



Ethnographic Film: Failure and Promise

Author(s): David MacDougall

Source: *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 7 (1978), pp. 405-425

Published by: [Annual Reviews](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2155700>

Accessed: 27-02-2015 16:42 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Annual Reviews is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Annual Review of Anthropology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM: FAILURE AND PROMISE

◆9620

David MacDougall

Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra,
A.C.T. 2601, Australia

Ethnographic films cannot be said to constitute a genre, nor is ethnographic film-making a discipline with unified origins and an established methodology. Since the first conference on ethnographic film was held at the Musée de l'Homme 30 years ago, the term has served a largely emblematic function, giving a semblance of unity to extremely diverse efforts in the cinema and social sciences. A canon of ethnographic films has gradually emerged, and in the past dozen years a movement has grown up nourished by foundation grants, further international conferences, theoretical publications, and training programs.

Faced with defining ethnographic film, some writers (7, 14) have concluded that one can only say some films are more ethnographic than others, or that films become ethnographic by virtue of their use (37, 38). Since all films are cultural artifacts, many can tell us as much about the societies that produced them as about those they purport to describe. Films can thus serve as a source of data for social science in the manner of myths, rock paintings, and government papers. From World War II onwards, fiction as well as documentary films have been studied sporadically for their ethnographic content (2, 5, 16, 35).

In practice, most discussions of ethnographic film set aside films useful to anthropologists as naive cultural documents and narrow the field to those made with some discernible intention of recording and revealing cultural patterns. Some writers, including Rouch (27) and de Heusch (8), have refused to pursue further distinctions, arguing that to do so is to inhibit the cross-fertilization of varied approaches. Others (1, 12, 14, 18-20, 25, 31)

405

0084-6570/78/1015-0405\$01.00

have marked out taxonomic, functional, or stylistic categories within ethnographic film. Leroi-Gourhan (18), for example, has divided the field into research films, general audience films of some ethnographic interest, and films of purely exotic intentions. Asch, Marshall & Spier (1) have created the terms Objective Recording, Scripted Filming, and Reportage to identify broad subcategories. Very often, however, the most complex and influential works function on several levels and defy such strict classification.

One distinction that remains useful in discussions of the field is that between *ethnographic footage* and *ethnographic films*. Films are structured works made for presentation to an audience. They make manifest within themselves the analysis that justifies such a presentation. Films are analogous in this sense to an anthropologist's public writings or to any other creative or scholarly productions. Footage, on the other hand, is the raw material that comes out of a camera, and no such expectations attach to it. It can perhaps best be compared to an anthropologist's field notes and may be used for a variety of purposes, including the making of films.

The work of Félix-Louis Regnault stands as the type and earliest example of ethnographic film footage. In 1895, the same year that the Lumière brothers held the world's first public film screenings, Regnault filmed the pottery-making techniques of a Wolof woman at the Exposition Ethnographique de l'Afrique Occidentale in Paris. Ethnographic film is thus as old as the cinema, which itself arose out of the research apparatus invented by Eadweard Muybridge and Étienne-Jules Marey to photograph human and animal locomotion. Regnault (17) published a scientific paper based on his film record, which clearly differentiated his aims from those of the Lumières, for whom film was primarily a commercial novelty. He regarded the camera as a laboratory instrument that could fix transient human events for further analysis, and he went so far as to predict that ethnography would only attain the precision of a science through the use of such instruments (26, p. 437). The celluloid strip with its chemical emulsion was to be the fixing medium of anthropology.

Commercial film directors like Méliès and Porter soon turned the Lumières' cinema of visual bonbons into a narrative medium. In 1914 Edward Curtis produced a story film¹ played by Kwakiutl actors in authentically reconstructed Kwakiutl surroundings, and in 1922 Robert Flaherty released *Nanook of the North*. Flaherty's work resembled Curtis's in its attempt to reconstruct a traditional culture, but in other respects it was fundamentally different. Flaherty did not emphasize the dramatic conven-

¹Originally entitled *In the Land of the Head Hunters*, Curtis's film was restored and reissued in 1973 as *In the Land of the War Canoes* with a soundtrack of Kwakiutl dialogue and music prepared by Bill Holm, George I. Quimby, and David Gerth.

tions that had by this time reached such sophistication in fictional films (6, p. 7). His sophistication was of a more conceptual kind. In place of a smoothly running story line is a procession of loosely linked observations, reflecting his fascination with technology and his joy in the revelation of personality through spontaneous behavior. The film becomes a construct of texts about Eskimo life and character, centered around themes of cultural dignity and ingenuity. In contrast to Curtis's film, *Nanook* is manifestly an exploration of the society itself.

The work of Regnault and Flaherty defines alternative tendencies in ethnographic film that have persisted to the present day. For those working in the tradition of Regnault the camera has been regarded primarily as an instrument for gathering cultural data. The process of analyzing the data has remained largely external to the footage itself. For Flaherty and his followers, film has not only provided a means of recording human behavior but also of leading the viewer through its intricacies according to some system of communicative logic.

ETHNOGRAPHIC FOOTAGE

The gathering of ethnographic footage has taken two major forms: *research footage*, made to serve specific scientific inquiries, and *record footage*, made to provide more general documents for archiving and future research. A comparatively recent phenomenon is the production of ethnographic footage for teaching purposes.

Research footage permits the study and measurement of behavior that cannot be approached adequately through direct observation. The most obvious beneficiaries of this resource are the disciplines that have grown up around cultural patterning and communicative aspects of body movement. These include proxemics, pioneered by Edward T. Hall, Ray Birdwhistell's kinesics, the choreometrics of Alan Lomax and his associates, and studies of facial expression by Ekman, Eibl-Eibesfeldt, and others. A major attempt to gather research footage on a multidisciplinary basis was undertaken in the Project in Human Communication at Bronx State Hospital. Video cameras were placed in households and the signals transmitted to a central control studio, where the data was subjected to a battery of analytical procedures, studying dominance and authority, territoriality, demonstrations of affection, and other aspects of behavior (29).

