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Alan Wardrope came back to Australia after several years with the American majors to an Australian film industry which was surprising itself with success, after many years in the doldrums.

"At last all that self-consciousness of things Australian had gone. The public was ready to accept the work of Australian film makers. But the story of Australian product doesn’t end there, I’m afraid. We’ve now got the same problem as other major producers—rising production budgets.

So, as Director Marketing and Distribution, the ball is very much at my feet to exploit the world market place.

Let’s face it, if we don’t start to internationalise our industry now, then we’ll have one of very limited dimension or worse, virtually none at all. By internationalise, I mean of course, Australian stories with widest possible appeal.

The Australian film that can re-coup its costs in the home market is becoming harder to guarantee.

"We’re going to Cannes this year with an unashamedly hard-sell approach. With the current worldwide shortage of good product, we’re in the best position yet to demonstrate that we’ve become a viable and reliable source of product supply. This year we’re presenting no fewer than sixteen features plus a carryover of product still available for some as yet unsold territories."

The Commission currently has an investment in around thirty-five projects at various stages of development. Allowing for natural wastage that should give us about twelve or so features for next year’s market. Now that’s something some American majors would be happy to achieve in today’s climate of bigger budgets and difficult market conditions."

"Closer to home we’ve still got a lot to do to maximise the market for our short educational and specialist films.

But right now, it’s Cannes with the biggest line-up of product Australia has ever presented."
My God! Didn't anyone ever tell this guy that the MOVIE BOOKSHOP is on the FIRST floor of the Crystal Palace arcade ...
IF YOU’RE IN FILM PRODUCTION, PROCESSING OR DISTRIBUTION, STUDY THIS SYMBOL

IT COULD SAVE YOU A LOT OF INSURANCE HEADACHES

Yours is a highly specialised business with insurance needs that most insurance sources in Australia don't fully understand.

The symbol is our Corporate logo; we are specialists in insurance for the entertainment industry. Here are some of the services and policies we offer.

**Film Producers Indemnity**

Protects you during the 'shooting period' against loss by interruption or abandonment of production due to health or injury problems with artists. Specific extensions can be tailored to suit your individual needs.

**Negative Film Risk Insurance**

Your company is protected against loss of or damage to the raw stock, exposed negatives, matrices, fine grain prints, positives, working prints and cutting copies — both mute and sound. We invariably include an extension to cover processing damage.

We also arrange policies covering: fire; burglary; multi-risk on film, cameras, projectors, props, sound equipment, etc. (either on an annual or short-term basis); comprehensive public risk; motor vehicle; workers compensation; personal accident; flights risk for aerial photography.

Because we're an independent broker, we can arrange the most competitive rates available. We have a long association with both local insurers and overseas markets including Lloyds of London, and through our Telex facilities we can provide rate quotations to suit your urgent needs.

Among productions we have insured are: ‘No. 96'; ‘Alvin Purple'; ‘Hogan in Singapore'; ‘Campus'; ‘Alvin Rides Again'; ‘End Play'; ‘Oz'; ‘Mad Dog'; ‘Eliza Frazer'; ‘Wake in Fright'; and many others.

Why not add your name to our list of satisfied clients?
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CROSS OF IRON
A SAM PECKINPAH Film
starring
JAMES COBURN
MAXIMILIAN SCHELL
JAMES MASON
DAVID WARNER
SENTA BERGER in the part of EVA

Screenplay by JULIUS J. EPSTEIN
Music composed and conducted by ERNEST GOLD
Produced by WOLF C. HARTWIG
Directed by SAM PECKINPAH
A Winitsky-Sellers/Rapid Film Production
An Anglo-German Co-Production Technicolor®
Distributed by EMI Film Distributors Limited.

Original Soundtrack Recording on EMI Records EDML 7892

EMI

JAMES COBURN as Sergeant Steiner
MAXIMILIAN SCHELL as Captain Shamrock
JAMES MASON as Colonel Brandt
DAVID WARNER as Captain Hesse
SENTA BERGER as Sister Eva
Leisure is an important aspect of life today. The pressures of urban living are placing new strains on the individual which leisure can release. Leisure can be immensely creative or insufferably dull. The choice of what we do with our leisure is ours.

The Australian cartoonist, Bruce Petty, has conceived a film which treats the subject with warmth, understanding and humour. He reaches a new peak of creativity with animation.

Industrialisation, according to Petty, has driven a wedge between work and leisure. All too often, leisure has become passive, inactive and uncreative. He poses the question: Have humans lost the art of leisure?

Petty vividly illustrates how leisure must break out of its time and space slot and occur spontaneously when people want it.
Bolex announces the H16EL, with a new kind of meter that is ultra sensitive to light changes and built for hard use.

A built-in light meter once turned even a ruggedly built pro camera into a delicate instrument. Enter the H16EL, with a silicon cell instead of the conventional CdS cell. Results: 1. Instant response to light variations. Shift from blinding light to deep shadow with perfect results. 2. No sensitivity to temperature variations. 3. No corrections needed, because of its straight response curve. 4. Equally responsive to all colours from blue to red.

Manual light measurements are made through the lens in the body of the camera so the camera can be fitted with any optics, including long telephotos, macro lenses, even extension tubes. For extreme changes of light, use a lens with built-in automatic exposure adjustment. Bayonet lens mount for quick and precise changes. So strong that you can carry the whole camera by the lens.

