for photographing sensitive subjects, was seldom needed or used. Some theatrical performances were specially staged in daylight, as a concession to the camera. As the corpus of photographed data grew, it "was used consciously to compensate for the changing sophistication of the viewer" (Mead 1963:174), by comparing photographs taken before a hypothesis was formulated with those made afterwards.

On their way home from the field, Bateson and Mead spent six months in New Guinea, collecting comparative data among the Iatmul. Then World War II made fieldwork impossible, and other urgent research priorities demanded attention. Despite these, Bateson and Mead prepared *Balinese Character* and edited several films, which were released, after the war, in the Character Formation in Different Cultures Series (1952). In discussions of film, Mead often fails to distinguish it from still photography, a usage which reflects her method in dealing with both (Mead 1963). After viewing the 25,000 stills sequentially, Bateson and Mead chose and arranged 759 of them in 100 plates, thematically juxtaposing related details without "violating the context and the integrity of any one event" (Mead 1972:235). The films were edited chronologically (*Trance and Dance in Bali*) or by presenting contrasting items of behavior (*Childhood Rivalry in Bali and New Guinea*) (cf. Plate 9).

While Bateson and Mead were in Bali, Jean Rouch was in Paris, studying engineering and forming the associations which would lead to his be-

coming a leader of the ethnographic film wave in Europe, and an indefatigable producer and popularizer. At the Musée de l'Homme, Rouch heard the lectures of Marcel Mauss and Marcel Griaule. He encountered Henri Langlois, now the director of the Cinémathèque française. His decision to study anthropology seriously was made during the war, which he spent in French West Africa supervising the construction of roads and bridges. "Culture conflict struck me from the start," he said (Desanti and Decock 1968:37). Rouch was not among those chosen, in 1946, for the Ogooué-Congo Expedition, a well-equipped (in 35-mm) group of explorer-filmmakers (Francis Mazières, Edmond Séchan, and Pierre Gaisseau) and anthropologists (Raoul Hartweg, Guy de Beauchêne, and Gilbert Rouget). Instead he floated down the Niger with two friends, making films by trial and error with a 16-mm Bell and Howell from the flea market. The tripod soon fell overboard, and necessity nudged Rouch toward an original shooting style (Rouch 1955). In order to film a hippopotamus hunt on the river, he enlisted the help of Damouré Zika, a Sorko who was to collaborate with Rouch in research and filming (*Les maîtres fous*, 1953), as did Oumarou Ganda (star of *Moi, un noir*, 1957; director of *Le wazou polygame*, 1971) at a later date. Rouch's career has been described as one of "inveterate amateurism" and "incurable dilettantism" (Marcorelles 1963: 18). Rouch is, in fact, the first full-time ethnographic film professional (Plate 4).

The only film that Rouch had to show for those months on the Niger was sufficiently well done to be bought by Actualités Françaises, blown up to 35-mm, embellished with narration and shown as *Au pays des mages noirs*, on the same bill as Rossellini's *Stromboli*. There was a grander sequel in 1955, when a number of Rouch's short films in color were enlarged, combined, and released as a feature, *Les fils de l'eau*. This was rapturously reviewed in *Cahiers du cinéma* by Claude Beylie, who compared Dogon cosmogony to the philosophy of Thales, Empedocles, and Timaeus, and asserted: "we are the monsters" (Beylie 1959). Rouch by this time was Executive Secretary of the International Committee on Ethnographic Films (CIFE), which had been formed in 1952 at the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences at Vienna, to further preservation, production and distribution. The French section of this organization prepared analyses and critiques of 106 films, and in 1955 UNESCO published this catalogue as part of its series on Mass Communication. Thus, under Rouch's care, the genre of ethnographic film acquired scientific and political as well as artistic stature in the postwar decade.

Others besides Rouch were active in this transformation (or, as Rouch

called it, “renaissance”), and there were other conceptions besides that of CIFE as to what an ethnographic film should be. In Germany, the Institut für den Wissenschaftlichen Film was reorganized immediately after the war, and soon German anthropologists were again filming in Melanesia, Africa and Europe. The Institute’s approach to anthropological film was characterized by emphasis on scientific purity (Spannaus 1961:73–79). Subjects and treatments that might have ideological significance were to be avoided, along with the tendency to admit laymen to the field. The Institute conducted intensive courses in film technique for anthropologists preparing to do fieldwork, and supplied equipment for expeditions supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, provided the applicants had taken the course. On the basis of this program, the Institute published its “Rules for film documentation in ethnology and folklore” in 1959. These require that filmmaking be done by persons with sound anthropological training or supervision, and that an exact log be kept; that the events recorded be authentic (technical processes can be staged for the camera, but not ceremonies), filmed without dramatic camera angles or movement, and edited for representativeness.