The successful use of research footage often requires painstaking frame-by-frame analysis. In some studies where the emphasis is upon the internal dynamics of behavior, film can provide data in the form of case studies; in others where it is upon repetitive patterns, film can provide extensive data for cross-cultural analysis. The controls necessary in the case-study method

usually encourage researchers to produce their own footage. In some cross-cultural studies researchers have been able to make do with footage drawn from other sources. In this way a secondary kind of research footage comes into existence through its specialized use.

One of the most extensive projects of recent years to exploit the possibilities of research footage has been the Choreometrics Project, which treats dance as a formal manifestation of the movement styles that permeate other cultural activities. To provide a world sample of dance forms the project has drawn upon a wide assortment of materials found in documentary, fiction, and archival film. It has thus opened to study one form of human cultural expression as a coherent, modulated system, making use of information which in most cases went unrecognized at the time it was recorded.

Regnault's early work focused upon African movement styles, and for many years the use of research footage was limited to studies of physiology and technological aspects of culture. The breakthrough to new uses occurred in 1936–38 with Bateson & Mead's famous study of Balinese character formation (3), which demonstrated the potential of film for analyzing interpersonal relationships. Still and motion picture cameras were used to gather data on social interaction in general and parent-child interaction in particular. As the project progressed, filming was directed toward documentation of increasingly specific behavioral situations. Some of the possibilities suggested by the Bali project have been pursued in laboratory settings, as in the interpretation of family therapy interviews at the Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute, using film techniques developed by Jacques Van Vlack.

Other researchers have continued to apply film to field situations. A recent study by Sorenson (32) is the result of sustained dedication to film as a medium for research. Sorenson's early work with Gajdusek at the National Institutes of Health compiled a research footage collection to investigate child growth and development and the clinical manifestations of *kuru*, a degenerative neurological disease of the eastern New Guinea highlands. Sorenson later used research filming to test hypotheses about personality development derived from an examination of footage shot among the Fore, who had been among the original groups studied for *kuru*. From further research in which film has played a major part, Sorenson has argued that the childhood learning of the Fore has aided their successful adaptation to new economic and demographic patterns.

The term *record footage* applies to material made for more broadly descriptive purposes than material produced as research footage. To anthropologists, and to others conscious of the mutability of cultures, photographic records appear to offer a means of preserving some irreducible embodiment of societies that will vanish or undergo radical change. A film

record is not the thing it records, but as a direct photochemical imprint it shares in its reality in a way that written descriptions cannot. As Susan Sontag has remarked (30, p. 25), Bardolators would prefer, if it were possible, an almost illegible photograph of Shakespeare to a detailed portrait by Holbein the Younger. Much record footage has been devoted to compiling inventories of culture, and film records always hold out the possibility that, like lumps of charcoal collected years ago, they may reveal things to us we never expected.

The making of record footage goes back to 1898, when A. C. Haddon included a Lumière camera in the scientific kit of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Straits. Like Regnault, Haddon had great hopes for film as an aid to anthropology, but primarily as a medium for general ethnographic documentation. Despite his influence, record filming was not widely adopted as a standard fieldwork activity. Most anthropologists who continued to shoot film did so in much the same spirit that they took still photographs—occasionally, and often almost as a respite from what they considered their legitimate work.

The value of film records as a resource for anthropology was more widely acknowledged with the acceleration of social change that accompanied World War II. In the postwar years a number of projects revived Haddon's concern for systematic anthropological filming. During the Peabody-Harvard-Kalahari expeditions of 1950–59, John Marshall shot more than 500,000 feet of 16 mm color film on Bushman culture, producing what remains the most comprehensive visual ethnography of any traditional preliterate society. During the same period the *Encyclopaedia Cinematographica* was established at the Institut für den Wissenschaftlichen Film at Göttingen. One of its aims was to acquire and preserve carefully chosen "thematic units" of human behavior. At the University of California, Samuel Barrett directed a program to film the food-gathering techniques of American Indians, and in Australia in the mid-1960s Roger Sandall, working with the anthropologist Nicolas Peterson, embarked on a project to film Aboriginal ritual for the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. Another project primarily devoted to recording Aboriginal material culture in the Western Desert was carried out in the same period by Ian Dunlop of the Australian Commonwealth Film Unit with the anthropologist Robert Tonkinson; and with Maurice Godelier, Dunlop later produced *Towards Baruya Manhood*, a detailed record of initiation in the New Guinea highlands.

Out of some of these projects came films as well as record footage, the result of processes of selection and interpretation that became increasingly necessary at the time of filming in order to represent complex events. It is perhaps ironic that many of these films are far better known than the

extensive footage the projects were designed to gather. Sandall's films on Aboriginal ritual are widely used in anthropology teaching, and a number have received awards at film festivals, but his carefully prepared archive footage about the same rituals is rarely consulted.

Education rather than research has been the financial mainspring of much ethnographic film activity in recent years, as shown by the rapid expansion of Heider's listing (15) of films for anthropology teaching.² It has made possible projects whose significance for the field goes well beyond the classroom. Generous foundation funding for curriculum development led to the filming of the Netsilik Eskimo series, directed by Asen Balikci in 1963–65 as part of the elementary school program *Man: A Course of Study*. This was the first of several projects designed to immerse students in another culture and provide them with the materials for deriving principles of social behavior. The Netsilik project was an historical reconstruction in that Balikci had asked his subjects to resume their precontact technology, but it made use of the very latest film technology of light-weight cameras and synchronous tape recorders. The resulting footage was a revelation to anthropologists and ethnographic film-makers for its intimate and uninterrupted camera takes of interpersonal behavior, as was De Vore's footage of primate behavior made for the same project.

When the Netsilik material appeared very little of John Marshall's !Kung Bushman material of the 1950s had been seen except for *The Hunters*. Few people were aware that in recording intimate events he had in many ways anticipated the achievements of the Netsilik project. Marshall now began to edit some of this material into a series of segments for anthropology teaching, drawing upon extended sequences showing structured social incidents. Timothy Asch, who worked with Marshall in editing the !Kung material, wished to apply the pedagogical ideas he and Marshall had developed to the initial filming process, and with Napoleon Chagnon he has done so with over 50 film sequences on the Yānomamö of southern Venezuela. Marshall went on to produce an analogous project on the Pittsburgh police—ostensibly for legal and law enforcement studies, but as he views it, also as an ethnography of the police. These projects have at the very least given the collection of visual records an immediate utility. They have also shifted the emphasis of record-making from an impersonal cataloging of cultural features toward culture perceived through individual lives.

