

pief PROGRAM IN ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM newsletter

A PROPOSAL FOR THE FOUNDING OF A SOCIETY FOR VISUAL ANTHROPOLOGY

At a recent meeting of the Board of Directors of the Program in Ethnographic Film, it was decided that, in conformity with the American Anthropological Association's suggestions, PIEF would begin to explore the formation of a Society for Visual Anthropology.

The following is a short description of how and why we would like to see such a society developed.

PIEF was the culmination of many years of organizational work by a small group of anthropologists and filmmakers who were interested in both making and using ethnographic films, and who wanted to provide a forum for disseminating information about research and production in ethnofilm. We now have a membership of 1,000 and a start has been made in bringing together those interested in this area.

In examining the interests of PIEF's membership, and in thinking about recent research trends in anthropology, it has become apparent to us that there is a growing and deep interest not only in ethnofilm but also in the use and study of visual forms in general. Not only is the term "ethnographic film" too specific and limiting to cover current interests, but its use actually tends to discourage the kinds of conceptualizations and research needed to understand how ethnographic films are and can be made and used. Ethnofilm is only one specific use of film, and knowledge about film as such, how it is made, used and understood by different cultures for different purposes in varying contexts, is clearly necessary before we can understand how it is used in one specific context—anthropology. Ethnographies of film conceived and carried out in frameworks similar, for example, to ethnographies of speaking, or ethnographies of art, will enable us to escape from the visual provincialism within which we now live.

But anthropologists are interested in more than films. There are those interested in painting, housebuilding, decoration, clothes, nonverbal and nonlinguistically connected body behavior, television, dance, drama, and a host of other culturally learned and meaningful activities that take place through the use of a large variety of visual codes and modes. These nonverbal or pictorial symbolic forms are organized and patterned within a culture in a way similar to the organization of speech and language.

A society for visual anthropology would be able to bring together those whose interest in the study of all or any visual forms falls within the conceptualizations and methodologies common to ethnology and anthropology. Such people work in a number of disciplines other than anthropology—communication, sociology, psychology and the history of art, for example—but all are interested in what can be called the cultural dimensions of visual communication and behavior. In one way or another they are concerned with the study of the patterns, codes and rules within which visual symbolic forms are developed and used, and with the relationship of these specific codes and modes to other patterns and codes within a culture.

How does the use of pictures, carvings, films, relate to how one speaks, tells stories, sings, dances or constructs one's language? Do films made by Navajos follow Navajo linguistic (syntactic) rules? Does the way we structure reality when we make pictures of it determine how we speak of it (to turn Whorf around for a change)? Is the world out there ordered and presented to us, and are our pictures of it—and ethnographic films—merely a copy? Do all people structure their visual codes in different ways?

And another group of questions: How do different groups in our society or in other societies organize themselves around different visual codes? Does everybody find the same social organization for making movies or pictures? What social purposes are served by visual symbolic forms? Is it the same as for verbal ones?

Should one teach visual communication to our children in schools? Should one teach children to make movies or television? How? Should anthropologists learn about television as they once learned about field methods since in the future they may get to know other peoples through the tube rather than in the field? How does one analyze how another culture structures reality?

A society for visual anthropology would be able to bring together researchers who are interested in these and many other questions related to visual anthropology.

In general we would hope to invite for membership the following groups of people:

1. Those interested in the study, use, and production of ethnographic film and photography for research and classroom teaching.

2. Those interested in the analysis of visual symbolic forms from a cultural-historical framework.

3. Those interested in visual technologies and methodologies for recording and analyzing behavior.

4. Those interested in the ethno-semantics of visual communication; that is, the structuring of reality as evidenced by visual production.

5. Those interested in the cross-cultural study of art and artifacts.

6. Those interested in the relationship of culture and visual perception.

We would like to expand the *PIEF Newsletter* and to change its title to the *Journal of Visual Anthropology*. It would in expanded form consist of three sections: (1) papers devoted to the kind of questions discussed above; (2) short descriptions of research in progress so that all of us can begin to share research directions and ideas; (3) reviews of books, film, and other visual material available for classroom and research uses.

We would like to help organize institutes and symposia at the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association in the areas of interest to our members, ranging from research institutes to screenings, exhibition, and discussion of visual productions for use in teaching, as well as general public information and presentation.

The visual media are growing increasingly powerful not only in our society but in those of many developing countries. Control of the use and distribution of films and television in schools and in nations means power to create culture. We would hope in the Society to provide a forum for discussion of the anthropological politics of symbolic forms, and would expect that our membership might want to present resolutions to the American Anthropological Association on matters about which we are knowledgeable and concerned.

In a sense this is a call for an organizational meeting to be held at the annual meeting of the Association in Toronto in November, 1972. We would welcome—in fact, urge you—to write and tell us your feelings about what we have proposed. How do the list of interests correspond with your own? Do you want a Society of Visual Anthropology defined in general as we outlined? What ideas do you have?

If your response seems to warrant the formation of a Society (meeting during the annual meeting of the AAA, with dues and a journal), we will set up an organization meeting at the Toronto AAA meeting. You can write to: PIEF, Temple University, South Hall 200, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122. Please let us know your attitudes and thinking about this.

Sol Worth

Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

Jay Ruby

Temple University

The International University of Communications

The International University of Communications will be getting under way soon in the Washington, D.C., area. The novel university will offer graduate work in such important areas as Urban, Rural, Educational and International Communications, focusing on such media as TV, Radio, Film, Print and Computers. Such provocative thinkers as R. Buckminster Fuller, Robert Lewis Shayon and Harold Taylor are associated with this endeavor. For a free copy of the university's Master Plan write to Dr. Robert L. Hilliard, President, The International University of Communications, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Venice Film Festival, 1971

The latest documentary from the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies Film Unit, *Pintubi Revisit Yumari*, was chosen for presentation at the recent 1971 Venice International Film Festival. A record of ceremonies at a site in the Western Desert the film is the fourth Institute production in as many years to receive this honor. Field liaison and documentation were by Jeremy Long and Ken Hansen. Direction and photography were by the Director of the Film Unit, Roger Sandall.

Yumari is distinguished by a group of large standing rocks jutting out of a spinifex plain. Before these rocks, at sundown, a dozen tall churinga embodying the life-force of the tribal ancestors were stood in a line on end. Young men visiting Yumari for the first time then raced across the spinifex to rub themselves against the churinga. These preliminaries were followed, at night, by a series of "revenge party" dances, simulations of attack and defense. On the second day a large ground painting of a waterhole was made, and the concluding rites then took place above it.

The ethnographic documentaries produced by the Institute are bringing the art and culture of the Aborigines to a steadily widening audience overseas. At the London National Film Theatre a program devoted exclusively to the Unit's work was shown earlier this year. Seven titles are currently distributed by the University of California, among them three films shown in past years at the Venice Festival: *Emu Ritual at Ruguri* (1968), *Walbiri Ritual at Gunadjari* (1969), and *Camels and the Pitjantjara* (1970).

PIEF Newsletter is published by Program In Ethnographic Film through a grant from the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research.

Editors: Jay Ruby, PIEF, Room 200 South Hall, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122.
Carroll Williams, Anthropology Film Center, P. O. Box 493, Santa Fe, NM 87501.
Myra Brown, PIEF.

Art Work: Galen Longwell, Radio-Television-Film, Temple University.

Published three times a year, Fall - Winter - Spring. Subscriptions are \$2.00 per year (\$3.00 for institutions). Single copy, \$1.00. Available from the American Anthropological Association, 1703 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20009. Payment should accompany order. Make checks payable to the American Anthropological Association.

The deadline for submission of copy for the next issue is July 1. Please send your contributions double-spaced and in duplicate to: Editor, PIEF, Room 200 South Hall, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122.

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

FILMING IN DIFFERENT WEATHER CONDITIONS

PHOTOGRAPHY IN THE ARTIC

Care of Film

Film becomes progressively more brittle as the temperature drops below 0° F. It will remain more flexible, however, if it retains its proper moisture content. Kodak camera films are protected against loss of moisture until the package is opened. Do not open film packages until you are ready to use them.

Film is more likely to crack or break with the emulsion side out than in. Choose only cameras which use B wind film. A camera which incorporates large-radius bends in the film path, such as an Arriflex 16, is preferable.

Winterizing the Camera

There are various degrees of winterizing which vary a great deal in cost and temperature operating range. Winterizing for temperatures down to -10° F usually requires complete disassembly of the camera and removal of all greases and lubricants.

For arctic conditions, it is often necessary to machine parts to allow greater clearance. This is because aluminum and certain alloys have greater coefficients of thermal expansion than steel.

Cameras which have been winterized should not be used in temperature climates without being relubricated and new bearings installed where necessary.

After a camera is winterized it should be run for 3 or 4 hours. Make a loop long enough to go through the camera and magazine so that all film handling parts will work in. Note that magazines, as well as cameras, need to be winterized.

It is a very good practice to test cameras and other equipment by placing them in a cold room (-30° or -40° F) for at least 24 hours and then running them *as they will be used* as a system. This will show up any component that may cause trouble later.

A black finish on all camera equipment is helpful in the arctic because it absorbs some heat when the sun is shining. Barneys or heavy quilted blankets help keep camera equipment warmer, and chemical heating pads also help. Electric heaters installed in the camera may be helpful, but an adequate power supply must be available.