In 1952, the Institute’s director, Gotthard Wolf, was the first to implement what had repeatedly been proposed, by establishing at Göttingen the first systematic anthropological film archive. Films meeting the Institute’s scientific criteria were first solicited from anthropologists in Germany and then, with growing success, from abroad. At the start, Konrad Lorenz worked on assembling and arranging the *Encyclopaedia cinematographica* and others have added several thousand films on anthropological and biological subjects. To facilitate comparative research, each film consists of a single “thematic unit,” such as dance, work, or ritual, and the films are arranged in natural science categories, biological subjects by phylum, genus, and species, ethnological ones by geographical location and social grouping, e.g.:

SOUTH AMERICA

BRAZIL

E75 Tukurina (Brazil, Upper Purus River) — Curing the sick by medicine men. 1950 (Color, 2½ minutes) H. Schultz, São Paulo.

This natural science treatment of ethnographic film contrasts with and complements CIFES’ social science orientation. (The Committee added the “*Sociologique*” to its name in 1959.) Several countries have institutional affiliations with both CIFES and the *Encyclopaedia cinematographica*; CIFES has been less active than its counterpart, however, in making films routinely available to scholars. Wolf’s efforts in this regard have been major and prescient. Since 1966, an American archive of the

Encyclopaedia cinematographica has been housed at Pennsylvania State University; and in 1970, a Japanese archive was established at Tokyo.

As ethnographic film became institutionalized, it quickly accumulated a literature. Definitions and typologies of ethnographic film were devised. Griaule sustained Regnault's conception of ethnographic filming as a scientific activity concerned with traditional ethnographic subjects. He distinguished three film types: archive footage for research, training films for anthropology courses, and public education films (including, occasionally, "works of art") (Griaule 1957). (Although Griaule was hardly a film enthusiast, he became in death the subject of a "public education" film — of his own Dogon funeral.) André Leroi-Gourhan expressed a more original view of things in an article, "Le film ethnologique existe-t-il?", in which he applied the term "ethnological" to another tripartite classification: the research film, the "exotic" travel film (to be abhorred as superficial and exploitative), and the "film of environment... produced with no scientific aim but deriving an ethnological value from its exportation" (Leroi-Gourhan 1948). These contrasting typologies of ethnographic film, one exclusive in tendency and the other inclusive, survive to this day. Griaule's view has been echoed by many who differ among themselves chiefly as to the degree of prophylaxis necessary against the "contamination" of the commercial cinema. On the other hand, it has been pointed out by Sol Worth that definitions of ethnographic film are tautological, since no film can be called ethnographic in and of itself (Worth 1969). Much depends upon the uses to which a film is put, regardless of the intentions of its author. A single film can be used in a variety of ways. It's a simple matter, when film represents the confrontation between "us" and "them" (Europeans and natives; scientists and laymen), for the filmmaker and the viewer to negotiate the conventions. But especially since World War II (though even long before it), neither "we" nor "they" have ceased to change.

The "steady inertia" *vis-à-vis* new technical devices in anthropology, of which Rowe complained in 1952, has since been supplanted by steadily accelerating activity, heightened, in recent years, by the availability to anthropologists of videotape. We are now waiting for videotape storage of data, in a central location servicing far-flung terminals, to be implemented (Ekman *et al.* 1969). But the existence of technology has never been a sufficient condition of scientific advance.

Although Kuhn (1962) has questioned the existence of paradigms in the social sciences, a fair degree of consensus exists as to what constitutes normal anthropological research using film. The state of the field a decade ago can be glimpsed in Michaelis (1955), Spannaus (1961), and Mead

(1963); today's situation is exposed in the papers in this volume, and, often more revealing, in their overlapping bibliographies. New uses of film, and refinements of old ones, are constantly occurring. Semiotic analysis and evocative techniques have joined the following long-established uses of film by anthropologists: as a note-taking tool for events which are too complex, too rapid, or too small to be grasped with the naked eye or recorded in writing; as a means of salvaging data for future generations of researchers, either because the behavior is about to disappear, or because the theoretical equipment to deal with it does not yet exist; and for comparisons. These may be either synchronic (cross-cultural, emic-etic, macro-micro) or diachronic (individual maturation or cultural change).