Of the other film material shot over the years by anthropologists in the field, little is available either for research or teaching. Where it has all gone, no one knows: much of it, certainly, into attics, trunks, and dustbins, and

²Further information on most of the films mentioned in this paper can be found in Heider's publication.

a smaller proportion into film archives. Only a few fragments of Haddon's Torres Straits footage have survived to the present day, and Baldwin Spencer's footage of 1901 and 1912 from Central and Northern Australia lay forgotten in its original containers at the National Museum of Victoria until it was rediscovered in the 1960s (9). The New Guinea footage of the anthropologist Paul Wirz, some of it dating from 1918, was finally archived in 1975, although it had been described by Wirz's son in a UNESCO survey made in 1966 as existing "at my mother's house (in Switzerland)" (39, p. 43). By 1975 much of the deteriorating 35 mm nitrate original had already been burned as a fire hazard. Even properly archived ethnographic film material remains largely unknown to anthropologists and unused by them, in part as a result of its dispersal in different countries and the lack of adequate catalogs and study facilities.

For at least a decade, and particularly since the Belmont Conference of 1970, there have been sustained efforts by some anthropologists in the United States to create a repository and study center for the nation's scattered and imperiled ethnographic film resources. These efforts culminated in the establishment of the National Anthropological Film Center at the Smithsonian Institution in 1975. The Center has begun to search out existing material for deposit on the basis of a World Ethnographic Film Sample, has embarked upon the gigantic task of compiling a National Union Catalogue of Anthropological Film, and has begun a training program for ethnographic film-makers from developing countries. It has also become involved in generating new footage, much of it in collaboration with independently funded projects.³ The Center is perhaps the best hope for making film records available to anthropological research; but its resources will inevitably remain strained by the effort to fulfill so many diverse functions.

Increased archival activities and research projects using film have raised questions about methods of collecting and documenting record footage. Much footage has been found to be useless for research because of the ways in which older conventions of cinematography fragmented temporal and spacial relationships, or because footage has not been properly documented. Some cross-cultural studies are frustrated because no one has happened to film certain cultural features in adequate detail. The situation is reminiscent of the problems faced by anthropology in the nineteenth century before basic field methods were brought into common use by successive revisions of *Notes and Queries on Anthropology* and the contributions of Malinowski and Rivers (34). The guidelines developed in the 1950s by Gotthard Wolf

³These projects have included studies of child behavior among the Canela Indians of Brazil, the Agnicayana Vedic ritual in southern India, the Pashtoon nomads of Afghanistan, and Micronesian life and culture in the Western Caroline Islands.

and the Institut für den Wissenschaftlichen Film took a step toward new scientific standards for the selection and recording of behavioral items, but at the risk of being excessively reductionist about culture.

Sorenson & Jablonko (33) recently have proposed a general model for gathering visual records. Although they acknowledge that it is impossible to predict what data may finally prove significant, they suggest that a tripartite strategy of sampling techniques based upon intuitive, planned, and semirandomized responses to social phenomena will greatly improve future research possibilities. These techniques are termed Opportunistic Sampling, Programmed Sampling, and Digressive Search. The method seeks to transcend the limitations of the individual observer and fashions in anthropology by ensuring that the varied means by which human beings acquire knowledge are brought into full play.

The Sorenson-Jablonko model presupposes that different forms of sampling can offset one another's deficiencies, but it cannot overcome any major cultural bias that may dominate all three forms of sampling in an individual observer. A more formidable difficulty with any global system of ethnographic documentation is its obligation to cover a broad spectrum of cultural features. Out of the endless possibilities that present themselves to an observer, to say nothing of those that may be uncovered through particular research interests, only a small proportion can be filmed. The camera can never be everywhere at once, and multiple cameras become hopelessly intrusive. The problem immediately becomes apparent when one tries to film the full ramifications of even one simple social event. Sampling techniques tend to discourage filming the complexities of social experience as they might appear to the participants, and this can leave a significant gap in our understanding. The danger lies not so much in the limitations of such methods as in the seductive belief that they can record all that really matters about human societies. As in anthropology itself, ethnographic filming must balance attempts at comprehensive documentation with intimate explorations of particular phenomena.

ETHNOGRAPHIC FILMS

Ethnographic film-making owes as much to the rapidly evolving forms of the cinema as does written anthropology to styles of scientific discourse that have developed over several centuries. The cinema inherited dramatic and literary conventions, and almost from the start the narrative efficiency of words (at first in the form of titles) vied with that of photographic images. The story-teller's voice still retains a hold upon documentary films in the form of spoken commentary, but in dramatic films it has largely dropped away, leaving language to the dialogue of fictional characters. This differ-

ence in the employment of language has produced one film tradition in which images illustrate a verbal argument and another tradition in which the images (in the sound film including spoken dialogue) must carry the burden of revealing a coherent line of development. Ethnographic films span both traditions and can thus be seen as either illustrative or revelatory in approach, the first form obviously bearing the closer resemblance to written anthropology.

Illustrative ethnographic films make use of images either as data to be elucidated by means of a spoken commentary or as visual support for verbal statements. The form has often lent itself to misuse, since a plausible narration script can often impart authority to the most fragmentary images. That possibility has encouraged the gathering of attractive but disconnected material and the creation of "films" out of material which does little to substantiate the assertions of the commentary. At its worst it produces the illustrated lectures familiar in travelogues and classroom films. It is at its best in providing analyses of behavioral patterns, as in de Vore's films on primate social organization or the film on proxemics, *Invisible Walls*; surveys of individual societies, such as *Mokil* and *Miao Year*; or films on ritual or other formalized events, such as *Masai Manhood*, *The Cows of Dolo Ken Paye*, and *Trobriand Cricket*. It can also serve to demonstrate theoretical findings, as in Lomax and Paulay's *Dance and Human History*.