Film speeds 10-50 fps, single frame, reverse and crystal control are electronically regulated and are coupled automatically to the meter, with a selector knob rated from 10 right up to 630ASA. The motor is electronically controlled. When you stop, it stops. And the shutter closes. You can use your original film without having to cut frames from both ends of each take. The viewfinder has high brightness and 13x magnification, plus built-in comfort with either eye. Two red light diodes in the viewfinder indicate correct aperture. No waiting for a needle to settle down. The diaphragm of the new Vario-Switar 12.5-100mm f2 lens is fully open for accurate focusing and closes down automatically when you squeeze the button. Power is supplied by a Ni-Cd battery. Take your choice of two power packs, two chargers.

With the usual Bolex attention to detail, a full range of accessories is available, including a removable 400 foot magazine that is used with a take-up motor providing constant film tension. The whole unit is built like a tank. It is a rugged and reliable piece of gear that is as failsafe as Bolex know-how can make it, despite its light weight (about 7lbs for body and power pack).

The Bolex Shoulder brace provides excellent stability with good weight distribution, and frees the cameraman’s hands to operate camera and lens.
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search of Anna (produced by Natalie Miller, directed by Esben Storm); and $50,000 for The Rake and The Scarlet Pimpernel (both produced by Astans, directed by Bruce Beresford).

Before the establishment of the corporation; the Victorian government also invested directly in Break of Day (produced by Pat Lovell, and directed by Ken Hannam); and Raw Deal (produced by Russell Hagg and Patrick Loggwood - directed by Russell Hagg), as well as providing distribution finance for Fred Schepisi's The Devil's Playground.

New South Wales

The NSW Interim Film Commission is presently advertising for a chief executive officer. Sponsors are looking for someone who is required to have a wide knowledge of the production industry; a capacity to analyse and initiate film projects and packages; an ability to predict economic and foreign market trends; and, above all, to coroise business and creative aspects of film production; and to successfully negotiate on behalf of the corporation in joint ventures with producers, distribution agencies and private and public sector investors.

If the corporation finds anyone with these skills, it won't be long before he will be spiritual away to the boardrooms of Burbank and New York.

Meanwhile the Interim Commission's report was presented to the Premier on January 28, and the proposed legislation is now with the Attorney General. The Bill to set up the NSW Film Corporation is expected to be presented to Parliament in the Spring. The corporation has so far received 38 applications for financial assistance and it is believed that at least two investments will be approved before Easter.

Jenny Woods has been appointed acting project officer for the commission.

Queensland

Unfortunately the Queensland Film Corporation, which has been formed in the last week, has not yet opened. The National Party committee comprising Terry Archer (both North and Centre of Queensland); Allen Williams (Mary Williams Production); Brian Serson (the official state film officer) and Jim Ashley (Queensland Broadcasting Corp.); and Ron Archer (Queensland Film Commission); and National Party committee are not yet government. It is feared that in the Queensland Film Corporation it will be some time before anything happens.

South Australia

The South Australian Film Corporation is still trying to get on its feet with United Artists and the Australian Film Commission in the production of Peter Weir's The Last Wave, and are planning a new film for 1977-78. One, a prisoner of war drama, will be directed by Bruce Beresford and another on Gallipoli will be directed by Peter Weir. The AFC is also planning a series of co-productions with the ABC's tele movie partners Trans Atlantic Enterprises.

Under the leadership of Peter Rose, the AFC's main functions are being carried on. The company, which is considering a major take over, is doing box office in Adelaide (out-grossing King Kong) and is reported to have made considerable impact on overseas buyers. R.O.T.

THE CORPORATIONS

Victoria

The Victorian Film Corporation is reported to have finalized arrangements for Jill Robb - former marketing manager for the South Australian Film Corporation, to be director of the VFC.

Projects backed by the Victorian government through the corporation include: $76,000 for Summerfield (produced by Pat Lovell, directed by Ken Hannam); and $60,000 for
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NEW MARKETS

As Australian films continue to appeal overseas, news of an Australian film revival is spreading far and wide. And since Cinema Papers last listed the sales of Australian overseas (see issue 11, January 1977, p. 200) there have been several new developments.

David Waddington’s Barley, a disaster at the local box-office, has opened well for its distributor Columbia Pictures in Japan and Hong Kong. Picnic at Hanging Rock, which is still running in London in a West End cinema, has been sold to Holland, Finland and Spain.

In New Zealand, Goodbye Norma Jean is also doing well, having been released office and is about to go into release in Italy through Fair Play.

United Artists have invested in Peter Weir’s The Last Wave — the first investment by UA in a recent Australian feature — and have received distribution rights in advance for Australia, New Zealand, Europe, South and East Asia. It is understood that the French and German rights have also been pre-sold.

Break of Day will be the first Australian film to be distributed through Trans Croma, the Angelenes based competitor of Fly, which distribute features to most airlines, have bought the new Pat Lovell production, and Qantas will be the first airline to release it. Fantasm has been sold to the U.S., to Centerwest Films of Boston, and O2 has been acquired by the U.S., by Independent Films of Los Angeles (who last year bought Let The Balloon Go). Fantasm begins its American run in San Antonio, Texas on May 13.

Meanwhile prominent Paris based international agent, David James recently visited Australia to consider production of The Last Wave and Summerfield, which will be selling in Europe. Cinema Papers was able to have an exclusive interview with Seawell in the July issue.

Details of sales of Australian films and international interest is expected to be made available to Cinema Papers readers in the near future by the Australian Film Commission for regular publication, beginning next issue. A.I.G.

THE STING

Australian cinema admission prices are currently $1.80 and $1.50, and in a recent survey some Melbourne and Sydney cinemas in central and inner suburbs are charging as much as $7.50 to $9.00. Fortunately most cinemas have not followed suit, but it is true that the large independent exhibitors are still charging admission prices most expensive in the world.