The use of film to elicit responses, which occurred in psychological research as early as 1909, became fairly common in psychiatry during World War II (Moreno 1944; Saul 1945; Prados 1951), and was adapted to sociological research by Rouch and Morin in the early 1960's. (In 1925, Mead used still photos taken during the filming of *Moana* to elicit responses from Samoan children.) Rouch not only recorded his actors' comments and exclamations at seeing themselves on the screen (in *Jaguar*), but also used the presence of cameras and cameramen to provoke psychodramas in *La pyramide humaine* (1959) and *La punition* (1962). Worth and Adair carried the process still further in 1966, when they experimented with eliciting films AS RESPONSES. They undertook to teach a group of Navaho men and women to make their own motion pictures, on any subject they wanted, in order to elicit a "visual flow" that could be analyzed semiotically, i.e. "in terms of the structure of images and the cognitive processes or rules used in making those images."

A working hypothesis for our study was that motion picture film, conceived, photographed, and sequentially arranged by a people such as the Navajo, would reveal aspects of coding, cognition, and values that may be inhibited, not observable, or not analyzable when the investigation is totally dependent on verbal exchange – especially when such research must be done in the language of the investigator (Worth and Adair 1972:27–28).

The Navaho filmmakers learned to use 16-mm Bell and Howell cameras with amazing rapidity, and within two months produced short exercises and seven silent films. These were shown to the Navaho community, analyzed by the researchers (who compared them with films made by Philadelphia teenagers), and eventually placed in distribution, where they have acquired a renown in experimental film circles.

The use of videotape as an experimental agent in urban anthropology, by George Stoney, the Rundstroms, the Videograph project and others,

has added synchronous sound (namely, speech) to the resources available to informants for their productions.

Reinterpretation of "ethnographic film" as a process of communication between filmers and filmed is among chief developments in this kind of filming since the war. The Balinese experience has never been replicated, but it served to open up the whole communication field, which has been so fertile that only a few of its works can be mentioned in this short account. When war and cold war destroyed some cultures outright and made others inaccessible, Columbia University's Research in Contemporary Cultures Project, directed by Ruth Benedict, gathered together a team from various disciplines to study cultures "at a distance," by means of interviews, films (preferably Grade B films, less idiosyncratic), literature, art, and other types of material. During the war, Bateson worked at the Museum of Modern Art on an analysis of the UFA film, *Hitlerjunge Quex* (1933), in order to derive some of the "psychological implications of Nazism." Martha Wolfenstein went on to apply the principles of thematic analysis to the content of films made in Western nations (England, France, Italy, and the United States), and discovered national patterns in fantasy. These studies gave rise to others dealing with personal and formal levels of filmic communication, exemplified in the "*politique des auteurs*" expounded in *Cahiers du cinéma* from 1950, and the anthropology and semiology of the cinema (Powdermaker 1950; Morin 1956; Metz 1974; cf. Weakland's paper, *infra*).

One would assume that the study of nonverbal communication would demand the use of film, and the members of the American linguistic school have used not only film but also videotape in their research. But Ray L. Birdwhistell, who adapted the methods of descriptive linguistics to the study of culture, at first used film less to study communication than to communicate about it; he mapped the kinesics of American English by eye, using a written notation system (Birdwhistell 1952). Other researchers in choreometrics have from the start depended upon rater consensus and successive refinements of parameters discovered by repeated inspection of a large sample of dance films. The musician and folklorist, Alan Lomax, has since 1961 directed a cross-cultural study of expressive style, of global proportions, involving song, dance, and speech; his Choreometrics Project, which is concerned with movement style, has collected for analysis films of dance and work from nearly two hundred cultures. Most of the footage analyzed by Lomax and his collaborators was filmed by others, both scientists and laymen, for a variety of reasons. Each extract found to be acceptable for research was coded, using a descriptive system based on the Laban Effort-Shape theory. The ratings thus

obtained were computerized for multifactor analysis, into summaries identifying the most "potent classifiers" of cultural style. The aim of Lomax's research is the development of an evolutionary taxonomy of culture (Lomax 1968; Lomax, Bartenieff, and Paulay 1969; Lomax and Berkowitz 1972). In applied terms, it is also the renewal and revitalization of cultures, threatened by mass media "greyout," which spring to life again when confronted with self-expression (Lomax 1973; cf. his paper, *infra*).