PHOTOGRAPHY IN THE EQUATOR

Care of Film

16 mm film comes in taped cans, and since a small amount of leakage is unavoidable, additional water vapor protection should be given if film is to be kept longer than a month in a region having high relative humidity. This would include not only tropical locations, but also any place where relative humidities of 70% or higher prevail, as in damp basements, ice boxes, or refrigerators. This additional water vapor protection can be obtained by tightly sealing as many rolls as possible in a jar or can.

When color films must be kept for several months, store them at 55° F or lower in the main compartment of a refrigerator. Storage above 70° for more than 4 weeks may lead to perceptible changes in speed and color balance.

When film that has been refrigerated is opened too soon, moisture from outside the package may condense on the film

surfaces. Packages removed from cold storage should be allowed to reach room temperature before being opened.

Protecting films from moisture also protects them from certain gases which will have a bad effect on film. Films should be kept away from motor exhausts, moth ball vapors, formaldehyde, solvents, cleaners, and mildew and fungus preventatives.

Films should be exposed and processed as quickly as possible after the package is opened. High temperature and relative humidity may cause changes in the latent image. It is particularly important that exposed films be processed as soon as possible.

Under adverse heat and humidity conditions, film should not remain in the camera, magazines, or holders longer than necessary. A carrying case with a shiny exterior and a tightfitting lid will help reflect heat and protect film from moisture and harmful gases.

Should direct sunlight strike the carrying case, the temperature may rise quickly to the neighborhood of 140° F. A few hours under such conditions, either before or after exposure, is likely to have serious effects on color quality. Do not allow a film container, including a camera or closed automobile, to stand in direct sunlight for any longer than is absolutely necessary.

There are several steps which may be taken to protect the film while it is in the camera in very hot climates:

1. Most cameras are painted black, which absorbs heat—have them painted with white enamel which is highly reflective.
2. Wrap the film magazine in aluminum foil when not in use.
3. An umbrella with a clamp on the handle can be used to shade the film container or camera if there is no natural shade.
4. Constantly clean all of the camera equipment.

Color film tends to get sticky in humid weather. The effects of this are magazine jamming and film hanging up in the gate. The only protections you have are to try to keep your film dry as described earlier and to use more than normal care in cleaning the camera.

Care of the Camera

Do not over-lubricate the camera in hot weather—oil and grease attract dirt of any kind and will just increase your maintenance problems. You should be able to wipe every part of the inside of your camera with a white handkerchief without getting it oily or dirty.

Salt air is very hard on mechanical equipment. If you are working near the ocean, a light film of oil rubbed into the finish of the camera with a towel will help to protect it from corrosion. It is also a good idea to tape areas where dissimilar metals are in contact, such as brass lens mounts and aluminum camera bodies, to prevent electrolysis. This tape should be changed nightly, however, to permit cleaning.

Lenses are not troubled by hot weather, but some extra precaution should be taken to avoid touching glass surfaces with your fingers. The salt, always present in perspiration, will etch the lens coating if it is not removed immediately.

SHOOTING FILMS IN EXTREME TEMPERATURES

Anthropological films are almost never shot in pleasant conditions as far as weather is concerned. On the other hand, film, lenses, cameras, and sound recorders are products of temperate climates, where it is assumed that they will always be operated within specific temperature limits.

There are four points to consider in operating Motion Picture Equipment in extreme temperatures and, as you would guess, there is quite a difference between cold and hot climates on equipment functioning. These break down into: Mechanical, Electrical, Optical, and Chemical.

Hot Weather

Another heading, Biological, is applicable only in hot, moist climates where fungus is apt to grow on lenses, film, electrical contacts, and leather. This can only be prevented by keeping equipment dry. One way to do this is by packing it in trunks that seal very well and that are equipped with cloth bags filled with Silica Gel (a drying agent made by DuPont).

Silica Gel absorbs a great deal of moisture, which can be driven out by baking the bags in an oven, thus revitalizing the Silica Gel material. Silica Gel lasts indefinitely and can be reactivated by heating to a temperature between 300° and 400° F in a vented oven or over a fire. At this temperature, one-half hour will reactivate small quantities—larger quantities will require 2 to 3 hours. Allow the hot Silica Gel to cool in a closed metal container to prevent re-absorption of moisture.

Rice dried by browning in an oven or dried tea leaves can be used, but they have only about one-eighth the moisture absorbency of Silica Gel.

If fungus starts growing on electrical parts or leather, try to clean it off with alcohol or acetone. If it starts on a lens, clean the lens with normal lens tissue and lens cleaner. The fungus probably will not come off, but it usually does not affect the optical properties of lenses.

Film is particularly sensitive to heat and humidity. Protection from moisture is essential for color film. Kodak color films are sold in sealed foil envelopes, screw-cap cans, or taped cans to provide this protection. Original packages should not be opened until the film is to be used.

Cold Weather

In the Arctic, batteries are a special problem. All types of batteries lose efficiency rapidly at low temperatures and should always be protected from freezing. Keep the batteries under your coat whenever possible. Belt batteries, worn under your coat, will pick up some body heat and will be protected from the cold. Since batteries lose so much efficiency when they are cold, it makes sense to provide yourself with plenty of spares.

Extreme cold causes leather and rubber to become brittle. A wax leather dressing of good quality should be rubbed into carrying cases and leather covered cameras and carrying straps to prevent the absorption of moisture. Rubber should be eliminated.

Silk or lightweight cotton gloves should be worn under heavy mitts. Silk gloves will keep the hands warmer when mitts are removed for loading the camera, adjusting the lens, etc.

In cold dry air, body static causes lint from the clothing to be attracted to lenses. Inspect them often when shooting, especially if the camera is held under your coat to keep it warm.

Even during a driving snowstorm, film in any camera can be changed if a dark plastic bag big enough to fit over the head and shoulders is used. A deep lens hood is very desirable for filming in the snow. It will help keep the lens dry even during a driving storm.

Certain cold weather recommendations are in order for any camera. Breathing on a lens will cause condensation that freezes instantly and is very difficult to remove. Lenses should only be brushed for cleaning outdoors. Unpainted metal surfaces, especially steel, should be taped so that they cannot be touched with an ungloved hand. Skin sticks to cold metal—painful!

A thoroughly chilled camera cannot be used in a warm room until its temperature approaches the surrounding warmer temperature. On the other hand, a warm camera cannot be taken out into a blizzard because the drifting snow will melt upon striking the warm camera and it will soon be covered with ice.

Great care must be taken in handling film in sub-zero temperatures. The edges of cold, brittle film are extremely sharp and will cause severe cuts.

It is important that film be loaded and exposed promptly, not left in the camera or magazines. If allowed to stand in a camera for a day or so, the film may dry out and break where the loop was formed when the camera is started.

The speed and timing of motors should be checked frequently. Batteries should be charged every night with a well regulated automatic charger. The tiny chargers built into most battery packs are not adequate and will either cause batteries to overcharge, thus destroying them, or will cut off before they reach full capacity.

*Jack Behrend, President
Behrend's Incorporated
Chicago, Illinois 60611*

Reprinted from the *Filmmakers Newsletter*, IV, 8, PO Box 46, New York, New York 10012.

SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL FILM CATALOGS

(Producers' catalogs excluded)

Ackermann, Jean Marie. *Guide to films on international development*. Film Sense, P. O. Box 783, Claremont, CA 91711, 1970. First published in *International Development Review*, 1963-1967. Commentaries on documentary and some feature films, appendices listing further references and sources of films, and geographical and alphabetical indices.

\$2.50 prepaid or \$3.00 billed; for five or more copies—\$2.00 per copy.

Anthropology films. Extension Media Center, Distribution; University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720. 1969. 4 p. Lists about 200 films by title, roughly classified by subject. Résumés of 48.

Bell, Violet M., and others. *A guide to films, filmstrips, maps & globes, records on Asia*. New York: The Asia Society, 1964. 87 p. Lists 73 films, 31 series of filmstrips, and about 100 record albums on the cultures of Asia, including Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines. Entries are arranged by countries. Annotation: technical details and short résumés.

The Encyclopaedia Cinematographica. English translation of film titles listed in 1967 index. University Park, Pennsylvania: American Archive of the Encyclopaedia Cinematographica, n.d. [1968?] 56 p. Includes about 550 films dealing with ethnology and primate behavior, the former arranged by country. Technical details and filmers cited; no further annotation. Some films accompanied by descriptive leaflets. (The main archive of the Encyclopaedia Cinematographica is maintained at the Institut für den Wissenschaftlichen Film, Göttingen, Germany, which issues a complete catalog.)

Supplement to 1967 index. n.d. [1970?] 16 p. Lists titles of 123 anthropological films added to the *Encyclopaedia Cinematographica* in 1968 and 1969.

Films: The visualization of anthropology—an interim listing. University Park, Pennsylvania: Audio-Visual Services, Pennsylvania State University, 1970. 96 p. About 1200 films classified by subject and area. Not annotated (an annotated catalogue is planned for the Fall, 1970). Copies available from Mr. Duke Reeves, Audio-Visual Services, Willard Building, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802.