In the U.S. a double bill of triple X rated cinemas in Broadway and Los Angeles which have been charging the same prices for many years — the average price for a seat in a first release is $3.50. In England, on the other hand, no run Broadway houses are, however, more expensive: Don Rugilo’s new Cinema S, for example, charges nothing for first year run films.

According to the New York based Morton Research Corporation, which has chartered the increase of average admission rates in U.S. cinemas from 1948 (when the average was 44 cents), the average admission for all U.S. cinemas in 1976 was $1.85 (suburban, cost $1.92, cost houses etc was $2.10). However, it is noted that the average admission rate in the U.S. is that many cinemas operate by keeping the box office by the local community. local shows within three or four months of their Broadway release, with admission rates of $1.50 and $1.50. Unfortunately the distribution-exhibition structure in Australia has effectively wiped out independent theatres of this sort.

But by and large the new multi cinema concept will continue to be a success. Village is greater in the capital cities and major county towns are among the most well-appointed in the world. For comfort and luxury, few Broadway or Los Angeles theatres can compete with the Melbourne and Sydney cinemas.

The difference is worth $175 per admission is arguable. Some say that given the 20 cents (since the introduction of colour television, price wars have certainly not help to get back lost audiences.

In London, only about six West End cinemas have the equivalent of a 44 admission, — these include the Curzon, the ABC 1 and 2, the Lyceum 3 and 4, and the Prince Charles,
However this buys the best seats in the house: other seats are available for as low as $3.25. Perhaps Australian cinemas should also react to ‘multiplexing’, even in one-level cinemas in a time of general economic depression in the reduction in the price of certain seats would undoubtedly lead to bigger attendances. A.I.G.

ARCHIVES

More attention is now being paid to film archival activity in Australia, much of it highlighted by the activity of an archives working party and an archival interagency program administered — and in the latter case also funded — by the Australian Film Commission. Both these developments bring life to the Clause in the Australian Film Commission Act 1975, which specifies that the AFC ‘encourage whether by the provision of financial assistance or otherwise, the proper keeping of films in archives in Australia’.

The working party report is expected to be submitted to the Prime Minister (Mr Fraser) as Minister for the Arts), by the end of May, while the committee granted $806,926 to conduct interviews with 35 Australian film pioneers will cover costs for 12 months.

The purpose of the working party, which met monthly between September 1976 and January 1977, was to look in detail at the operations of some 13 public and privately run bodies throughout Australia. These conduct archival activity, either with Australian and imported film and video, or with filmed documentation, including scripts and publicity. Communication between these organizations has been limited previously, so that among its achievements, the working party should help establish closer ties between the rival hierarchies of the National Library and Australian Archives.

Other organizations represented on the working party were Film Australia, the Australian Film and Television School, and the Film, Radio and Television Board. Further submissions to the working party have been received from the ABC, the Federation of Australian Commercial Television Stations (FACTS), and the Australian Film and Television Archive.

The AFC has also circulated a questionnaire among Australian film and television producers which covers attitudes in the production industry to the localisation and operation of film archives.

For the Association for a National Film and Television Archive, the initiative taken by the AFC is an indication that the association’s activities over the past two years have not been in vain. Since its establishment, the association — an independent pressure group for the establishment of an Australian national film archive — has worked hard to get the AFC and National Library to democratise their film archival responsibilities, and to put these responsibilities at the disposal of Australian film producers. The association claims that the setting up of a working party and archival interagency programs have largely been a result of its frequent contact with many archival interests, including the ABC, National Library, and politicians.

The steering committee for the archival interview program comprises, besides members of the associations mentioned from the Film and Television School, National Library, and Creative Development Branch of the AFC. The committee, which met on January 6, selected 35 interviewees, and to witness the AFC’s presentation of the cheque for the program to the Film and Television School.

The school will supervise the administrative and technical side of the program, while the interviews will be carried out by the National Library’s film archive in Canberra. Colorfilm Pty. Ltd. are contributing to the project by keeping all film printing and processing costs. G.S.

AFC INVESTMENTS

From all appearances the Australian Film Commission is getting tough on handing out investments to local producers, in handing out investments to local producers. Perhaps not surprisingly, in the wake of Let the Balloon Go, Summer of Secrets, Break of Day and Rare Deal, the performances have been poor in the home market, with only Don’s Party, and Storm Boy among the few releases looking good lately, like *Picnic at Hanging Rock, Caddie* and Devil’s Playground.

The AFC has recently rejected a record number of applications, notably Harry Millar’s *Yossarian*, Miller’s *Voss*, and Margaret Fink’s *My Brilliant Career*.

However the AFC has continued to invest in and loan money for a wide range of projects. Recent approvals include: *Last Run of the Kameruka* (Royce Smead Film Productions, $129,000); *Patrick* to be produced and directed by Richard Franklin (Quest Films, $192,227). *Long Weekend* to be produced and directed by Colin Eggleston (Colin Eggleston Productions, $133,791); *The Battle of Broken Hill* (Independent Arts, $300,000); *Captain Goodvibes* (Voyager Films, $170,740) to be produced by David Eppling. *Highway One* produced and directed by Steve Oton (Highway Productions, $16,564). For details see page 354.

SNOW WHITE

It’s official: violence is a turn-off! At least as far as certain producers and distributors are concerned.

Cinema International Corporation recently sourced to clean up the American advertising campaigns for Marathon Man and Two Minute Warning on the basis of the ill-advised violence in the films. The result of the reworking was that revealed that films containing explicit and graphic violence were definitely turning off large sections of the audience. And John Morris, director of the South Australian Film Corporation, was reported in The Australian (February 3, 1977) as saying that he found violence in films totally unsettling and unacceptable.

Morris, the former head of production at Film Australia and the producer of *The Fourth Wish*, also said he believed there was a connection between screen violence and real violence.