The method of the research film can be summarized by the statement that the ratio of analysis to observation is high at this end of a continuum which extends, at the other extreme, to the purest, most uninterpretable aesthetic experiences. Research film technique is expected to behave with a modesty befitting the handmaid of the mind. Where research use of film involves production, the technology is in general that which can be mastered by a nonprofessional cameraman. Film costs in research budgets are modest compared with documentary or theatrical production, and the proportion of usable footage is greater. Videotape, in use since the late 1960's, offers advantages of easy handling, immediacy, and economy (the tape is reusable; cf. Hockings' paper, *infra*). If an image of high quality is required, conventional filming is called for. At present, this means shooting 16-mm with or without the recording of synchronous sound on quarter-inch tape. It's possible, though unusual, for a single person to be a complete film crew, by using, for example, a zoom-equipped Beaulieu connected to a Nagra (Polunin 1970).

In the course of research into ecology, epidemiology, and child development in New Guinea and elsewhere, E. Richard Sorenson has developed a conception of the "research cinema film" which is, together with the *Encyclopaedia cinematographica*, a leading attempt at rationalization of ethnographic film archives. Such systematization is essential if future research involving film is to be carried out efficiently — or at all (Sorenson and Gajdusek 1966; Sorenson 1967; cf. his paper, *infra*).

The uses of ethnographic film in education range from scholarly communication, such as Birdwhistell's *Lecture on Kinesics* (1964), to elementary-school social studies, for which the multi-media *Man, a Course of Study: the Netsilik Eskimos* was designed. Since World War II, the social sciences have received an increasing share of academic importance, and markets for textbooks and educational films have grown enormous. Until the mid-1960's, the bread-and-butter of ethnographic film in education was the descriptive documentary, used as an adjunct to lectures and "relevant readings" in college courses on ethnology. The best of these filmed ethnographies are very good indeed: Robert and Monique Ges-sain's *Obashior endaon* (1964) and William Geddes' *Miao Year* (1968)

spring immediately to mind. Both films were by-products of the fieldwork of their authors.

The most spectacular and influential of all visual ethnographies is John Marshall's record of the Bushmen, filmed on several expeditions to the Kalahari desert in the 1950's and still being edited. After collaborating with Robert Gardner to produce *The Hunters* (1958), Marshall photographed the celebrated *Titicut Follies* (directed by Fred Wiseman), and filmed the activities of the Pittsburgh police for the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence. Concurrently, he was developing a theory of reportage and pedagogy as he structured the Bushman material (over 500,000 feet in all) into short sequences. He became dissatisfied with *The Hunters*: it had not been filmed with synchronous sound, and its synthetic story depends heavily on narration; furthermore, it gives undue importance to hunting in Bushman subsistence, which is in fact more dependent upon gathering. *Men Bathing*, *A Joking Relationship*, and *An Argument about a Marriage* concentrate, instead, on the details of interpersonal interaction during a short time span; the dialogue was hand-synched and translated by means of subtitles. These film episodes were shown in the introductory anthropology course at Harvard to illustrate concepts such as avoidance and reciprocity. The police series (*Three Domestics*, *Investigation of a Hit and Run*, etc.) was filmed in long uninterrupted shots with synchronous sound, representing virtuoso camera performances under difficult conditions for which Marshall's work in the Bridgewater State Hospital had prepared him. They have been used for police training and in law school and junior high school discussions. With Timothy Asch, Marshall in 1968 formed the Center for Documentary Anthropology, where Asch and Napoleon Chagnon, using the "sequence concept" which they had developed, are collaborating on a series of more than forty films of the Yąnomamö (*The Feast*, *Magical Death*, and others). The films are being subjected to curriculum experimentation during the editing process.

Instruction in ethnographic filming, initiated by Mead at Columbia in the 1940's has of late become extremely popular with undergraduates, many of whom have used home movie cameras since childhood. Rouch and Gardner have trained individually a number of filmmakers. In Rouch's words, only "one in a hundred" turns out to have the capacity for combining scientific rigor with cinema fluency. How can this capacity be developed? A "how-to" literature exists (Dyhrenfurth 1952; Collier 1967; sections in *Research Film* and the *Program in Ethnographic Film Newsletter*). Gatherings such as the International Film Seminars (from 1955), the Festival dei Popoli (from 1959), the Conferences on Visual Anthropology organized by Jay Ruby (from 1968), Venezia Genti (1971–

1972), several UNESCO round tables, and the UCLA colloquium (1968), provide opportunities to learn from new films. University programs are effective in teaching film strategies, but much work remains to be done on the theoretical underpinning of ethnographic film, beginning with the problem of reconciling often rivalrous systems of science and art. Too many social scientists still feel uncomfortable about following the advice of Luc de Heusch, the anthropologist-filmmaker:

Ethnographers should make themselves familiar with contemporary film theories and abandon the notion that the camera purely and simply shows reality (de Heusch 1962:25).