Heider, Karl. *Films for Anthropological Teaching*. Fourth Edition, Program in Ethnographic Film, Room 200 South Hall, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122. Lists over 300 films together with their distributor and bibliographic references. Contains subject, distributor, and author indices. Copies available from American Anthropological Association, 1703 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20009. \$3.00 postpaid (\$5.00 for institutions).

Levinson, Melvin F. *Visual resources in Indian studies. Survey of documentary films on India and India's cultural influence on Asia*. Albany [?], New York: University of the State of New York, State Education Department, Office of Foreign Area Studies, Foreign Area Materials Center, 1965. 29 p. Includes 19 annotated films and 91 listed by title only. Annotation: technical details and description.

Long, Joseph K. *Anthropological films*. Green Bay, Wisconsin: University Center System, University of Wisconsin, 1967. About 90 pages. Lists about 350 films by title with a subject index. Annotation: technical details, producer, rental fee, and description; some also with author's criticism.

Premier catalogue sélectif international de films ethnographiques sur l'Afrique noire. Paris: Unesco, 1967. 408 p.

Catalogue: 37-373. Includes 467 films, classified by country. Indexed by title, subject, ethnic group, and filmer. Annotation provides technical details and subject; some with résumés or analyses and criticism. Prepared by the Comité International du Film Ethnographique et Sociologique. Preface and appendix ("Situation et tendances du cinéma africain") by Jean Rouch. Films analyzed for content by sequences measured in seconds. Films included are in French (83%), English (15%), and other languages (2%); and pertain to West Africa (45%), Central Africa (35%), East Africa (6%), and other parts of Africa and adjacent islands (14%). Only 3% were produced before 1939, and 82% appeared after 1950.

Schneider, John M., and David E. Kemp. *An annotated catalog of films in the behavioral sciences*. Norman, Oklahoma: Behavioral Sciences Audio-Visual Laboratory; Department of Psychiatry, Neurology, and Behavioral Sciences; University of Oklahoma Medical Center; 1967. 110 p. About 730 entries arranged by title. Indexed by subject and topic. Annotation: content, producer, technical details, distributor and reference sources. Chiefly psychological, including films on personality, socio-cultural influences on behavior, child development, heredity, and animal behavior.

Sorenson, E. Richard, and D. Carleton Gajdusek. "Research films for the study of child growth and development and disease patterns in primitive cultures," in *The study of child behavior and development in primitive cultures*. Supplement to *Pediatrics*, vol. 37, no. 1, part 2, 1966, p. 197-243. Lists 176 films by filmer, expedition, and year. Annotation: technical details and extensive description. Indexes: names of individuals who appear in the films and geographical and linguistic groups. Most of the films listed are restricted to individual viewers engaged in scientific investigations; they are not available for demonstration or teaching.

Stevens, Warren D. *African film bibliography 1965*. (African Studies Association, Committee of Fine Arts and the Humanities, Occasional papers, 1.) Bloomington, Indiana: 1966. 31 p. About 300 entries, arranged by subject and title. Indexed by title. Short annotations provide technical details and résumés. Includes only films available from sources in the United States.

Voorlopige lijst van Nederlandse cultureel-anthropologische films. [Provisional list of Netherlands cultural-anthropological films.] Utrecht: Nederlandse Vereniging voor de Wetenschappelijke Film, 1957. 66 p. Lists 66 films on peoples of present and former Dutch territories, arranged geographically. Annotation: technical details, contents, appraisal, location; English synopsis.

Gordon Gibson
Smithsonian Institution

PHOTOGRAPHIC PROJECTIVE TESTS

Copyright © 1971 by A. Michael Schreiber

The investigator hands an illustrated card to a subject and instructs the person to make up a story, with a past, present, and a future outcome, that involves the characters or things pictured on the card. Every five minutes or so the person is

handed a new card and after an hour perhaps eight or ten stories will have been recorded. Hopefully the contents of these stories will reveal important data, concerning the story teller and his culture. When used in conjunction with other,

more traditional methods, a number of anthropologists have found these "Projectives" quite valuable.

For more than twenty years a standard set of Projective Cards have been in use. Most interviewers, in most situations, have found them satisfactory. However, under certain circumstances, alterations in the pictures have been made, particularly when using these materials cross-culturally. There exists a Japanese set where the features have been changed from the original Anglo-Saxon to Oriental. Even though this is a relatively simple alteration, it was necessary to find an artist who was able to closely imitate the "feeling" of the original illustration. In other cases, where architecture, props, and objects in certain drawings were changed to fit the culture being studied, a great deal of time and effort had to be expended.

The real difficulties appear when an attempt is made to create an entirely new set of projectives designed to investigate a specific problem or question. An artist must be found and an initial set of drawings or paintings worked up. These must then be thoroughly tested to find which are fruitful, which fail to stimulate stories related to the area of interest, and which fail to stimulate much of anything. It is also necessary to find which illustrations work better with male or with female storytellers. The sterile and misdirected cards are removed from the set, and new illustrations created to replace them. This is a long drawn out process that few are willing to go through.

It would seem at first thought that photographs would be an ideal solution to the problems stated above. By eliminating laborious artwork, photography would save a great deal of time both in creating the initial set and in providing replacements. Alas, to date this has not been the case. The photograph contains a fantastic wealth of information, background noise if you will, and the subject, rather than telling a story usually winds up merely describing the detail. Attempts with visual distortion such as soft-focus, in an effort to eliminate "noise," usually serve to direct attention to these manipulations rather than inspiring imagination.

Finding myself in need of a set of projectives specifically designed to elicit feelings and attitudes concerning the role of women, the family in general, and toward children specifically, I tried my hand at creating photographic projectives.

In some cases I set up tableaux (using children, women, pregnant women, men) showing ambiguous interaction. In other cases I shot "live" on the city streets and parks in Berkeley and various towns in Italy. The initial pictures were shot using slow film (Pan-X 32 ASA) and a 400mm lens wide open. I had hoped this combination would serve to eliminate excess information by throwing the foreground and background out of focus, while the subjects themselves remained quite sharp. The results were cardboard-like figures, isolated from their environment, and not at all satisfactory.

The next attempt was to use a relatively fast film (Ilford HP4 ASA 650) which I overexposed and then underdeveloped in a too warm developer and dropped into a slightly cool fix. This gave the prints, upon extensive enlargement, a pronounced grainy quality. The results were pleasing, and the effect was not too much different from the original cards used for the past twenty years. Noise was beginning to disappear, but the grain attracted much attention. I needed the same effect without grain.

After messing about during spare moments in the dark-room, I finally came upon the method that I believe will fulfill

the requirements: sufficient detail and context, minimum "noise," no distracting grain, and ease of creating an endless series of pictures all with a similar "feeling."

The film I used was Ilford FP4 (ASA 125). Plus-X would probably work fine. I confined my shooting, when possible to the afternoon when the sun was at a sharp angle, throwing everything I shot into extremely sharp contrast. The lens was closed down as far as possible to retain depth of field, but the shutter speed was never slower than 1/100th of a second. The negative was processed in Edwall developer diluted 1 to 15 in a 9% solution of sodium sulfite. The resulting negatives were high contrast with exceptionally fine grain.

Enlargements were made, using approximately half the 35mm frame, on a supercontrasty #5 Oriental paper. The final results are relatively grainless 8x10 prints that resemble ink-wash drawings with an abundance of cold black and clear white. These prints have sufficient contrast to be reproduced by the xerox method. However, care must be taken to see that imperfections on the xerox glass do not add any interesting bits to the illustrations.

Since arriving in Southern Italy, I find it difficult to obtain #5 paper . . . matter-of-fact, I find it impossible to obtain. So I am having the prints made on #4. Using fine grain film, I will make copy negatives which I will again print on #4. Perhaps this "Rube Goldberg" substitution will work, or maybe I will have to send to Germany or England for the proper contrast paper.

In order to swiftly test the relative fruitfulness of the various illustrations, xerox copies can be sent to colleagues and administered to captive groups of students in classes and seminars. After recording a hundred or so sets of stories, this rough testing should quickly isolate the sterile illustrations, indicated which pictures fail to stimulate stories in the area of interest (in my case attitudes toward children and the family), and which cards, if any, stimulate informants of one sex rather than another.

Sometime early in 1972 I will have a set of photographic projectives ready to be tested and refined. I would be pleased to hear from college or university professors who would be willing to aid in this work by presenting the materials to their students. It is not necessary, or probably even desirable, that the students be exclusively within a department of anthropology. I would also be pleased to correspond with researchers who have made attempts to create projective materials for their own work, using any medium, including still photography.

A. Michael Schreiber

c/o United Nations Social Defense Research Institute
Via Giulia 52
Rome, 00186 Italy

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST Film Reviews

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

CURRENT STATE OF ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Venice Festival, August 27-29, 1971

Translated from French by Carol Katz

The Conference on the Current State of Ethnographic Film Throughout the World, held in Venice in the context of a 32nd Exhibition, was organized conjointly by UNESCO and the International Board of Ethnographic and Sociological Film (C.I.F.E.S.).

The meeting was organized a bit late on account of difficulties familiar to the Venice Festival and it was only in the beginning of August that the invitations were able to be sent out.

In spite of these difficulties, 20 filmmakers, ethnologists and sociologists, were able to attend three consecutive days devoted to the screening of ethnographic films and the discussion of problems arising in this field.

In a spirit of organization, the Venice participants worked to prepare the ground for future international ethnographic film events to be held each year in Venice.