In illustrative films verbal analysis provides what James Blue has called the film's "transport mechanism." Revelatory films, on the other hand, require the viewer to make a continuous interpretation of both the visual and verbal material articulated by the film-maker. Voice-over narration need not make images wholly illustrative in character provided the voice is an integral part of the subject matter. Thus Preloran's *Imaginero* gives us the spoken autobiography of its protagonist, Hermogenes Cayo, and Wright's *Song of Ceylon* utilizes the commentary of the seventeenth century traveler Robert Knox as a "found" object.

Revelatory films very often follow the chronological structures perceived in events. A classic example on a large scale is Cooper & Schoedsack's film of 1925, *Grass*, which traces a Bakhtiari migration of thousands of people to their highland pastures. Rouch's *Jaguar* chronicles a journey of young rural Africans to the Westernized world of the coastal cities and back again. Usually the events are more circumscribed: a ceremony (*Larwari and Wal-kara*), a ritualized event (*The Feast; The Wedding Camels*), or a small episode of social interaction (*Debe's Tantrum*).

Sometimes a chronological narrative provides the transport mechanism that links discontinuous material (Flaherty's *Moana*, Birtles's *Coorab in the Island of Ghosts*). In *The Hunters* a single hunt is synthesized out of different hunting expeditions, and in Gardner's *Dead Birds* the attack and

counter-attack of cyclical raiding is seen through the experiences of two of the people affected by it.

Social processes that occur over long periods of time, or other aspects of culture that do not yield to narrative exploration, may require more conceptual film structures. *Nanook* is an early attempt in this direction. *Rivers of Sand* examines socially regulated sexual exploitation through the toll it takes upon individuals. In *Kenya Boran* an attempt is made to reveal long-term consequences of social change through the conversations and behavior of persons who occupy different positions in the social and historical matrix. *The Path*, which deals with an event that would ordinarily invite conventional narrative treatment, instead presents the Japanese tea ceremony through filmic devices designed to convey its meaning for the participants.

Ethnographic films have been profoundly influenced in recent years by the ideas and techniques of observational cinema that arose out of *cinéma vérité* in the early 1960s and the British Free Cinema movement of the preceding decade. Lightweight synchronous sound cameras and film stocks of increased sensitivity made it possible to film almost anywhere with a minimum of disturbance to those being filmed. A new dimension of private, informal behavior was opened up to patient and discreet film-makers like Richard Leacock and Michel Brault. The Netsilik Eskimo series first dramatized the possibilities of this approach for ethnographic film, making apparent the curious veil that earlier films had drawn across the observation of people in their daily lives.

Observational filming, using synchronous sound, emphasized the spontaneous dialogue of the film subjects rather than a commentary spoken by the film-maker or anthropologist—or more often some anonymous reportorial voice. Already, documentary films made in our own society had included such conversations as a major element (*Primary, Pour la suite du monde*), but in the Netsilik films we began to listen to a language we could not understand. It became obvious that in these films we lacked direct access to information and to an expression of intellectual and emotional life that we took for granted in films about our own culture. Subtitles translating indigenous dialogue made their appearance in *The Feast* and *To Live With Herds*; and in some recent ethnographic films (*Kenya Boran, The Wedding Camels, Naim and Jabar, The Mursi*) both filming and editing have been largely determined by the dialogue of the subjects. Subtitling cannot convey all the nuances of speech apparent to a native speaker, but it seems the most efficient and least objectionable method of bringing literate audiences into the verbal world of other peoples. It has even been adopted in ethnographic films for television, largely through the influence of Brian Moser, the producer of the *Disappearing World* series in Great Britain.

Speech, of course, reflects personality as well as culture. Synchronous sound has helped to reveal the range and diversity of personality types that can exist within cultural norms. In Asch & Chagnon's material on Dedeheiwä we gain an insight into the personal world of the shaman. In *Rivers of Sand*, *Lorang's Way*, and *The Spirit Possession of Alejandro Mamani* we meet people unreconciled to what others in their society accept, sharpening by contrast the cultural elements under examination. As Flaherty realized, to show individuals coping with problems is one way of affirming their dignity and the rationality of their choices. Some assessments of the effects of ethnographic films upon students (13) suggest that access to the intellectual life of individuals in unfamiliar societies may be an essential step in recognizing their humanity.

At first the intimacy afforded by lightweight camera equipment created euphoria among film-makers, who saw in it a means of extending an inquiry into the real world that had previously been possible only in the realm of fiction. The camera continued to be treated stylistically as it had been in dramatic films: as a privileged, invisible presence. To some anthropologists this approach promised records "of people doing precisely what they would have been doing if the camera were not there" (11, p. 1). But observational filming also prepared the way for undermining the conception of cinema as disembodied observation. It became increasingly clear that the illusion of authorial invisibility could lead to a false interpretation of the behavior on the screen, and films like Tanya Ballentyne's *The Things I Cannot Change* and Shirley Clark's *Portrait of Jason* highlighted the way in which behavior stimulated by the camera could become a dominant effect. Some film-makers came to believe that their films should not only be revelatory, but also self-revelatory, containing evidence of the encounter which had produced them.

One can see the shift taking place in *Lonely Boy*, a film made by the National Film Board of Canada in 1961. An interview scene apparently shot to be condensed through conventional editing (in which the owner of the Copacabana orders his waiters around and chats with the film crew) is included in the film intact. It is perhaps there partly for its novelty, but it has the larger effect of turning the film upon itself and raising questions about how films deal with reality. Rouch and Morin's *Chronique d'un été*, made at about the same time, dealt explicitly with these questions and has affected the course of both ethnographic and documentary film-making. It has become more difficult to think of ethnographic films as definitive representations of events, independent of the process that produced them, and ethnographic film-makers have begun to look upon their work as more tentative forays into cultural complexity, in which individual films become parts of a continuing inquiry. Such thinking has led to the gradual emer-

gence of the film-as-text, discussed below. It has also meant that larger bodies of material, like the Asch-Chagnon Yānomamö corpus, can now be read as metafilms whose content can be endlessly rearranged to yield new insights.