Finally, accessible film collections (such as the Museum of Modern Art's and the Royal Anthropological Institute's) are essential if students are to profit fully from accumulated experience.

Unlike the specialized uses of film in research, where conclusions are expressed verbally, and unlike the uses of film in education, where effectiveness is dependent upon context, the use of ethnographic film as public information depends upon the presence, in self-contained form, of visual attractiveness and intellectual substance — a most demanding format. But this use, by making it possible for many to view the richness of human resources, makes it slightly more possible that we will preserve and encourage them in the years to come (cf. Sorenson's paper, *infra*).

The personal film statement on a universal theme is a durable public information format. Robert Gardner, whose film *Dead Birds* (1963) was praised by *Variety* and Robert Lowell, first expressed his theory of film while he was engaged in producing *The Hunters* at the Film Study Center at Harvard. Gardner's cinematography is conservative (he filmed *Dead Birds* using a battery-driven Arriflex, without synchronous sound), and much of the expressive power of his films is produced by editing of images and by the commentary. Gardner's binnacle has been his own sensibility, applied to universal themes such as the relationship of men and women, and death.

I saw the Dani people, feathered and fluttering men and women, as enjoying the fate of all men and women. They dressed their lives with plumage, but faced as certain death as the rest of us drabber souls. The film attempts to say something about how we all, as humans, meet our animal fate (Gardner 1972:35).

Other nonintrusive sensibilities have produced anthropological documentaries with forms recognizable by those steeped in European tradition, hence readily accepted by lay audiences. Jorge Preloran's *Imaginerio/Hermógenes Cayo* (1970) and *Araucanians of Ruca Choroy* (1971) employ a

biographical model. Of Cayo, Preloran remarked, "I was not interested in the details of his situation, but rather in the image of his soul" (Suber 1971:48). Although the audience for these films may feel that "its humanity is confirmed" (in Gardner's words) by viewing them, the films can also be employed to reaffirm and reinforce European cultural hegemony (cf. Preloran's paper, *infra*).

A film which caused a scandal when shown to African students in Paris marked Rouch's turning from conventional documentary to what he and Edgar Morin, resurrecting Vertov's title, were to call *cinéma vérité*. ("Vertov and Flaherty are my masters," Rouch declared in 1963). While studying Songhay religion in Accra in 1953, Rouch was invited by the priests of the Hauka sect to document sequences of a possession cult. The result was *Les maîtres fous*, a short film showing Hauka adepts, possessed by spirits of generals, doctors, and truck drivers from the British power structure, as they slaughter a dog, cook and eat it, march back and forth, dance violently and foam at the mouth. By including shots of the Hauka going about their menial daily work in the city, Rouch implies that the cult helps its members to cope with the strains of everyday life, particularly in the colonial situation (cf. Muller 1971:1473). The film is not fully comprehensible without Rouch's written treatise on the subject (Rouch 1960); nonetheless it excited such strong reactions that both Europeans and Africans urged him to destroy it. He demurred, and *Les maîtres fous* went on to win a prize at Venice. However, after this experience Rouch began the "cinema of collective improvisation" with *Jaguar*, his "ethnographic science fiction" collaboration with Damouré, Lam, and Illo playing three young migrant workers in search of fortune on the Ghana coast. By the time the film was completed, Rouch sensed that the period of freedom of movement between the newly independent West African nations was over, and that the experience could never be duplicated. In a sense, what Rouch and Morin accomplished in 1960 with *Chronique d'un été* was a condensation of the *Jaguar* process: instead of planning a dramatic improvisation before shooting, and recording the dialogue and comments of the actors afterward, the characters in *Chronique d'un été* were instantly created, with the help of the prototype Éclair camera, the Nagra recorder, and the question "Are you happy?"