All the participants were enthusiastic about the project. The Exhibition Bureau and the city of Venice were approached in this regard at the end of the Conference. On account of the general interest excited by the Conference, the reception by the Exhibition Bureau and the city of Venice was very friendly, and we can look forward to an ethnographic film event to be set up in 1972, probably running in April.

The first day of the Conference was devoted to a survey of the current state of ethnographic film in the various countries represented in Venice.

Tunisia

The only documentary filmmakers in this country are amateurs, dependent on the Tunisian Federation of Amateur Filmmakers. The Ministry of National Education awards them a limited grant in the form of subsidies. The films are occasionally shown in art houses but their diffusion is restricted. The only truly ethnographic films made in Tunisia have been made by Sophie Ferchiou, a Tunisian Research Associate for the National Center of Scientific Research, Paris, who received her film training in France.

Italy

No ethnographic film has been made in the last few years. However, a particularly interesting example of one took place from 1938 to 1968 with four different depictions of the same subject, "Il Pianto delle Zitelle." The comparative analysis of the four versions could be a topic for study during the next Ethnographic Film Conference.

Canada

The production of documentary or fictional films is assured to a considerable extent by L'Office National du Film (L'O.N.F.). It is noteworthy that this agency recently financed the shooting, by an Indian team of a film on the Canadian Indians. L'O.N.F., which made possible the training of a great number of young Canadian filmmakers and which is a model of its kind, is presently threatened with replacement by a government organ of propaganda. The Conference participants, conscious of the worth and originality of L'O.N.F., expressed the wish that its independence be safeguarded.

Netherlands

There are two centers in the Netherlands concerned with ethnographic film: The University of Amsterdam (Troical Museum: films shot in Venezuela, Colombia and East Africa) and the University of Leiden (National Museum of Ethnology: films made by Dr. Gerbrands and P. P. Creutzberg).

Brazil

It is thanks to Europe that Brazil is aware of her filmmakers. The university, of a conservative bent, has remained closed to the cinema and there is no instruction of film theory or technique. One can only hope that meetings such as the one in Venice will act as an amplifier and a stimulant to Brazilian film.

Great Britain

The Royal Anthropological Institute has just created a library of ethnographic films containing fifty titles. Furthermore, British television companies are involved with documentary film subjects and with a just-begun collaboration they have established with ethnologists.

Australia

Australians complain of not having a film industry. Ian Dunlop (Commonwealth Aboriginal Institute) and Roger Sandall (University of Sydney) are the only filmmakers who have shot quality films on the aborigines and the Italian communities of Australia. But it is thanks to the C.I.F.E.S. and to UNESCO that Dunlop's films were shown at all to Australians.

Japan

The Japanese public is very much interested in foreign cultures and Japanese television produces a number of documentaries which enjoy great success. A considerable number of these documentaries were made with the assistance of ethnologists and specialists.

Films Shown

Le Pèlerinage à La Mecque, de Rezai (Iran)

35mm, color, sound, 1 hour 45 minutes, English version, 1968

Le Vieil Albarka, M. Alassane (Nigeria)

16mm, black and white, sound, 25 minutes, 1969

La Charpaigne, C. de France (France)

16mm, black and white, sound, 30 minutes, 1968

Le Grand Masque Molo, G. Le Moal (France)

16mm, color, sound, 30 minutes, 1969, Upper-Volta

Femme Noire, Femme Nue, D. Ecaré (Ivory Coast)

35mm, black and white, sound, 50 minutes

Sigui—La Caverne de Bongo, J. Rouch, G. Dieterlen (France)

16mm, color, sound, 40 minutes, 1969, Mali

Acadie, Acadie, M. Brault, P. Perrault (Québec)

16mm, black and white, sound, 1 hour 30 minutes, 1970, New Brunswick

People of the Australian Western Desert, I. Dunlop (Australia)

16mm, black and white, sound, 48 minutes, 1966, Australia

The Hadza, J. Woodburn, S. Hudson (Great Britain)

16mm, black and white, sound, 40 minutes, 1966, Tanzania

Mission in Melanesia, A. Gerbrands (The Netherlands)

16mm, color, English subtitles, 30 minutes, 1970

New Guinea Tribal Life—Papua, Y. Toyotomi (Japan)

16mm, color, double systems, 80 minutes, 1968

Vietnam

16mm, black and white, double systems

Marriage Sabrya, S. Ferchiou (Tunisia)

16mm, color, sound, 60 minutes, 1970, Tunisia

In the course of debates that followed the screenings, a certain amount of problems dealt with specific problems concerning the content of the films shown as well as problems relative to the ethnographic film in general.

Relationships of

Ethnological Filmmakers with Television

In most countries it is very difficult, indeed impossible, to have access to television films and to unused rushes (which, though unused, can be of great interest nonetheless on a scientific plane). It seems that in Great Britain, a new collaboration is being established in this area. The Japanese representative indicated that he presented this problem to the officials of Nippon Television. The participants resolved that access by scientists to these sources of documentation be facilitated. UNESCO was invited to try to draft a body of regulations in this direction.

Problems of Sound-Effects in Ethnographic Films

At the time of editing a film one is led to proceed to a choice of sound in the same manner that one selects images. The participants considered that this choice was perfectly justified, since the effects of authenticity are made from components of authentic sound. In addition, it was emphasized that there also exists a choice of speed and that in certain films the filmmaker, consciously or not, films certain actions approximating the effect of slow-motion, in order to accentuate precision.

The Use of Film a posteriori for Ethnological Investigation

Two ethnologists (A. Gerbrands, J. Rouch) took part in the outcome obtained thanks to the showing of their films to the people in their films. This screening reaped quite a number of spontaneous and informative responses, complementary or brand-new, thus demonstrating the significant role played by the film itself in the ethnographic inquiry.

The Language of Film—True-to-Life and Fictional

The ethnographic value of certain fictional films—distortion of reality and cultural stereotypes. These matters were briefly dealt with but were slated to be topics for discussion at the next Venice event.

Participants

Michel Brault, Filmmaker, 20 Boulevard Richelieu Nord, Mont Saint-Hilaire, Quebec, Canada.

Tahar Cheriaa, Director of the International Festival of "Carthage Film Events," Deputy Director of the Ministry of Culture, Tunis. Envoy of the Agency for Cultural Cooperation: 170, rue de Grenelle, Paris 7^{ème}, France.

Romano Calisi, Director of the Institute for Research in Mass Communications, Consultant with UNESCO, Palazzo Ancaiani, Spoleto, Italy.

Marielle Delorme, Administrative Secretary, International Board of Ethnographic and Sociological Film, Musée de l'Homme, Palais de Chaillot, Paris 16^{ème}, France.

Germaine Dieterlen, President of the French Board of Ethnographic Film, 172, rue de Grenelle Paris, 7^{ème}, France.

Xavier de France, Instructor of a course on film theory at the University of Paris X-Nanterre, 43, rue de la Comète, 92, Asnières, France.

Enrico Fulchignoni, Head of UNESCO's Artistic Creation Division, Department of Culture, 7, Place Fontenoy, Paris 7^{ème}, France.

Adrian Gerbrands, Ethnologist-Filmmaker, University of Leiden, Stationsplein 10, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Guy Le Moal, Ethnologist-Filmmaker (African Studies, C.N.R.S., Paris) in charge of the Department of Black Africa, Musée de l'Homme, Palais de Chaillot, Paris 16^{ème}, France.

Jean Rouch, Secretary General of the International Board of Ethnographic and Sociological Film, Musée de l'Homme, Palais de Chaillot, Paris 16^{ème}, France.

Fernando da Silva, Filmmaker-Investigator, c/o Direcen de Carvalho, Av. Ipiranga No. 200, Apt. 224 (Bloco E), Sao Paulo, Brazil.

Yasushi Toyotomi, Nippon Television Network Corporation, No. 14 Niban-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

James Woodburn, Ethnologist, London School of Economics, Royal Anthropological Institute, London, Great Britain.

Observers

Gillian Hanson, Journalist, *Sunday Australian*, Sydney 6, Alma Square, London, NW 8, Great Britain.

Nicholas Allen, Journalist, *The Herald*, New York, c/o American Express, 11, rue Scribe, Paris 9^{ème}, France.

William Brennan, Director of Film Research, Center for Understanding Media, 267 West 25th Street, New York, New York 10001, U.S.A.

Marian Handwerker, Institut des Arts de Diffusion, Brussels, Belgium.

Gerald Collet, Institut des Arts de Diffusion, Brussels, Belgium.

Liliana Magrini, Journalist, Via Del Tritone 66, Rome, Italy.

International Board of Ethnographic
and Sociological Film
Musée de l'Homme
Palais de Chaillot, Paris 16^{ème}

TOWARD THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SEMIOTIC OF ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM

This paper represents a revised version of a paper presented at the 1968 annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Seattle, Washington.

Since what I will be dealing with in this paper will be concerned with communication, and with the signs and messages through which communication occurs, it might be fruitful to start by examining the title of this paper as a possible communicative event composed of a sequence of sign units. Our first task ought to be a preliminary analysis of some of the signs I am using. (I am arbitrarily assuming at this point that I know that individual words are a sign.) I will try later on to

suggest that analysis of similar sign units might be necessary in the development of a semiotic of ethnographic film.