“I saw Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs on television recently, and the part where Snow White is put into a glass coffin with all the little dwarfs standing around sniffing actually made me sick,” he said.

“Not because I was sorry about Snow White — I knew the Prince would come along and work time throughout history, was unacceptable.”

And in London, Russell Boyd has been awarded a British Academy Award for his cinematography on *Picnic at Hanging Rock*. Nominations included *One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest*, *Taxi Driver* and *The Slipper and the Rose*.

These came second to the Academy awards and puts Boyd among the world’s best cameramen. P.B.

AWARDS

Leisure, a 14-minute animated short devised and drawn by Bruce Petey was awarded an Oscar for the best animated short film at the Academy of Motion Pictures and Sciences 49th Academy Awards held on March 29 in Los Angeles.

Bruce Petey is only the second Australian filmmaker to win an Academy Award. The other was Damien Parer who won an Oscar for *Kokoda Front Line* which was made in New Guinea during the Second World War.

Leisure, a satirical view of man’s leisure and work throughout history, was produced by Suzanne Baker for Film Australia on a budget of $40,000.

At the recent 6th International Festival of Science Fiction and Fantasy Films, held in Paris between March 12 and 22, *Summer of Secrets* (produced by Mike Thornhill and directed by Jim Sharman) was awarded the special jury prize for a film showing the greatest originality, and also the critics prize.

In the same festival the prize for the best foreign performance was awarded collectively to the young schoolgirls from *Picnic at Hanging Rock*. Both films were given prominent and favorable reviews in Le Figaro.

And in London, Russell Boyd has been awarded a British Academy Award for his cinematography on *Picnic at Hanging Rock*. Nominations included *One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest*, *Taxi Driver* and *The Slipper and the Rose*.

These came second to the Academy awards and puts Boyd among the world’s best cameramen. P.B.

FILM Festivals

Festivals This Quarter

This Quarter

Principal Competition Features and Shorts

30th Cannes International Film Festival May 12-27, 1977

1 rue de la Faubourg St. Honore, 75006 Paris, France.

Cables: Festintem unexpectedly, they would live happily ever after — but because I was reminded of the many funerals I have seen."

"I saw Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs on television recently, and the part where Snow White is put into a glass coffin with all the little dwarfs standing around sniffing actually made me sick," he said.

"Not because I was sorry about Snow White — I knew the Prince would come along and work time throughout history, was unacceptable."

And in London, Russell Boyd has been awarded a British Academy Award for his cinematography on *Picnic at Hanging Rock*. Nominations included *One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest*, *Taxi Driver* and *The Slipper and the Rose*.

These came second to the Academy awards and puts Boyd among the world’s best cameramen. P.B.

Leisure, a 14-minute animated short devised and drawn by Bruce Petey was awarded an Oscar for the best animated short film at the Academy of Motion Pictures and Sciences 49th Academy Awards held on March 29 in Los Angeles.

Bruce Petey is only the second Australian filmmaker to win an Academy Award. The other was Damien Parer who won an Oscar for *Kokoda Front Line* which was made in New Guinea during the Second World War.

Leisure, a satirical view of man’s leisure and work throughout history, was produced by Suzanne Baker for Film Australia on a budget of $40,000.

At the recent 6th International Festival of Science Fiction and Fantasy Films, held in Paris between March 12 and 22, *Summer of Secrets* (produced by Mike Thornhill and directed by Jim Sharman) was awarded the special jury prize for a film showing the greatest originality, and also the critics prize.

In the same festival the prize for the best foreign performance was awarded collectively to the young schoolgirls from *Picnic at Hanging Rock*. Both films were given prominent and favorable reviews in Le Figaro.

And in London, Russell Boyd has been awarded a British Academy Award for his cinematography on *Picnic at Hanging Rock*. Nominations included *One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest*, *Taxi Driver* and *The Slipper and the Rose*.

These came second to the Academy awards and puts Boyd among the world’s best cameramen. P.B.
Kenneth Loach, the director of the controversial BBC series “Days of Hope”* — screened recently throughout Australia — has previously taken strong stands on social and political issues. His first film, “Cathy Come Home”, made for BBC TV in 1966, dealt with the housing crisis facing millions of workers who were on or below the breadline. “Poor Cow” followed a year later, about the misery and uncertainty of a working class girl’s life in the city.

In 1969 Loach made “Kes”, which imaged the stifling effects of the education system on a bright and dreamy boy living in a northern industrial town. Then in 1971 came “Family Life”, a film that bitterly attacked psychiatric practices and institutionalized care for mental patients.

The scope of Loach’s attacks has steadily widened from individual abuses to the mentality that gives rise to them. In “Family Life” it is the society that’s blamed for turning vulnerable but ordinary people into mental patients and in “Days of Hope”, Loach overturns the assumption that Britain is founded on a tradition of justice and democracy.

The following interview with Kenneth Loach was recorded by John O’Hara for the ABC Radio’s media program “Double Take”.

How did the “Days of Hope” series evolve?

We had a script that Jim Allen had written about the miners’ lock-out in 1921 and our intention was to make a film of this — a cinema film — but we weren’t able to raise the finance. Perhaps not surprisingly, so Tony Garnett, Jim Allen and I decided to try and expand this into four films. The period we chose was from World War I, 1916, to the general strike of 1926 — and we were able to get them made on television.

Did that period seem to you particularly important in the present history of Britain?

Yes, well, it’s certainly very formative, and it reveals the various tendencies within the Labor movement that we wanted to look at very clearly.

What in particular interested you about the period?

Well, it was just after the revolution in Russia and the influence of that was being felt. It was the period which led up to a major defeat of the working class in 1926, which has gone into our history — we thought, wrongly — as being the Conservative in helping to keep secret and ready for the Tories when the Labor government was in power.