The most important aspect of the observational approach is that it represents an effort to pierce through the individualistic reconstructions of reality that once characterized documentary film style in order to bring audiences closer to events as independent witnesses. Through the use of unbroken camera takes which replace the synthesis and condensation of film editing, film-makers seek to respect the temporal and spacial integrity of events. Even so, filming does not become a simple, objective process. The camera, through its positioning and framing, continues to see selectively, and the burden of interpretation falls with a new immediacy upon the film-maker at the time of filming. Observation of informal, nonrecurring events precludes shooting scenes from a variety of angles or shooting them more than once. The manipulation of the camera thus comes to reflect a particular sensibility and process of thought. In responding to the flow of interpersonal behavior, the film-maker irrevocably defines and shapes the meaning of relationships that will be perceived by the audience. That process requires the same depth of understanding that informs all good anthropology.

FILM AND WRITTEN ANTHROPOLOGY

Ethnographic film has always produced a fascination that seems disproportionate to taking the measure of human societies. Photographic images capture a wealth of detail that an observer can only begin to describe and make possible a way of physically possessing external reality, not merely possessing knowledge about it. At first anthropologists acquired images much as they acquired objects for museums: records of technology, of dances, and of physiognomy and musculature. Stocker went so far as to film his subjects copulating for the camera.

In 1900, after his return from the Torres Straits, Haddon wrote to his friend Baldwin Spencer, enthusiastically describing the motion picture camera as “an indispensable piece of anthropological apparatus.” Perhaps few anthropologists would make so sweeping a claim today, but the sentiment typifies the hopes that have periodically been held out for ethnographic film.

Morin, writing in 1962, reaffirmed the suitability of film for recording what he termed intensive, ceremonial, and technical sociality, but added:

There is the rest, the most difficult, the most moving, the most secret: wherever human feelings are involved, wherever the individual is directly concerned, wherever there are inter-personal relationships of authority, subordination, comradeship, love, hate—in other words, everything connected with the *emotive fabric of human existence*. There lies the great *terra incognita* of the sociological or ethnological cinema (23, p.4).

Jean Rouch had begun to explore some of these possibilities in his West African films of the 1950s. In *Les maîtres fous* the emotional significance of an urban cult ritual is suggested through reference to the daily experience of the participants as colonial subjects. Gardner's *Dead Birds*, filmed in 1961, attempted even more explicitly to identify the relationships between human psychological needs and cultural forms. These films did not, however, establish a theoretical framework or methodology for ethnographic film-making as a discipline. Both Rouch and Gardner worked in a personal and often intuitive manner—a circumstance which failed to provide an academically acceptable path for anthropologists to follow. Nor were the films themselves easily assimilated as contributions to anthropological knowledge. They were often admired by anthropologists for their insights, but they were almost equally often dismissed in the same breath as works of “art” rather than science.

Neither Rouch nor Gardner have sought to defend the contributions made by their films in conventional anthropological terms, but both have expressed a belief in the power of film to communicate across cultural frontiers. To Rouch this power is elusive, and his references to it are elliptical:

There are a few rare moments when the filmgoer suddenly understands an unknown language without the help of sub-titles, when he participates in strange ceremonies, when he finds himself walking in towns or across terrain that he has never seen before but that he recognizes perfectly . . . (27, p. 89).

Rouch's efforts have gone into extending these moments from brief episodes to entire films, cultivating a gift which, as he has remarked, sometimes comes to “masters, fools, and children” (27, p. 90).

In 1957 Gardner explained the approach as a form of mimesis:

If it was possible . . . to render a realistic account in film of some seemingly remote experience, then these capacities [of sharing experience] might reasonably be expected to produce reactions in those who saw it which, in meaningfulness, had some approximation to the feelings of those to whom the experience actually belonged (10, p. 347).

The value of at least one form of ethnographic film was thus seen to lie in a communication of indigenous perspectives which might illuminate more formally derived knowledge. Such films gave access to the interior world of people who had previously been shown only as objects of research.

By the mid-1960s ethnographic film seemed to its partisans to offer anthropology a scientific technology and an opening toward avenues of research that might serve as a corrective to narrow scholasticism. The expectation arose that anthropology might evolve from a discipline of words into one embracing the perceptions of a visual medium, and that film would finally attain the importance in the mainstream of anthropology that the early pioneers had predicted for it.

No such revolution has yet taken place. Ethnographic film-making has not become a significant occupation of anthropologists themselves, nor have films affected the broader conceptualization of anthropology. Considering only the record-making potential of ethnographic film, Margaret Mead has called its history a "wretched picture of lost opportunities" (21, p. 4) blaming her discipline for "our gross and dreadful negligence" (p. 6).

In retrospect, the recent disappointment of hopes for a rapprochement between film and anthropology seems only a further episode in a chronic complaint. Over 40 years ago, toward the end of his career, Regnault (25) deplored the indifference to scientific uses of film that followed his early efforts. The example set by Bateson & Mead, while it stimulated widespread interest, produced no surge of comparable projects. De Brigard (7) and Mead (21) have examined possible reasons for the reluctance of anthropologists to employ film. Some of these are technical: that film-making is too costly, too intrusive, and too difficult. Others are practical and historical: that film techniques in the early years were inappropriate to the shifting concerns of anthropology, nor could they assist anthropologists in salvage ethnography conducted through interviews with informants. Mead views most of these explanations as rationalizations. She blames anthropologists for their conservatism, arguing that they have selfishly sacrificed a research tool of immense potential to maintain an orthodoxy of words in which they feel secure and competent.

The tenor of this argument is not that anthropologists were behaving rationally, but that they were too timid, too lazy, and too self-indulgent to seize upon the benefits of film. But it is perhaps these very benefits that require further examination. In its attributes as a medium, and in the models it offers for communication, what possible use can film be to anthropologists? In a recent review of an ethnographic film an anthropologist remarks:

The analysis of ethnography requires the probing of a complex of minute particularities in a search for demonstrable connections; it is always tentative and demands detachment, openness and uncertainty. The bossy one-eyedness and distorting beauty of film, on the other hand, seeks to simplify, disarm, and impose (4, p. 7).