By a semiotic as used in this paper I mean roughly: a science, or a doctrine, of signs which will help to explain how human beings communicate with one another within a shared system, exchanging units that have common significance and a commonly understood set of rules of inference and implication. This is not a standard definition, since most uses of the term "semiotic" include signs and sign systems employed by non-human organisms, and include signs that do not, or may not, have a communicative function or context. I would like for the moment to concentrate on signs used in human communication.

By "ethnographic" I mean broadly the study, description, and presentation of the customs and ways of people all over the world. By a "semiotic of ethnographic film" I mean a method by means of which we can study the signs, and the rules of implication and inference that we employ when we use those signs in films that are intended to describe and present the customs and ways of people all over the world.

An ethnographic film, then, is something that we *employ* for some particular purpose. It is a kind of film which its makers or viewers *use* for the study, description or presentation of people and culture. Its users have by agreement attached some of the concepts of a discipline labeled "anthropology" to their use of film in this way, and generally believe that there is some relationship between the goals of that discipline and "ethnographic film."

There can therefore be no way of describing a class of films as "ethnographic" by describing a film in and of itself. One can only describe this class of films by describing how they are used, and assigning the term "ethnographic" to one class of descriptions. Just as one cannot say that any sign—the arbitrary word sign "dog," for example—has a significance in and of itself, one cannot say that any film has a significance or meaning in and of itself. For any film, just as for the word "dog," there must exist a common and shared significance between the members of a group who make implications and inferences or draw meaning from the use of a sign in a process of communication.

Just as words are signs of, and in, a speech event, so are visual images parts of an *image event*. An image event, however, is much more difficult in some ways to deal with than the speech events that occur in verbal language. We do not have a lexicon of images as we do of words, by which we may check on a culturally agreed upon signification. To some extent, when we use visual images, we depend not on *arbitrary* sign meaning but on an expected common set of perceptual mechanisms, and a common set of rules by which we perceive and organize the world. We are, however, learning that this set of rules by which we perceive and organize the world is as much dependent on our culture as on some set of built-in perceptual mechanisms. The Whorfian notion that the language one speaks determines to some extent how we see the world around us must be considered quite literally when applied to film, and most particularly when applied to ethnographic film use. Although image events appear in no lexicon that has been bound and stacked in libraries, differing cultures use, organize, and imply and infer meaning from image events in differing ways.

If, then, no single film can be classed as ethnographic by looking at it—in and of itself—it follows that *any* film might become an ethnographic film because of its purpose or its use. It would seem, therefore, that in order to know something about ethnographic films, we must examine not the films primarily, but why they are made and how they are used.

What I am suggesting is the obvious fact that it is not enough for our purposes to study the film or even a film code itself. In order to know about ethnographic films we must study the code within some specific functional context. In our case it will do us no good to study film qua film. We must begin to determine the relationship between a film code and its context not only within ethnographic research, but within the culture or the subculture that both produces and uses a film.

To develop this point further, I would like to borrow a question formulated first by Sapir in 1938 and called to our attention by Hymes in a paper entitled "Why Linguistics Needs the Sociologist" (1967). It might become interesting if we were to challenge our interest in ethnographic film by asking why the filmmaker needs the ethnographer or even why the ethnographer needs the filmmaker. In one sense, of course, the relation between these two disciplines can be of trivial intellectual interest, even though of great practical desirability. It might be thought of as analogous to asking why the anthropologist or the linguist needs a sound tape machine operator. The anthropologist in the field might need a similar technician to perform a visual recording service for him. "Make me a picture of that dance," he would say. Conversely, the filmmaker might want to make a film about Eskimos and would expect the anthropologist to act as a sort of straw boss in the field. "Ask those guys what they're doing, and do you think it's O.K. for me to say on the soundtrack that Eskimos love their dogs? Do you think that would be O.K. for the Board of Education?"

Unfortunately, such things have occurred. I am not talking about that kind of need. To clarify the original question, and to make more precise the area which is of significance intellectually, I should rather ask why the person interested in *studying* ethnographic film needs the ethnographer or why the ethnographer needs a person interested in the *study of film*.

Let us for a moment look at how film has been used by anthropologists in the past. I will not detail this history (cf. Ruby 1971), but would rather talk about types or categories of films used in a specific intellectual community—that of anthropology. Films may of course still be examined in terms of their own structure, but if the use of the film determines its labeling as "ethnographic," it is its use that must first be established.

An ethnographic film is a set of signs used to study the behavior of a people. Films can be used in two basic ways to achieve this purpose: as a recording of data *about* culture, or as data *of* a culture.

First, a film can be made or examined as a particular form of data retention, collection and transmission. Such a film records the basic data of culture in and within the cognitive system and value structure of the data collector. It is similar in this way to the linguist's use of the tape recorder. He chooses his speaker according to a determined set of rules developed by his discipline, and saves memory storage by having a machine collect a particular set of sounds for analysis. In a like manner one can choose a "chunk" of behavior and have the camera (with or without synchronous sound) record it. We can use that piece of film to save memory storage, or we can use it to observe units of behavior that are not visible at normal speed. Normally we do not see in units of 1/24 or 1/1000 of a second. The movie camera can record these chunks of behavior in frames passing before a lens at any given speed, and we can then observe this behavior at will, and at any speed. *We*, however, point the camera, determine the speed at which the film passes behind the lens, and determine what we will view, and at what speed we will view it.

Secondly, films can be thought of as a phenomenon of culture in their own right, reflecting the value systems, coding patterns and cognitive processes *of the maker*. Here the ethnographer is interested in what has been called the

“ethnography of communication,” and studies not only the behavior recorded on the film, but primarily the behavior of the man who organizes image events on film. Such use is analogous to that of the anthropological linguist or the sociolinguist who wants to know what, why, and how specific people in specific contexts say or do not say specific things, and how they are related to other aspects of their culture, and the culture of people who live differently. Here one is interested in what things are said, why, to whom, and in what form.

Let us take these two different functions and try to see what we need to know in order to use film in these ways.

If one is interested in film only as a data bank, recording the behavior of an informant, one need not concern himself with how the *informant* would organize the film. One must, however, be clear about how the *ethnographer himself* organizes the behavior he records. The notion that film is in some way an objective record capturing some elusive “truth” must be recognized as the nonsense it is. I believe that this notion, implicitly held and sometimes explicitly stated, has done more damage to ethnographic research than any other “contribution” made about the use of modern technology. It has done damage not only because it is wrong—I can conceive of some very wrong ideas having quite positive effects in a research situation—but because it has prevented researchers from examining *their* own methods of organizing and structuring the visual events that are recorded in the field and subsequently analyzed and described as the behavior of an informant or group.

The obvious problem here is that—as Margaret Mead and others have pointed out so often—we forget that other things are happening when the camera is pointing in one direction, or that other things are happening outside that frame. We also tend to forget that all films are edited by someone. Even unedited research films are edited. Someone placed the camera and started, stopped, and started the camera again. Someone decided to take a close-up or a long shot. Someone decided what events were worth recording and what events were of no significance and not worthy of being recorded. In effect, someone acted as a human being making research decisions in the field.

Anyone who has ever analyzed a film can testify to the almost insidious power of the medium. We tend to believe that what is on the screen *is*—and is thereby some act of higher truth. Once one has looked at a film of an action or an interaction a number of times (and in some forms of micro-analysis 300 times is not a lot) one is hard pressed to remember that what one has seen is not what happened, but what the cameraman and camera put on his film.

There is, however, no point in taking the position that if film is not objective truth there is no use to it. I am arguing that there is great value in visually recorded data of culture—so long as we know what it is that we recorded, so long as we are aware of how and by what rules we chose our subject matter, and so long as we are aware of how *we* organized the various units of film from which we will do our analysis.

If anthropologists are to collect data on film and to be trained to do this, it is necessary for them to conceptualize clearly the mode and specific methods of analysis that they will use, rather than to concentrate on the technology required to get a clear image on film. If Navajo Indians (Worth and

Adair 1972) can learn to capture a clear image on film in two days of instruction, we ought to assume that anthropologists studying them can do as well with a week’s instruction, and that professors should spend time teaching something which cannot be picked up from an instruction book, or from a day’s instruction.

What I am suggesting is that a semiotic of ethnographic film concern itself—on this data collection level—with the study of three things. *First*, a description of existing analytic methods that are used in analyzing behavior recorded on film. *Second*, a description of the alternative ways of organizing the film image itself, and *third*, the development of new methods of analysis tied to ethnographic and anthropological theory.

The first concern—the description of existing analytic methods—is relatively simple because they are so few, and those few are fairly well developed (Birdwhistell 1971; Lomax 1970; Hall 1968; Ekman and Freisen 1968). At present, however, there are very few people trained in even this small variety of analytic methods. Achieving this first goal is a problem of educational organization within a multidisciplinary field combining parts of anthropology, communication and film.

The second concern—a description of alternative ways of organizing film—is a more difficult problem. There are at present few film schools in this country, few schools of communication, and almost no anthropology departments that I know of seriously investigating the ways human beings with differing cultures organize visual experiences when they record them on film.

The third concern—that of developing new methods of analysis tied to anthropological problems and theories—seems to me to be the most crucial. If we could make headway here, we would be able to integrate the study of ethnographic film into anthropology as part of a discipline.