The period when for the first time the Labor Party had been in the majority in the House of Commons and formed a government — although a minority government. And many of the strands that now bedevil our politics were seen very clearly then, perhaps more clearly than one can see them now; the two main strands being those in the Labor movement who thought that one could achieve socialism by gradual reform and through Parliament, and those who thought, and think, that it needs a more major upheaval to establish a new social order. Those two tendencies have struggled in the Labor movement ever since.

You originally intended one cinema film and you ended up with four television episodes. Did that involve changes in the way you conceived of the style?

Yes, very much so. In fact, the second film is rather out of step with the others. In the second film the main event is fictional, whereas in the other three the principal events are factual. I think if we had been starting right from scratch all four films would have been completely factual.

In the second film, there was a miners’ lock-out and troops were sent to the coalfields to support law and order, as they euphemistically put it, in other words to knock people’s heads in if they got too stroppy.

But the events concerning our fictional characters — Ben, in that case — was an event which we would like to think could have happened but, in fact, didn’t. Whereas the other events, the treatment of conscientious objectors in World War I; the propaganda of the war; the first Labor government, a minister in the Labor government colluded with the Opposition, with the Conservatives in helping to maintain a secret plan in the event of an industrial unrest which later turned into the Organization for Maintenance of Supplies in the general strike, and was a major strike-breaking force. All those plans were there, lying dormant, never captured, because you are not looking at Stanley Baldwin, you are looking at a man who looks fairly like him and who is speaking what he says, and more important, is interpreting as far as possible the lines of his policy and his method of dealing with the situation.

But, of course, there is an area where you can never be exact. As far as possible we were true to the spirit and the letter of what had actually happened.

I think Lord Citrine commented that looking back on the strike through your film, he found some of the characters not true to life at all.

Well, that’s hardly surprising, since we took a very critical view of what Lord Citrine had done. There is a clear case of a man who has risen to the House of Lords on the backs of the Labor movement. A very able man, no doubt, but I would suggest his actions in the court of the 1926 strike are hardly ones that have served the best interests of the Labor movement.

You have represented the end of that strike as coming about because of a betrayal from within the trade union movement. How historically accurate is that interpretation?
Well, it depends what one means by the word betrayal. It's an emotive word, and those at the top of the trade union movement who took the actions they did, wouldn't see it as a betrayal; they would see it as acting in the best interests of their members and saving them from acting unwisely.

The fact remains that the trade union movement was gathering strength, it was gathering momentum and all sorts of new questions were coming on the agenda. And many people who struggled and fought for real changes in society were able to see that there was perhaps a new method of achieving them, which was their industrial strength. And the experience of the trade union leaders, or the ordinary workers' experience of the trade union leaders, left them with not much confidence.

I don't think anybody now would dispute that there was a complete sell-out, though some might not use that term. But there was an ending of the strike without any conditions. Many people lost their jobs because there were no guarantees against having their jobs back.

The leadership of the trade union movement led those who were out on strike into a complete defeat. And the sad thing is, it is that the strike was gathering momentum, and was in fact becoming stronger. It was this strength which the trade union leaders were scared of.

Some of the controversy about the program has been caused by the way in which you have represented some of the people who took part in the crisis, particularly the trade union negotiator, Thomas...

Well, most of what Sir Thomas said in the film, he said in real life. Anybody who has read Thomas's autobiography will realize that we erred on the side of generosity in hindsight.

There is a picture of Jimmy Thomas in his book in full regalia looking like a Swiss admiral, and his pride in being welcomed by the nobility was amazing. His deviousness at the time of the general strike, of course, is well documented and in part we used Citrine's own book. We also used records maintained by Thomas Jones, who was the Cabinet Secretary of the time.

Jones recorded the events very accurately. The secret phone calls that Thomas made via a man called Selwyn Davis to pass messages to the Cabinet about what is happening in the Trades Union Council's general council meetings is accurate — all this is documented.

I think the films suggest, fairly strongly, that there was a kind of seduction by the ruling classes through their power and influence and the kind of patronage they could bestow...

There is a long tradition of members of the Labor movement welcoming the attractions of the rich and looking forward to their ennoblements and becoming peers of the Realm as, indeed, Citrine has himself. They really couldn't wait to get to the Upper House.

We were thinking of having a sequence in the film — that's in the third film — where members of the Labor cabinet — the first Labor cabinet of would-be revolutionaries — are getting ready to swear their allegiance to the Crown; they are dressing up in all their hired finery to get into Buckingham Palace and being instructed on how to kneel to the Sovereign. It was reported that one of the more revolutionary members had actually gone down on both knees just in case it was thought he wasn't humble enough.

You might feel then, that with that tradition of class differences there is not much hope for democracy...

What democracy?

It's very strongly the feeling that comes out in the film...

Yes, I think we have an appearance of democracy, but we don't have the substance. In other words, we can't really decide many of the things which govern our lives.

What about the treatment of the army? There had been comments on incidents such as the one depicted in the film of a soldier being tied to a stake in No-man's Land to be shot at because he was a conscientious objector — did that sort of thing happen?

Well, we found one or two people who could actually record this as eyewitnesses, or of people who had taken part. Again, historians will tend to adopt a stance and then find evidence to substantiate it.

The researcher who worked on the program with us had written a book and has documented a lot of evidence of brutality of this kind. The principal point is that con¬scientious objectors were ruthlessly pulled to the front line against the supposed wishes of the Govern¬ment, so that they were beyond the civil authority in Britain and were under martial law abroad, where they could be shot for refusing orders. And many of them died abroad. Now, how they died, we might spend a long time discussing, but the fact is that they were people who refused to fight on principle; were taken by the army, secretly, away from British justice here. They were taken abroad under martial law and some of them died. I think that's beyond dispute.