The description of anthropological method may be idealized here and the view of film unduly harsh, for we know that films often render the specific at the expense of the general; but in his impatience the reviewer correctly identifies the difficulty that anthropologists have in reconciling the observations of film and its forms of discourse to those they customarily employ. The same reviewer writes:

I confess to a feeling of unease about any film which aspires to be more than a simple record or an animated teaching aid, because there is a basic incompatibility between the purposes of anthropology and the aims of film. Each seeks quite different aspects of truth and utilizes quite different means of stitching scraps of culture together creatively (4, p. 7).

This may be a polite way of excusing the deficiencies of many films, but it also expresses an inclination among anthropologists to locate the aspirations of ethnographic film in familiar territory. If anthropologists have consistently rejected film as an analytical medium, and if they have themselves often relegated it to subordinate record-making and didactic roles, the reason may not be merely conservative reluctance to employ a new technology but a shrewd judgment that the technology entails a shift in perspective which raises major problems for scientific conceptualization. The incompatibility need not necessarily be one of attitudes, for both anthropologists and film-makers can respect the particularities of culture and accept reversals of their preconceptions. Rather, it lies in a discontinuity of modes of description and discourse.

The discontinuity arises first on the descriptive level. There is a profound difference between viewing photochemically produced images of objects and reading the signs of written language that represent them. The sign is at once undifferentiated compared to the image, which remains specific and continually asserts complexities that defy simple interpretation. Film images thus pose a challenge to the processes of language that classify objects and behavioral acts.

There are other important differences of context and articulation. In anthropological writing information is conveyed serially. Each item appears in isolation, already stripped, as it were, for anthropological action. There is little possibility of transmitting simultaneously a cluster of associated items. The effect of simultaneity ("the milking pot rests on the knee"; "the woman sings while the child plays") is a product of creative reconstruction. In ordering descriptive items, the writer draws upon a comprehensive mental image which is already organized conceptually. The choices made, however unintentionally, establish an emphasis ("the child plays while the woman sings") which is of a different order from that imparted by the selective techniques of cinematography. While it may be possible for an anthropologist to cite data throwing doubt upon his or her analysis, even to do so is to reinforce the conceptual framework that produced the description.

Description in these terms is really a misnomer when applied to film. Films present images for our inspection, and the information contained in them is described only in the sense that a circle is described by a pair of compasses. The film-maker marks out the boundaries within which the

objects of analysis can be found. These objects preserve their individuality and remain embedded in a context which presents itself as a continuum to the viewer.

Film is not of course without codes of signification, but its discourse is perhaps best described as a reflection of shifting attention rather than the direct representation of thought that in everyday life we associate with language. Even the most selective tool of cinematography, the close-up, leaves the object connected to the world around it, which extends beyond the edges of the frame. It may contain as much information as a wider shot, only in a narrower field. Film editing creates meaning by implying relationships between the content of shots, as does the movement of the camera from one field to another; but with both techniques the connotations of the material for the viewer may override its denotative meaning or the significance being attached to it by the film-maker. Film images do not constitute a lexicon of the kind available to the anthropological writer, nor can they be organized with the same grammatical assurance.

As film-making tends toward longer unbroken camera takes (sequence shots), film-makers find themselves dealing with passages of material in which different objects of signification vie increasingly for attention. A shift in the relationship between two people may be masked for the viewer by more intensive activities occurring within the shot. This kind of perceptual "noise" is overcome in fiction films through scripting that excludes distracting material. But the context of actual social intercourse is rarely so simple. The distraction may itself be of concern to the film, placing further demands upon its structural rhetoric.

Anthropologists have sensed these and kindred difficulties which make film so different from words in conveying information and ideas. In anthropological writing, data is held in suspension at the crucial moment to permit abstract expression; in film it is omnipresent. At the same time, film becomes attractive to anthropologists for its contextualization and rendering of data through means other than linguistic signs. This creates ambivalent attitudes toward ethnographic films which aspire to present a theoretical analysis by revelatory means, since that requires a manipulation of the data itself. It may also account for the fact that ethnographic films are more readily accepted by anthropologists when they keep data and analysis clearly separated in visual and verbal domains. But such a separation cannot finally allow ethnographic film to make its most distinctive contribution to the understanding of humanity. It is, after all, an articulation of witnessed human behavior that film can provide but written anthropology cannot. With that as an objective, the invention of new forms that balance the intellectual and informational potentialities of film becomes an urgent necessity for ethnographic film-makers.

THE FILM-AS-TEXT

The future development of ethnographic film is open to a number of strategies. Ruby (28) considers that the conventions of documentary film are altogether inappropriate to the practice of visual anthropology and has noted that "anthropologists do not regard ethnography in the visual mode with the same or analogous scientific expectations with which they regard written anthropology" (p. 104). He argues that ethnographic films must become more scientific, describing culture from clearly defined anthropological perspectives. Ethnographic film-makers must become more conscientious in revealing their methods and "employ a distinctive lexicon—an anthropological argot" (p. 107). In contrast to conceptions of ethnographic film that would settle for less, such a view asserts the primacy of film as a communicative system and holds out the hope of a visual anthropology as rigorous as the written anthropology that preceded it.

Ruby is certainly right in stating that films embody theoretical and ideological assumptions in their organization, and that film-makers should not only become conscious of that coding but make the forms of their work consonant with their analyses. But his proposal presupposes a rough semiotic equivalency between written anthropology and potential visual codes that would make a similar kind of discourse possible. It raises the question of whether a visual medium can express scientific statements about culture at all comparable to those that can be stated in words. If it cannot, the understandings communicated by film may always be radically different from those of anthropology and equally unacceptable to anthropologists.