Let me delay for a moment a fuller explanation of this point. I intend to come back to it after describing briefly the second of the two ways I mentioned earlier in which film can be used in the study of culture.

This second way in which film can be used is relatively new on some dimensions, but not on others. Here I am referring to the study of film as a phenomenon of culture itself, rather than its study as an anthropologist’s recorded data of that culture. Here we would analyze films for much the same reasons we analyze verbal language, methods of farming, child rearing practices and so on.

Using films this way—or calling films that we study for this purpose “ethnographic”—demands not only some of the same skills and conceptual clarity that was discussed earlier, but demands also the integration of some fundamentally new problems into existing theory both in communication and in anthropology.

Looking at culture through the films made *in* that culture poses some interesting questions. Wolfenstein, Weakland, Mead, Metraux, Gerbner and many others have looked at what Mead has called “culture at a distance.” They have made many assumptions which, so far as I know, have not yet been sufficiently clarified. Basic to much of this early work was the assumption that certain films—those made for mass audiences primarily—reflect the “daydreams” of the culture that produced them. These films are then sampled and analyzed to ascertain basic values and interests of the culture in question.

In many cases such work yields fruitful insights. Yet some of the assumptions are much too simplistic. It is true that analogously the linguist taking an interest in problems of *competence only* can examine the utterances produced by such diverse groups as political figures, night-club comics or street corner vendors. But as long as the theoretical structure behind such analysis does not require one to differentiate between these speakers, and seeks only to deal with that part of language that they all share, it does not matter. If, however, the analysis has as one aim to compare value systems, "national daydreams," or traits across a body of films, and does *not* include an analysis of how the films were made, under what cultural rules, by what groups, for what purpose, it is bound to be difficult to substantiate.

For example, it is clear now (Guback 1969) that films made in the West (United States, England, France, Italy, Spain) are not so much national expressions as supra-national products *designed, financed and produced* to appeal to as wide a group of viewers in as many countries as possible, by a multi-national or super-national organization. It is almost impossible to single out a recent British film, for example, that was not financed and approved by American interests with multi-national audiences in mind. The same holds true of the so-called Iron Curtain countries, whose films are financed by the Soviet Union and produced for much more than internal consumption.

It is important to realize that "films" are not all the same for ethnographic use either. Certain films, however, are made by individual members of a culture, but even here as in "avant-garde" or "art" films it is important to know which values and ideas are paramount for the filmmakers. Other films are made by members of a culture in a more ethnographic sense. But these rarely have been studied (Chalfen 1970). For example, "home movies" are made for showing to family and friends—for private rather than public viewing—and probably reflect more of what we mean when we talk about how members of a culture organize their world through image events, than do the commercial infra-national films. Recently, high school, college and independent groups such as Indians, blacks and chicanos, have been making films for their purposes in their ways.

Once one realizes that films are not made by a culture but by individuals or small groups within a culture or sharing some common culture, one is faced with a problem that has long preoccupied researchers interested in the complex relationship between the use and performance of verbal language and culture.

In developing a semiotic of ethnographic film on the level of film as a datum of culture, the problem of determining how film signs are used by individuals in a ruleful way becomes paramount.

Here we would be asking questions that have been asked about other modes of communication—in speech, of course, but also about painting, carving, architecture and so on. These might be considered questions of form or using linguistic terms, questions of syntax, as well as content, or semantics. In analyzing ethnographic films this way, we might want to ask such questions as: "Does film have the properties of a language, and if so what are they?" "Are there language communities of filmmakers and film viewers?" "Does film have the same function for all communities?" and so on.

The decision to concentrate for the time being on developing a semiotic rather than a grammar was made because it seems unwise at this state of ignorance to prejudge whether film communication should be considered a language in a formal and serious sense. The notion of a semiotic allows for the discovery of linguistic type rules for film organization, but does not preclude other less formal, less commonly understood, and perhaps, different, patterns of use.

For ethnographers, the study of film as another way to study the cognitive organization of different peoples opens a vast new area. Since people have divided themselves into different linguistic groups, those studying culture through language are forced to surmount the very difficult translation barrier. Descriptions of the attitudes, customs, and way of organizing experience rendered by the members of the studied culture are always filtered through the ethnographer's eyes, ears and cognitive system. He must translate the myths, redescribe the customs, and talk second-hand about how the "native" sees his own world and his experiences in it.

Films, just like still photos and paintings, can be made by the native people in question; and what is more, it may be the case that we can understand them *as the native does*. Notice the qualification—I said "it *may* be the case."

This seems to be the first job that those interested in a semiotic of ethnofilm must be prepared to tackle. What are the implications that the maker of a film puts into his film, and what are the inferences that a viewer infers from it? Are there universal patterns of inference, of narrative forms, of image use, that are of common shared significance across all cultures, or across certain groups of cultures? Are there certain structures of film communication related to other patterns of culture such as verbal language, kinship patterns and so on?

Not only do we have to know how "natives" organize their visual perceptions, but we must study the anthropologist's own system of organizing the films he makes. Does the language he—the ethnographer—speaks make for a different system of implication or inference? Does the anthropological theory he is working with, which the film as data is meant to elucidate, influence the way *he* sees the world *he* is trying to describe?

Bloomfield (1964) talking of White-Thunder's use of Menomoni, says, "Menomoni is a language no one speaks tolerably." To which Hymes (1967) comments, "White-Thunder forces us to face the fact that for both the individual and the community, a language in some sense is what those who have it can do with it . . . differences in facility and adequacy may be encountered that are not accidental but integral to the language as it exists for those in question."

We must know not only the differences in facility and adequacy among different users of film, but if Navajos, Negro teenagers or Trobriand Islanders make films, what must we know about their methods of patterning these sign units for us to use these films as data of culture? Using such films not only gives us the possibility of seeing and analyzing what the other person thinks important to show us, not only do we have the opportunity to determine the patterns by which he organizes what he shows us, but as with language itself, we can see what he does *not* show, and how he does *not* organize. In other words, negative cases count, and nothing never happens.

When I talked earlier about the need to integrate a theory of ethnofilm with theories in anthropology, I meant the kind

of integration which would be useful in tackling some of the problems briefly and cursorily mentioned above.

The mechanical amalgam of an ethnographically free film theory with that of an anthropology not concerned with ethnofilm problems will not do. The kind of training in which anthropologists learn about Eisenstein's theory of editing, and filmmakers learn some basic anthropology, will produce—perhaps—filmmakers who know a little anthropology, and anthropologists who know a little about how to make films, but will not contribute much to the development of problems whose solution can be integrated into a scientific theory of culture.

Rather than attempting to list a set of problems appropriate to this kind of analysis, let me give one example of the kind of problem for which an adequate theory must be developed if there is to be such a thing as a semiotic of ethnofilm.

Whorf and others have advanced the notion that the language one speaks influences the way one perceives and organizes the world. Let us state as a hypothesis that the way one organizes units of filmed event depends only on the way one organizes verbal descriptions of that event. (I do not think that this is true, by the way—but it is a testable hypothesis.)

Obviously, if this were true, it would be extremely important to both anthropological theory and to film theory, yet neither group can at present deal with the complexities of the problem. It would, in order to test this hypothesis, be necessary to develop a descriptive system of film organization across those dimensions of verbal language that can be compared with other relevant dimensions known to facilitate ethnographic description.

It would be necessary to examine much more closely how indeed the use of verbal language, in narrative, mythic and everyday events, relate to what we normally call the grammatical or syntactic. At the same time we would have to examine how film "narrates," "tells stories," and deals with everyday events in a way that could relate that to the formal, structural or syntactic codes of film use. The concept of "Language and Culture" as a label for the relationship of culture to modes of communication is clearly too narrow. How we make films, paint pictures, carve door posts, dress, set out tables and furnish our homes, as well as how we speak, are all uses of symbolic forms which are part of culture and which are all possibly related. A semiotic of ethnographic film is part of the study of the relationship between culture and communication itself.

Unfortunately, I have not had time to present the above arguments as fully as I would have liked to. Let me sum up, however, by restating some of them and indicating some of their perhaps controversial implications.

(1) There is no such thing as an "ethnographic film"—or, said another way, any film is an ethnographic film depending on how it is used.

(2) Learning how to make films *as films* with the emphasis on the technical or artistic aspects of the medium is not relevant to anthropology. Learning how to *study about* films in relation to some specific anthropological problem is relevant. At present this kind of study is almost non-existent.

(3) Whether those interested in analyzing culture through film use or define ethnofilm as *their* record of their observation or as the *native's own way* of seeing things requires a similar body of knowledge about ethnofilm analysis. I am suggesting that this knowledge must include (a) a description

of alternative ways of manipulating film, (b) a description of alternative ways of analyzing film, and (c) the development of a body of theory or at least problems relevant to existing theory that such analysis is designed to solve.

(4) A semiotic of ethnofilm should be concerned with questions that have broad disciplinary interest, and that stem from new problems generated by the congruence of film analysis and the analysis of culture. In other words, a semiotic of ethnofilm, if it is worth getting involved in, must become part of the science of culture and communication and the questions and problems it deals with must be those that the larger discipline cannot help getting interested in. Not only because films are fun, but because film studied in this way offers answers to questions that concern us as professionals.