You said "Days of Hope" was originally conceived as one cinema film: how was the style affected by the decision to make a television series?

The later films are those that would be difficult to see in cinematic terms, because they are more concerned with the details of meetings and the exchange of views across a table, and they are much more about what people say rather than events that happen.

One factor which really changed the nature of the films quite con¬siderably was inflation, because we had accepted the budget at the beginning of the project — which was two and a half years before we were shooting the last ones. Originally we had planned to have several sequences in the later films of what happened in London, involving a lot of people and vehicles; but that of course was very expensive, and by the time we had got to make the films, inflation had reduced the real budgets quite considerably. So all that had to go.

I think the films suffer as a result, because there isn't a sufficient context for the meetings to take place in.

It's quite noticeable in the last film; I think the only shot outside is the one of the workers holding up a bus...

Yes, it's quite inadequate really. But there was no money left.

What was the budget for the series?

I can't give it to you, unfortunately, because the BBC budgets things in such a strange way that certain things you pay for and certain things you don't. I really don't know.

The last film seems to me to create a claustrophobic effect; for example, the constant medium shots of people discussing something, as against a lot of tracking shots in the first film. The colors are much more subdued and you seem to use fades more when going from one discussion to another than you do in the first film...

In the last one we wanted to create the feeling of a measured thoughtful film, rather than an all-action film. We wanted to allow time for the implications of what was being said to register. There was no way that it was going to be a dynamic, all-action film. If it was going to work at all, it would work by people watching it, adding two and two together all the time, and setting what was said at one stage against what was said at another, and how people's attitudes changed and how they would be all fire and brimstone at a public meeting and then say something quite different a bit later on, and things like this.

And we felt we should have a measured, thoughtful film which would allow people to assess that.

Which is quite different from the intention of the first film, where there are quite moving changes in emotional emphasis...

I think if we had had enough money for the last film, there would have been an element of that in it. It would have had periods of excitement like that. I really regret that it didn't.

Do you feel that the attempt in the last film to establish a group of characters, and following their fortunes through several critical political events was overshadowed by the attempt to get straight what the nature of those events was?

It was perhaps an uneasy juxtaposition at times. It was patchy. But then of the main characters, one started out as completely non-political and the other as a sort of a
humanitarian idealist, socialist, conscientious objector.

They, in fact, became much more political; the non-political lad who volunteered for the army to defend poor little Belgium found he was attacking poor little Ireland. His experiences led him into the Communist Party, and then disillusioned with that he became much more political. Phillip, having been an idealist and a religious pacifist, gets his credentials as a left-winger, then moves into Parliament, enjoys that and moves to the right and becomes, again, a much more political animal.

So, in a way we felt it reflected the change in circumstance and attitudes of the principal characters.

The events themselves, par-

ticularly in the last film, are so fascinating that it was with some reluctance we left them and yet, we felt that if we just showed the event without our private people to put them in some political perspective and draw out some general conclusions, the effect would be just an impression — like good journalism — a blow by blow report, but with no perspective.

One of the things that probably strikes people about "Days of Hope" is how untelevision-like the series is. Were you conscious of people having certain expectations about what a drama on television should look like, and therefore perhaps tried to do something different?

Yes, in some ways, but it wasn't just a reaction against current television drama. I think our little group — that's Tony Garnett and myself and others who have worked with us — has always reacted against glossy productions. So we tried to give it a smack of reality wherever possible. And we tried to make it as accurate as possible.

It does have an extraordinarily real look about it.

One thing we tried to work on is a style of acting. I think most acting is very stylized and supposedly natural, but really isn't. There is a curious thing about this: there have been a lot of historical series on TV, but none has really evoked any argument about whether it is historical fact or pure fiction which is an argument that has hung around us considerably. Whether this is to do with the style of acting that's employed, I don't know.

Although techniques used in "Days of Hope", like leaving the camera on someone after he has ceased to speak, are quite unlike television which usually cuts to whoever is speaking...

Yes ... you see, if you are making a documentary and there was just a cameraman in the room and he was following the conversation, he would never be at some- other when they started to speak. He would follow the conversation. That's what we tried to do really, to let the conversation call for the cuts, rather than the camera knowing who was going to speak next and, therefore, always being in at the start of a sentence.

You don't seem to have used zooms nearly as much as a lot of television dramas do...

I don't really like them. I find it just makes you rather self-conscious — they are assertive in a way, I prefer quieter ones. But that's a matter of taste, I suppose.

Did you feel at all uneasy about the BBC televising this production?

No, not at all. I am grateful that they did. There is a curious paradox here, because we have abused them on several occasions for being apparently liberal and yet, in a way, that liberalism is proved when they will show films which are critical of themselves.

There's a long section in "Days of Hope"...

If one is cynical one could say, well they will only show films which are critical of themselves when they feel secure.

There has been a lot of comment, not only about the representation of the BBC, but also about the political views represented in the series. Do you see other television dramas being perhaps just as political?

I think more deviously political.

The support given to the police service is remarkable. The police have now taken over the roles of the wild west heroes. But I think that probably far more crucial is the way opinions have infiltrated into the news by the use of language and by the presentation of the issues. Opinions which aren't news in any way, but represent the opinions of those that run the BBC. And which, of course, are the same as those who run the Government, because the Government appoints those who run the BBC.

Would you say the same sort of thing about historical dramas like "Upstairs Downstairs"?