Metz (22) and Wollen (36) have held that in film image-symbols can take on the characteristics of linguistic signs, but other studies⁴ in the semiology of the cinema suggest that film is neither lexical nor grammatical in a linguistic sense and that its communicative structures are constantly reinvented. If this is the case, the documentary conventions that Ruby refers to as inappropriate models for ethnographic film-making probably exist only as a backdrop for more complex, extragrammatical processes. The very structural flexibility of film may make scientific communication and the creation of a conventionalized anthropological visual argot doubtful possibilities.

Even if it were possible to devise codes that would allow film to approach the forms of written anthropology, one must ask whether such an approach would open up the most productive path for ethnographic film. Not only does film have capacities for revelation that differ from those of language,

⁴For an overview of these theories see articles by Pasolini, Eco, Abramson, and Nichols in Nichols (24).

but it provides an opportunity for interrogating the concept of scientific communication, which assumes that language is an instrument for transmitting messages that progressively delineate the external world. From fairly early on a few films have implicitly challenged that assumption, and such thinking has begun to transform the modern ethnographic film, leading to what may be called the ethnographic *film-as-text*.

Wollen (36) has recognized a parallel development in the cinema as a whole, arguing that film was a latecomer among the arts in repudiating the ideology of traditional aesthetics. While literature and painting were exploring their own communicative systems and assuming new forms that questioned the mediating role of the artist, film was still in the age of the nickelodeon. Only recently, in the work of Godard, Makavejev, Glauber Rocha, and others have film-makers attempted to create objects that exist as texts to be plumbed by the viewer. These films refute the notion that ideas about reality become suitable replacements for it. In place of the monologues of previous films they offer areas of inquiry. According to Wollen,

the text is thus no longer a transparent medium; it is a material object which provides the conditions for the production of meaning, within constraints which it sets itself. It is open rather than closed; multiple rather than single; productive rather than exhaustive. Although it is produced by an individual, the author, it does not simply represent or express the author's ideas, but exists in its own right. (36, p. 163).

If Wollen's examination of this approach had included ethnographic films, he would have found it expressed before the work of Godard in that of Flaherty and Rouch. The underlying insight of the film-as-text is that a film lies in conceptual space somewhere within a triangle formed by the subject, film-maker, and audience and represents an encounter of all three. *Nanook* has a methodological and structural complexity which permits it to transcend Flaherty's particular brand of romanticism. More than any of his later films, it represents a collaborative effort between the film-maker and his subjects to devise a rich and open-ended cultural document. In Rouch's *Moi un noir* and *Jaguar* the subjects play roles which arise out of their own experience and become a part of it. These films make available to the audience an interior world which interacts with the surface reality that the film-maker documents with his camera. In *Jaguar* a third element is added: the commentary of the subjects upon viewing the film, which places the public face of the film within the context of how it was made.

Chronique d'un été was probably Rouch's most important contribution to the methodology of the film-as-text. It explored the lives of a group of young Parisians and became an inquiry with them into the manner in which film affected and represented their own experience. What *Chronique*

achieved at one blow was the destruction of conventions that in traditional films sustain the film-maker's authority and bolster myths about the perfection of knowledge. Such conventions guard against access by either the subjects or audience to a film's sources and creation. In written anthropology perhaps they can be compared to the suppression of field notes in favor of neatly compiled data or, finally, a dissertation which appears as a product of pure thought, uncomplicated by struggle and praxis.

The film-as-text stimulates thought through a juxtaposition of elements, each of which bears a relationship to the intellectual framework of the inquiry. These elements may reveal information on how materials were gathered, provide alternative perspectives by the film's subjects, or present the evidence out of which the film proceeds. This produces a kind of filmic montage, but montage in which the contributing passages retain an internal life and are not reduced, as in the montage of Eisenstein, to the level of iconic signs. The result is a form of film-making in which observational cinema (or the cinema of duration advocated by Bazin and other Realist critics) can coexist with the generation of meaning through the collision of dissimilar materials.

An increasing number of recent ethnographic films display elements of this approach. In the use of sound alone, spoken narrative that would once have represented the film-maker's viewpoint has been replaced by indigenous commentary, as in Strand's *Mosori Monika*, Preloran's *Imaginerio*, and Eric Crystal's film on Toraja ritual, *Ma'bugi*. In Roger Sandall's *Coniston Muster*, Rouch's technique of using the film to elicit comments from his subjects is combined with a further juxtaposition of filmed remarks by the protagonists and observations of their behavior. And in *The Mursi*, a tripartite soundtrack contains the synchronous dialogue of the subjects (translated on the screen in subtitles), the film-maker's remarks on the relationship between the filming process and the situation as he found it, and an interpretive commentary by an anthropologist.

The juxtaposition of scenes as a conceptual device has been developed more fully in the documentary tradition than in ethnographic films, although *Song of Ceylon*, made over 40 years ago, employs it extensively and spans both categories. In *The Village* it is used to present for comparison the institutions of Irish peasant society, and in *To Live With Herds* it links the processes of nation-building to their effects upon the people of a pastoral society. Pierre Perrault and Michel Brault's films about the Québécois (*Pour la suite du monde*, *Un pays sans bon sens*) frequently compose fragments of conversation and action into cultural statements, and in one instance (*Le regne du jour*) use parallel editing to provide a comparison of French and French-Canadian culture.

Asch's *The Ax Fight* is a film about Yanomamö social conflict and about anthropological method, using five segments to provide separate perspectives on an event and its ethnographic translation. We see first the unedited film roll shot during the fight. This is followed over black screen by the sound recorded after the film ran out, including Asch and Chagnon's conversation about what has just happened—in which they are not only in doubt but jump to conclusions that later have to be revised. In two further segments, interpretations of the fight are given through manipulation of the original footage and the use of commentary over a kinship diagram. The film closes with a conventionally edited representation of the fight in which material is sometimes transposed to maintain continuity. Although the film shows us how only a portion of the information was actually gathered, it dramatically underscores the precariousness of anthropological understanding during fieldwork.