Fifth, but by no means least important, is the fact that training students in this new area is extremely difficult to do at the moment. Some universities have instituted ethnographic film services, some are experimenting with joint courses run by filmmakers and anthropologists. Various plans are afoot, but, in my opinion, we have just begun. The problems have hardly begun to be clarified, and training in this area is still not accepted as necessary for a degree in either film, communication or anthropology.

Although the interesting questions are the research questions, I would like to emphasize the pedagogical implications of such interests. If culture and communication are worth studying, the entire field must determine its relevance and the methods of training which will enable those entering the field to pursue these problems. Just as the study of language has not been left to the formal linguist alone, so the development of a semiotic of ethnofilm cannot be left only to the filmmaker or only to the ethnographer.

References Cited

- Birdwhistell, Ray
1971 *Kinesics and context*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Bloomfield, Leonard
1964 Literate and illiterate speech. In *Language in culture and society*. Dell Hymes, Editor. Harper and Row. pp. 391-396.
- Chalfen, Richard
1970 Home movies are the closest things to life itself. Unpublished ms.
- Ekman, Paul, and Wallace Freisen
1968 The repertoire of nonverbal behavior—categories, origins, usage and coding. *Semiotica*, Vol. 1, No. 1.
- Guback, Thomas
1969 *International film industry*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Hall, Edward
1968 Proxemics. *Current Anthropology* 19:83-108.
- Hymes, Dell
1967 Why linguistics needs the sociologist. *Social Research*, Vol. 34, No. 4.
- Lomax, Alan
1970 *Folk song style and culture*. American Association For the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C.
- Ruby, Jay
1971 Toward an anthropological cinema. *Film Comment* 7:35-40.
- Worth, Sol, and John Adair
1972 *Navahos make movies: a study in anthropology and communications*. Indiana University Press (in press).

Sol Worth

Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

PROXEMICS AND PROXETICS

Paper presented at the 1968 annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Seattle, Washington.

Kenneth Pike (1954:8) coined the terms "etic" and "emic" and applied them to two different ways of studying systems of human behavior, using as an analogy the analytical distinctions made by linguists between phonetic and phonemic approaches to sound systems. The distinctions between etic and emic approaches have been treated in detail elsewhere (e.g., Harris 1968:568-604; Pike 1966:152-163), so a summary of these distinctions will suffice here.

The etic point of view approaches a system of behavior from outside the system, using criteria which are external to the system. The etic approach provides an initial base from which the observer can begin his analysis of the system. Statements made about the system in etic terms, in Harris's (1968:575) words, "depend upon phenomenal distinctions judged appropriate by the community of scientific observers."

The emic approach, on the other hand, is concerned with studying behavior from inside a single, culturally specific system. Criteria used in an emic description are drawn from the contrasts made within the system itself and are relevant in terms of the internal functioning of the system. Emic distinctions are those which are recognized as meaningful to the interactants who "use" the system.

So, a behavioral scientist interested in a particular area of human behavior might search for universals in this area, and use etic units and categories in describing this behavior as it occurs in cultures around the world. If he were interested in describing how this behavior is structured in one, culturally specific system, the etic categories previously uncovered would prove useful in providing an entre into that particular system and would serve as an analytical base until he had gained the knowledge necessary for an emic description of the system. That area of human behavior called "proxemics" provides an example of how etic and emic approaches can fruitfully be used.

Edward T. Hall (1963:1022), innovator of research in the area of proxemic behavior, coined the term "proxemics" because it evoked an image of the subject matter—proximity. Hall (1963:1003) defines proxemics as "the study of how man unconsciously structures microspace—the distance between men in conduct of daily transactions, the organization of space in his houses and buildings, and ultimately the layout of his towns," and also, in a more recent definition (1966:1), as "the interrelated observations and theories of man's use of space as a specialized elaboration of culture." The total range of proxemic behavior is broad, as one can see from Hall's definitions, but this paper is concerned with only the personal, interactional level of proxemic behavior: how man perceives and utilizes small amounts of space in his face-to-face encounters with other men.

In the course of his investigations in proxemic behavior, Hall (1963:1005) asked the questions "By what means other than visual do people make spatial distinctions? How do they maintain such uniform distances from each other?" He was then able to isolate the several elements which constitute the system of proxemic behavior. He found that the ways in which humans perceive and structure microspace is a function of all the senses. How a person determines whether another person is close or distant is, in Hall's (1966:172) words, a "synthesis of

many sensory inputs: visual, auditory, kinesthetic, olfactory, and thermal." Hall (1963) has also provided a system of notation to be used in recording observations of proxemic behavior.

Using the categories he had isolated Hall (1963) has described differences in the proxemic behavior of people from different cultures and the interference which results when two systems of proxemic behavior clash. Further, Hall borrows the terms "contact" and "non-contact" from the ethologist Hediger (1950:111, 1955:66) and applies them to human groups in terms of proxemic behavior, and suggests (1963:1023, 1964:44-45) that all cultures fall into one or the other global type. The contact group is composed of members who face one another more directly, interact closer to one another, touch one another more, look one another in the eye more, and speak in a louder voice than do members of the non-contact group.

It is perhaps obvious that the area under discussion here is really proxetics, and not proxemics. Hall (1963:1021) was aware of this when he wrote: "this presentation is concerned more with proxetics than proxemics, and is therefore only the first of a series of steps in a long, complex process." So far, proxemic research has been cast almost entirely in an etic framework. Hall has created categories of proxemic behavior which have been applied cross-culturally and appear to be empirically valid (Watson and Graves 1966; Watson 1968); the differences between Arab and American proxemic behavior as examples of contact and non-contact types has been confirmed (Watson and Graves 1966); and proxemic differences between various other groups besides Arabs and Americans have been demonstrated using measurements external to the system of proxemic behavior observed (Watson 1968).

We have the categories, we can observe, measure, and quantify the proxemic behavior of all the peoples of the world, so, etically speaking, all is well. But these things do not tell us much in emic terms, i.e., what the relationships are between proxemic variables in different culturally specific systems. Even given the differences between, say, Arab and American systems of proxemic behavior, all we can talk about is the contrast between the two systems, not the contrasts made within each system. Hall (1964:54) has emphasized that proxemic behavior is a matter of different *systems*: "This is *not* a matter . . . of generalizing about Ladino's standing closer than North Americans, or moving each space zone up a notch . . ."

If it were true that all systems of proxemic behavior were structured the same way internally (i.e., each variable in any system bore the same relationship to all the other variables in the system), and culturally specific systems of proxemic behavior differed from each other only in terms of quantity (i.e., interactants in one system would face one another more directly, display more eye contact, etc., than interactants in another system), then we would expect these consistencies to be demonstrated in some way. One such commonly used demonstration is a correlation matrix. If all proxemic systems were structured the same way, the values on a correlation matrix would remain about the same for any proxemic system. This does not appear to be the case, however. Data analysis from my own research (Watson and Graves 1966; Watson 1968) demonstrates that matrices correlating the various

proxemic variables in different culturally specific systems are *not* similar. This suggests that the variables within different systems have different relationships to each other.

Internal differences in various proxemic systems were also supported by interviews with subjects. Several Arab subjects, for example, told me that shoulder axis (i.e., directness of facing) did not really matter as long as eye contact was maintained with the person with whom one was conversing. Some Northern Europeans, on the other hand, insisted that shoulder axis and eye contact went hand in hand. North Americans, when approaching friends on the street, typically avoid eye contact and speaking until the other person is close enough to exchange greetings or begin interaction, i.e., they use physical proximity to establish contact. Arab subjects, however, indicated that there is no such hesitancy among them to begin interaction: upon seeing a friend approaching in the distance, they typically use voice loudness and eye contact to span that distance, beginning interaction from afar. Such behavior would be embarrassing and offensive to most North Americans.

Etic analysis of culturally specific systems of proxemic behavior would be necessary in order to isolate the proxemes—contrastive units of proxemic behavior—in a system. The etic categories isolated and used as a basis for measurement of proxemic behavior include, as previously mentioned, such things as the directness with which interactants face one another, the amount of touching which goes on during an interaction, the physical distance between the interactants, the voice loudness with which interactants converse, and the eye contact which takes place during an interaction. These categories are broken down further into smaller units of analysis which are observable and measurable. The category “eye contact,” for example, has four analytical subdivisions, which amount to: looking another person directly in the eye, looking at him in the area of his face, looking in his general direction, and directing the gaze away from him. In etic terms, these are four separate units, easily observed. But in emic terms, the boundaries between some of these units might not be significant in a culturally specific system. It could be, for instance, that in a culturally specific system of proxemic behavior looking a person directly in the eye and looking at him in the area of his face might not be contrasting units, i.e., might be alloproxes of the same proxeme and have the same meaning. The same thing would apply, of course, to the subdivisions of other proxemic categories.

Further investigations along emic lines might confirm some things which were suggested by my own research (Watson 1968). It appears, for example, that certain variables in a proxemic system are influenced and altered by certain factors, thus changing their relationships to other variables in the system. A specific example of this phenomenon regards the amount of touching in “contact” cultures (i.e., Arabs, Latin Americans and Mediterranean Europeans). People from these cultures, after they have been in the United States for a while, come to realize that the amount of touching which goes on between males in their own cultures is looked at askance in this country. Arab subjects, who had been in this country for a while, told of going to meet their newly arrived Arab friends and extricating themselves from an embrace long enough to tell their friends that this sort of behavior is frowned upon in this culture. One Italian subject put it nicely when he told me: “When I came to this country I touched less consciously, but

not I touch less unconsciously” (Watson 1968:125). These and other responses by subjects were supported by data analysis, which demonstrated that the longer a member from a contact culture had been in this country, the less he touched during an interaction.