Yes, I think that has a kind of neutralising effect, doesn't it? I mean, in general, the effect of programs like that is to evoke a kind of nostalgia for the past, while suggesting that the past really has nothing to tell us: "Weren't things quaint, and isn't it a pity people don't dress like that and yet look how much better off we are because there aren't those extremes."

Perhaps, also, people look back and say well, that at least was a secure time, because people knew where they stood...

I think you are right — it does have that harking back to the lord in his castle and the poor man at his gate.

Does that account at all for the criticism of "Days of Hope"?

Yes, and again the criticism of Days of Hope was very interesting. We had hoped that there would be a debate in the Labor movement arguing the reformist path against the revolutionary path. That's a very real argument and, looking back after our 50 years of Labor government in and out of office, we haven't got very far. So, in a way, the reformists have got a case to answer, and we felt it was a discussion worth having.

Of course, that's not the discussion you get on the BBC, and it's not the discussion you get in the press. The discussion there particularly in the extreme right-wing paper, The Daily Telegraph, was along the lines of, 'Should the BBC broadcast these films and is the BBC being infiltrated by the Left?' That was the discussion that was held on the BBC, when the editor of The Daily Telegraph was on a program and put his views.

The film didn't raise those issues at all. That was the issue as seen by the press. And when the BBC said they would have a program to discuss the films, we thought it would be interesting. But, of course, they didn't discuss the films, they discussed the right-wing reaction to the films.
The release of *Network* in Australia is indeed timely for it will be running concurrently with the public hearings associated with the Broadcasting Inquiry into Self-Regulation which opened last month. For anyone interested in industry self-regulation, the film is must. It is the story of Howard Beale — a man killed by a network because of lousy ratings.

Howard Beale is the network news anchor man on UBS-TV. Over the past five years his ratings have fallen from a 28 audience share to a 12 share. The news division has a $33 million deficit.

He is fired, effective in two weeks. So he goes on air and announces, “I’m going to blow my brains out right on this program a week from today ... we ought to get a hell of a rating with that, a 50 share, easy!”

The UBS network doesn’t have one show in the top 20 and it’s an industry joke. But it does have a very ambitious vice-president in charge of programming, called Diana Christensen. She plans to put the network on top of the ratings with her creative programming ideas.

Her brainchild grows out of Beale’s threat; it is the Howard Beale Show, a one-hour news program with Sybil the Soothsayer predicting tomorrow’s news today, Mata Hari with her skeletons in the cupboard and Howard Beale as the prophet of the airwaves who rages at the audience and tells them what’s really happening in our “demented slaughterhouse of a world.”

Soon the show has a 42 audience share which more than equals all the other network news shows combined.

Christensen’s other programming scoop follows the news hour. Known as the Mao Tse-tung Hour, it is a series based on the activities of a liberation army, a group of revolutionaries who shoot film footage of their political terrorism. Each show opens with authentic, on-the-spot film of their latest exploits.

Thus UBS-TV booms. They top the evening ratings and profits soar. That is, until Arthur Jensen, the head of the Communications Corporation of America, becomes unhappy with Beale’s speech on company takeovers.

Jensen has Beale brought to his office where he converts him to a different philosophy. Jensen explains the ecological balance of the ebb and flow of dollars. That “there are no nations. There is no America. There is no democracy. There is only IBM, and ITT and AT&T and Dow, Union Carbide and Exxon. Those are the nations of the world now. The world is a college of corporations.”

That evening, Howard Beale goes on air to preach the totally dehumanizing corporate cosmology of Arthur Jensen. By the end of the week the ratings begin to drop. People don’t want to hear that they aren’t important.

When the ratings drop 11 points, panic sets in among the executives. But Jensen is adamant. He doesn’t care if Howard Beale is the No. 1 show or the 50th. He doesn’t care if the Howard Beale Show loses money.

So the final solution is conceived. Christensen and her fellow executives plan to have the Ecumenical Liberation Army assassinate Howard Beale on air. The terrorists are upset anyway because Beale is a lousy rating lead into their program.

That’s the bare bones of the story. It is a provocative and highly controversial theme which is much wider than the issue of corruption in the newsroom. It concerns the destruction of the individual through a television system that promotes sensationalism, that trivializes, standardizes and is dedicated to the lowest common standards in public taste. It shows that profit returns are the only constraints on programming — a proposition that needs examination when self-regulation is afoot.

Theatre and the cinema dramatize, highlight and exaggerate a social issue to make a point. I grant that *Network* does just that. It stretches the social issue, but not beyond credibility. The audience in the theatre is involved. So if that kind of exaggeration is almost believable, how far has the reality gone?

A station’s life force is successful ratings. They strike terror in the heart of every program manager. There are six of these men in Australia who decide what 80 per cent of the TV audience sees.

Privately and sometimes publicly (The National Times, January 10) the program managers agree that Australia is over-serviced with television. Our three commercial networks cater for 13 million people. The U.S. has three commercial networks for 200 million and Britain one commercial network for 52 million people. The difference in the size of the advertising revenue pie is obvious.

I don’t know anyone with any knowledge of the television industry who will sincerely state that three commercial stations in the Australian capital cities is beneficial to the industry.

No less an expert than the current chairman of the new Broadcasting Tribunal, Bruce Gyngell, said in July 1972, when he gave evidence before the Senate Standing Committee on Education, Science and the Arts:

“I think the Government or whoever made the decision made a disastrous decision back in 1963 in providing a third commercial licence for Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide and Brisbane. I believe at that time when the two commercial organizations in all states were in fact making very good and healthy profits as high as 63 per cent return on capital in any one year, it would have been better if the Government had said the Australian quotas are coming in, a good return for a public company is 25 per cent return on money, therefore you have to spend the balance of the money in developing a worthwhile indigenous Australian service.”