Well might one ask such a question. While *Chronique d'un été* was being filmed in Paris, France was undergoing the painful disengagement from Algeria. Much has been made of the new portable synchronous sound filming rig (Plate 8), which enabled cameraman Michel Brault to follow the subject for ten minutes or more without stopping the camera, as if this hardware in itself had caused *cinéma vérité* to happen; but the

motivations of the filmmakers are at least as important in its history. In addition to the leftist political message of much of *cinéma vérité*, the films of Rouch, Ruspoli, and Marker demanded renegotiation of the existing conventions governing the roles of filmmaker, subject, and audience: the filmmaker appeared to become a transmitter of "truth," the subject would henceforth be judged by his own words and actions, and a heavy burden of interpretation was now placed on the viewer. It is no coincidence that the other home of *cinéma vérité* — the place, in fact, where it all began, according to one critic, with Brault's photography of *Les raquetteurs* (1958) (Madsen 1967) — was Québec, where cultural and political differences are still a problem. In the 1960's the superpowers, after more than a decade of colonial crisis, were redefining their stance *vis-à-vis* the minorities. Culture contact was implicit in *cinéma vérité*; and the function of *cinéma vérité* was politicization.

This use of film encountered opposition, and long before it arrived in Hollywood, *cinéma vérité* had gone on the defensive. Financing was hard to come by (Marcorelles 1963). Rouch has known the discomfort of being ridiculed by Europeans and shut out by Africans. The "new kind of journalism" which Richard Leacock and his colleague D. A. Pennebaker developed for television in 1960 was resisted by critics (Bluem 1965) and sponsors. *Cuba si! Yanki no!* was withdrawn from circulation in 1961, and *Happy Mother's Day*, a report of the commercial pressures to which the parents of quintuplets were subjected, was broadcast by ABC television in an altered version (cf. Young's paper, *infra*).

Even traditional ethnography has had a hard time getting on television in an intellectually reputable form. Thanks to an unusual decision of the head of programming at CBS television, the Netsilik became known to millions who saw *Fight for Life!*, a specially edited presentation of the material embellished with narration and background music. In television the Europeans and Japanese seem to be far in advance of the United States.

One of the major changes in motion pictures since World War II has been decentralization of production, as professional equipment became available on an unprecedented scale. Georges Sadoul's *Histoire du cinéma mondial* gives an account of the development of national cinemas. When Sadoul laid down his pen in 1966, after writing, "in fifty countries, the nation and its people became, in all their diversity, the material for ever more numerous films," only Africa remained without a cinema. This is no longer the case. Senegal's Ousmane Sembene, known to American audiences for *Mandabi*, *Tauw*, and *Emitai*, is one of a growing number of artists who are gaining fluency in all film genres (Hennebelle 1972). The effect of African production has not yet been felt outside, and until it is,

returnees from the festivals at Tunis and Ouagadougou can only try to describe what Europe and the United States are missing — what Rouch has labelled with justice “spiritual assistance for the overdeveloped countries” (Desanti and Decock 1968).

Film is such a rich trove of data that its usefulness depends upon a happy choice of level of analysis. The retrospective significance of a film often differs from the prospective significance intended by its maker. Films can be put to more than one use and should thus be preserved with written records. The most striking change in ethnographic film since its beginnings, and especially since World War II, has been the shift in the orientation of the camera, which no longer looks out at the world, but rather inside one's world. In Mali, Cisse has made *Cinq jours d'une vie*, a film of boys growing up, learning the Koran, migrating to the city, and returning to the village. In the United States and elsewhere, filmmakers are hard at work filming cultural enclaves, family life, and even their own biographies; autobiography, veiled in Flaherty's *Louisiana Story*, is now explicit. Recently some scholars in the field of semiotics have rediscovered Eisenstein's fascination with Freud and Malinowski, and his interest in myth which he planned to express in *Que viva México!* A flowering of ethnographic films fulfilling Eisenstein's promise would indeed be as important as drama or the novel have been in the past in helping people understand themselves. The history of ethnographic film is rich in examples of film's unique capacity to record the multileveled nature of events, of its usefulness in teaching new ways of seeing, and of its power to evoke deeply positive feelings about mankind by communicating the essence of a people.

REFERENCES

- ANDERSON, JOSEPH L.
1968 “The development of the single-concept film in a context of a general history of educational motion pictures and innovation in instructional media.” Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State University.
- BALIKCI, ASEN, QUENTIN BROWN
1966 Ethnographic filming and the Netsilik Eskimos. *Educational Services Incorporated Quarterly Report* (Spring-Summer): 19-33.
- BATESON, GREGORY
1943 “An analysis of the film *Hitlerjunge Quex* (1933).” New York: Museum of Modern Art Film Library, and Institute for Intercultural Studies (typescript).
- BATESON, GREGORY, MARGARET MEAD
1942 *Balinese character: a photographic analysis*. New York Academy of Sciences, Special Publications 2.