Finally, it appears that as more culturally specific systems of proxemic behavior are described, the more difficult it will become to utilize the global “contact” and “non-contact” typologies. Data analysis (Watson 1968) suggests that instead of the whole proxemic syndrome being used to classify a culture as contact or non-contact, as Hall (1963) suggests, the variables closeness and touching might be used for this. Similarly, eye contact and shoulder axis could perhaps be used to classify a culture along a “direct-indirect” dimension. If some such relationship does indeed exist, then it might be possible to find a culture which was “contact/indirect,” or “non-contact/direct.” Data analysis (Watson 1968) also suggests that proxemic systems will more likely fall along a continuum, and not into two polar types.

The relationships between proxemic variables suggested in this paper are tantalizing, but confirmation must wait until culturally specific systems of proxemic behavior are described and explained.

References Cited

- Hall, Edward T.
 1963 A system for the notation of proxemic behavior. *American Anthropologist* 65:1003-1026.
 1964 Silent assumptions in social communication. *Disorders of Communication* 42:41-55.
 1966 *The hidden dimension*. Doubleday, New York.
- Harris, Marvin
 1968 *The rise of anthropological theory*. Crowell, New York.
- Hediger, H.
 1950 *Wild animals in captivity*. Butterworths, London.
 1955 *Studies of the psychology and behavior of captive animals in zoos and circuses*. Butterworths, London.
- Pike, Kenneth
 1954 Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior. Vol. 1, *Summer Institute of Linguistics*.
 1966 Etic and emic standpoints for the description of behavior. In *Communication and culture*. A. G. Smith, Editor. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Watson, O. Michael
 1968 Proxemic behavior: a cross-cultural study. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Colorado.
- Watson, O. Michael, and Theodore D. Graves
 1966 Quantitative research in proxemic behavior. *American Anthropologist* 68:971-985.

O. Michael Watson

Department of Anthropology
 Purdue University

FILMS FOR ANTHROPOLOGICAL TEACHING

Films for Anthropological Teaching (4th Edition, 1970), prepared by Karl G. Heider for Program in Ethnographic Film with the support of the Wenner-Gren Foundation, is now available from the AAA Executive Office at \$3.00 per copy. Please enclose payment when ordering.

Film in Britain III

*Third Annual Graduate Film Seminar in London, England
June 26-July 28, 1972*

The Seminar is conducted in association with the British Film Institute for six graduate credits. Intensive study of all aspects of contemporary British film: writing, directing, performance, economics, technology, censorship, criticism, training, research. Lectures in mornings; afternoon field trips to major film and TV studios, archives, museums.

The staff is led by Dr. Raymond Fielding, filmmaker and author, Professor of Communications. His associate is Professor Kenneth Adam, distinguished British writer and until 1969 head of BBC Television. Guest lectures by top-flight British directors, actors, writers, critics, scholars, officials.

Participants must be 21 or older, hold a recognized baccalaureate degree. Limited to 18 enrollees.

Fees covering all academic expenses for the five-week, six-credit seminar: \$450. Food, lodging and transportation not included.

For Details write or call Dr. Raymond Fielding at School of Communications and Theater, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122. Telephone (215) 787-8427.

Holt, Rinehart and Winston has just published an extremely useful reference book, *Guide to Film: An Eleven-in-One Reference*, by Ronald Gottesman and Harry M. Geduld. In spite of the fact that they list PIEF as having a New York Address, we recommend it.

New Film Listing

A semidocumentary impression of life on a remote Korean island in the Sea of Japan is presented in *Out There, a Lone Island*, a 16mm film distributed by the University of California Extension Media Center, Berkeley, California 94720. It may be rented, purchased or previewed before purchase.

The film focuses on one family, powerfully evoking the stark atmosphere of the island, illuminating the Eastern philosophy of subordination of self to oneness with nature and communicating by purely visual means the universality of mankind's problems and joys.

The actors are islanders, and the story—without narration or subtitles and with only incidental Korean dialogue, accompanied by an original score—deals with the elemental aspects of life: the rhythmic change of the seasons, the simple pleasures that lighten the hardships of the struggle for survival, the outlook of different generations and the subtle processes of tradition and change. Scenes of everyday activities show the men fishing for squid, tending fields and cattle, and helping the women with the seaweed harvest.

Out There, a Lone Island was made by Humphrey W. Leynse; it is 67 minutes long and is in black and white. It may be purchased for \$385 or rented for \$35.

The film is useful for the study of anthropology, ethnology, Asian culture, family life, social sciences and other subjects. A study guide is available. Further information may be obtained from Extension Media Center, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720.

New Program in Anthropological Film at the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle

The Department of Anthropology at UICC will give a series of courses in visual anthropology, beginning in the fall of 1972. (There is also one undergraduate course offered on the History of Ethnographic Film.) The courses are electives for graduate students taking the M.A. in Anthropology or another social science. Teaching faculty include Paul Hockings, Jack Prost and Gerald Temaner. The lay-out of these courses is very similar to the former program at UCLA, except that a course on Kinesics and Film has been added. Here is an outline:

Fall quarter

(1) Weekly seminar on the history and theory of ethnographic film, and on fieldwork techniques.

(2) Two hours viewing and one hour discussion of relevant films each week.

(3) Weekly workshop on filming and sound-recording techniques. All students shoot a one-scene film for practice, using videotape.

(4) Each student researches and prepares a film proposal in a small group or ethnic community near Chicago.

Winter quarter

(1) Two hours viewing and one hour discussion of relevant films each week.

(2) Pairs of students film the best among their proposals, using 16mm sync. equipment.

(3) Alternatively, those more interested in kinesics and proxemics will do research in that area, learning to use the super-8mm camera and a computer in their work.

Spring quarter

(1) Students conclude shooting and then complete editing their films.

(2) Weekly workshop on editing techniques.

Summer quarter

If funding permits, selected graduates from the above program join faculty on field projects where they assist in the production of major documentaries or other research involving film and videotape. This work could lead to the presentation of a film and videotape. This work could lead to the presentation of a film for the M.A. thesis.

Students interested in this M.A. program in Anthropology should write for the admission forms to the Secretary, Department of Anthropology, University of Illinois, Box 4348, Chicago, Illinois 60680.

Opportunity Wanted

Prize winning, documentary filmmaker with experience in ethnographic films seeks assignment. Abilities include ideating, writing, camera work, editing, etc. Please contact Ion Knaller, 2401 Pennsylvania Avenue, Apt. 4-C-43, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19130.

New Film Catalog

The University of California Extension Media Center's new 1972-73 catalog of 16mm films is now available from the Center, Berkeley, California 94720.

Computer typesetting, photocomposition and recycled paper were utilized in production of the catalog, which has

been completely redesigned and re-edited, including a new and more useful indexing system. The catalog describes 2,883 films, 460 of which were acquired since the 1970 EMC catalog was issued. All of the films may be rented and 277 are also available for purchase. Films offered for sale may be previewed before purchase.

"EMC's collection of films is unique in several ways," states C. Cameron Macauley, director of the Media Center. "It is one of the most up-to-date collections—EMC withdraws an older film for nearly every new acquisition—and it reflects a constant effort to maintain quality and timeliness in new acquisitions.

"It also specializes in many of the most dynamic areas of serious interest," Macauley notes. "Among these are anthropology, the arts and sciences, documentaries, drug abuse education, ecology, education and teacher training, ethnic studies, film education, futures studies, social studies and social issues.

"In addition, recent acquisitions have broadened EMC's collection of film as art. A number of outstanding animated films are available, as well as several classic comedy shorts by Charlie Chaplin and W. C. Fields."

All films in the EMC library are available to colleges, schools, institutions, business and industrial firms, organizations and responsible individuals for use within the United States. Copies of the new catalog may be obtained without charge by writing to University Extension Media Center, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720.

A relatively new book on filmmaking is out. Although very basic, it is well illustrated and may be of use as an introduction or as a teaching aid with children.

Lidstone, John, and Don McIntosh

1970 *Children as Film Makers*. New York, New York:
Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Call for Information

The Film Students' Handbook, the first fact-filled reference book especially for film students, has started gathering information, according to Austin Lamont, editor. Present film students and recent graduates are invited to submit information on their film schools, their experiences with film distributors or film festivals; how they obtained a salaried job or production contracts. The address is *The Film Students' Handbook*, 26 Waverly Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02135.

Signet books will publish *the Film Students' Handbook* when it is completed. It will be filled with facts and straight opinion on film schools, film distributors, film festivals, and on getting and holding a film job. There must be fifty books on filmmaking, but nothing on what happens first (school) or afterwards (distribution and jobs). This book will be useful to film students from high school through college and graduate school.

For more information contact Sayre Maxfield, *The Film Students' Handbook*, 26 Waverly Street #105, Boston, Massachusetts 02135.

American Anthropological Association
PROGRAM IN ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM
1703 New Hampshire Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20009