Unlike *The Ax Fight*, but like Perrault and Brault's films, *Kenya Boran* relies for its revelatory content primarily upon scenes of informal conversation. As a text for analysis, the film consists of a geometrical structure built upon the encounters of four persons: a traditional herdsman, a friend who is a minor government functionary, and their two sons, one of whom has received schooling and the other not. The behavior of each in relation to each of the others provides a separate axis upon which the audience can plot the values and constraints governing their differing lives. Through the convergence of these lines an image is presented of the choices that irrevocably separate people during periods of rapid social change.

Probably none of these films makes a scientific statement in purely filmic terms, but most raise anthropological questions that further examination of their contents can help to answer. They draw upon anthropological thought, but also upon the quite different means by which film-making can articulate the experience of the viewer.

The cinema, of which ethnographic film is a part, has become increasingly concerned with problems of evidence and methodology; and in recent films that eschew a scientific label, like Roger Graef's work on decision-making in the two British television series *The Space Between Words* and *Decision*, one can often find more thorough and original examinations of social phenomena than in those which assume the label of anthropology. Ethnographic film-making can now hardly return to the impressionism of the solitary artist, but it seems equally unlikely that it can abandon its intellectual roots in the cinema and veer toward a specialized scientific language. Film can never replace the written word in anthropology, but anthropologists are made conscious by their field experience of the limitations which words impose upon their discipline. We are beginning to discover how film can fill some of the blind spots.

Literature Cited

1. Asch, T., Marshall, J., Spier, P. 1973. Ethnographic film: structure and function. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 2:179-87
2. Bateson, G. 1943. Cultural and thematic analysis of fictional films. *Trans. NY Acad. Sci.* 5:72-78
3. Bateson, G., Mead, M. 1942. *Balinese Character: A Photographic Analysis*. NY Acad. Sci. 2
4. Baxter, P. T. W. 1977. The Rendille. *R. Anthropol. Inst. Newsl.* 20:7-9
5. Benedict, R. 1946. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
6. Cameron, E. 1975. Barnouw on documentary. *UFSC Newsl.* 5(5):1, 7
7. De Brigard, E. R. 1975. The history of ethnographic film. In *Principles of Visual Anthropology*, ed. P. Hockings, pp. 13-43. The Hague: Mouton. 527 pp.
8. De Heusch, L. 1962. The cinema and the social sciences: a survey of ethnographic and sociological films. *UNESCO Rep. Pap. Soc. Sci.* 16
9. Dunlop, I. 1967. *Retrospective Review of Australian Ethnographic Films (1901-1967)*. Lindfield (Aust.): Australian Commonwealth Film Unit
10. Gardner, R. 1957. Anthropology and film. *Daedalus* 86:344-52
11. Goldschmidt, W. 1972. Ethnographic film: definition and exegesis. *PIEF Newsl.* 3(2):1-3
12. Griaule, M. 1957. *Méthode de l'ethnographie*. Paris: Presses Univ. France
13. Hearn, P., DeVore, P. 1973. *The Netsilik and Yanomamö on film and in print*. Presented at Film Studies of Changing Man, Smithsonian Inst., Washington DC
14. Heider, K. G. 1976. *Ethnographic Film*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press. 166 pp.
15. Heider, K. G. 1977. *Films for Anthropological Teaching*. Washington: Am. Anthropol. Assoc. 187 pp. 6th ed.
16. Kracauer, S. 1947. *From Caligari to Hitler*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press
17. Lajard, J., Regnault, F.-L. 1895. Poterie crue et origine du tour. *Bull. Soc. Anthropol. Paris* 6:734-39
18. Leroi-Gourhan, A. 1948. Cinéma et sciences humaines: le film ethnographique existe-t-il? *Rev. Géogr. Hum. Ethnol.* 3:42-51
19. MacDougall, D. C. 1969. Prospects of the ethnographic film. *Film Q.* 23(2): 16-30
20. MacDougall, D. C. 1975. Beyond observational cinema. See Ref. 7, pp. 109-24
21. Mead, M. 1975. Visual anthropology in a discipline of words. See Ref. 7, pp. 3-10
22. Metz, C. 1974. *Film Language*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
23. Morin, E. 1962. Preface. *UNESCO Rep. Pap. Soc. Sci.* 16
24. Nichols, B., ed. 1976. *Movies and Methods*. Berkeley: Univ. California Press. 640 pp.
25. Regnault, F.-L. 1931. Le rôle du cinéma en ethnographie. *La Nature* 59:304-6
26. Rouch, J. 1968. Le film ethnographique. In *Ethnologie générale*, ed. J. Poirer, pp. 429-71. Paris: Gallimard
27. Rouch, J. 1975. The camera and man. See Ref. 7, pp. 83-102
28. Ruby, J. 1975. Is an ethnographic film a filmic ethnography? *Stud. Anthropol. Visual Commun.* 2(2):104-11
29. Schaeffer, J. H. 1975. Videotape: new techniques of observation and analysis in anthropology. See Ref. 7, pp. 253-82
30. Sontag, S. 1977. Photography unlimited. *NY Rev. Books* 24 (11):25-32
31. Sorenson, E. R. 1967. A research film program in the study of changing man. *Curr. Anthropol.* 8:443-69
32. Sorenson, E. R. 1976. *The Edge of the Forest*. Washington: Smithsonian Inst. Press
33. Sorenson, E. R., Jablonko, A. 1975. Research filming of naturally occurring phenomena: basic strategies. See Ref. 7, pp. 151-63
34. Urry, J. 1972. *Notes and Queries on Anthropology* and the development of field methods in British anthropology, 1870-1920. *Proc. R. Anthropol. Inst. G. Br. Irel.*, pp. 45-57
35. Weakland, J. H. 1975. Feature films as cultural documents. See Ref. 7, pp. 231-51
36. Wollen, P. 1972. *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press. 176 pp. 3rd ed.
37. Worth, S. 1969. The development of a semiotic of film. *Semiotica* 1:282-321
38. Worth, S. 1972. Toward the development of a semiotic of ethnographic film. *PIEF Newsl.* 3(3):8-12
39. Young, C., Carpenter, E. 1966. *Films Made by Americans in the Pacific Which Have Any Anthropological or Ethnographic Significance*. Presented at UNESCO Round Table on Ethnographic Film in Pacific Area, Sydney