If the decision is made to correct the mistake? In Mr Gyngell’s words, there is no such agreement about the fourth channel, why won’t the Government do anything to correct the mistake? In Mr Gyngell’s words, the decision has been made and you can’t undo it” (The Australian, April 29, 1976).

Broadcasting in this country has never been free from political interference and the decision to grant the fourth licence had nothing to do with the public interest and developing a worthwhile indigenous Australian service.

Former Prime Minister Robert Menzies was anxious to ensure that the fourth licence wouldn’t fall into non-commercial hands and the Liberal government was embarrassed by the regular handouts they gave to subsidize the Ansett-ANA airline operations. According to Ken Davidson in 1968*, one reason Ansett got a licence was to help him with long term protection from unforeseen economic ups and downs.

He acquired his Brisbane licence by other means. The Australian Broadcasting Control Board granted the third Brisbane licence to a local company. Ansett got control by buying up the 50 cents shares for 60 cents. This little episode demonstrated the futility of Control Board hearings and the board remained emasculated until it was abolished in December 1976.

The desire for the Sydney and Melbourne licensees to extend their operations to Adelaide and Brisbane was again not motivated by a desire to provide good broadcasting, but rather to

---

*Profile and Loss in 10 Years of TV, ed. by Mungo McCallum, Sun Books, 1968.
The fact is that half the programs shown on Australian television are insignificant in ratings. But prime time remains the time slot program managers worry about most. They are just not that interested in the daytime audience. If they can achieve a reasonable share of the audience with a cheap serial import during the day, that's good enough. And no one seems to want to do anything about this problem either.

When the Advisory Committee on Program Standards was appointed in September 1975, we were asked "to review the objectives towards which standards should be directed in the light of present day community standards". Over a period of six months we received submissions, met with interested and experienced parties and had many discussions among ourselves.

Although the ABCB and the Commercial Federations wanted the committee to confine its comments to the content of particular programs, the overwhelming weight of evidence indicated that public concerns related chiefly to advertising, children's programs, Australian content, the small range of program types available, the lack of programs for minority groups and the general banal level of television. Matters of taste were generally mentioned within these contexts.

The inadequacies in all these areas seemed to the committee to stem from lack of finance and the low profit margins that stations had to work with. Although the stations claim their financial problems are now over, their economic history shows an unreliable growth pattern. One might also ask if they are now all so viable where is the consequent improvement in programming?

The other problem is related to the stations' inability to work together in the public interest. The notions of a moratorium during children's programming including no advertising, a restoration of the cartel arrangement for buying overseas programs to curb costs, and a late night (10 p.m.) viewing slot for reconstructed R films are anathema to FACTS.

When the advisory committee recommended the payment of the cost of one channel in exchange for community ownership as a basic requirement for any improvement in television services, there was uproar from the commercial federations. The committee was declared to be biased, incompetent and we were thrustingly chastised by Mr Gyngell (The Australian, April 29, 1976) for our ignorance and simple-minded desire to do good.

Mr Gyngell attacked the report and denounced its authors, though many of the views expressed in the report were those he had held previously. At the same time, positive comment flowed into the board's offices.

Although much essential information was not made available to the advisory committee, my subsequent appointment to the ABCB gave me access to information which confirmed the validity of what were to become the committee's recommendations.

Since that report, some radical changes have occurred: the Green Report was completed, the ABCB was abolished and the tribunal established. Instead of two academics on the board, we now have a chairman and a vice-chairman who have spent most of their careers in commercial television.

Mark Armstrong, a Law lecturer at the University of New South Wales, has said that "the composition of the tribunal when taken over as a whole is considerably less judicial or quasi-judicial" than was its 'non-quasi-judicial' predecessor, the Broadcasting Control Board.

It's difficult to assess Mr Gyngell from his past public statements — they change so often. The transcript of the Senate Committee in 1972 reveals exchanges like this. 

Senator Hannan: ... regardless of what the program matter is, people tend to develop a liking for what they are given over a period. Would you agree with that proposition?

Mr Gyngell: I think so.

Senator Hannan: So that, in true, if people are exposed to a diet of tripe on television over a period of time, they will acquire a liking for tripe?

Mr Gyngell: I believe so.

And in reply to a comment from the chairman, Mr Gyngell said:

"I am not so terribly liberal in my thinking about television. There has been a lot of benevolent dictatorship. People have to be told what to watch."

From such comments one might get the impression that Mr Gyngell could be something of a reformer. Yet four years later Mr Gyngell said television would evolve on its own. He denounced inquiries and said:

"I don't think an inquiry is going to achieve anything at all. I think you have to be very careful that intellectuals and pressure groups who are more vocal than others won't come up and push their particular barrow ... I just think an inquiry is a waste of time." (The Australian, May 5, 1976)

Now the same man is chairing the self-regulation inquiry.

Mr Gyngell appears to be a man of radically changing views. But there is one opinion he hasn't changed in the four and a half years since he spoke to the Senate Committee — that is his view of the purpose of television and its audience.

In 1972 he said:

"I believe that commercial television's prime role is to provide entertainment to the majority of people who are tired, bored and in the main disillusioned with life, entertainment so that they can escape into a more palatable world down the flickering tunnel at the end of their living room.

Most of them don't like the job they have got, don't like their lifestyle and a lot of them don't like the person they are married to." (The Australian, May 5, 1976)

By January 1977 Mr Gyngell was a little more detailed in his description of the marriage partners:

"She has varicose veins, her hair is in curlers, she smokes, and she's not attractive either. They need escape ... to get away from the humdrum." (The Sydney Morning Herald, January 1977)

Howard Beale, the news anchorman in Network, effectively agreed with Mr Gyngell,

"Television is a goddamned amusement park that's what television is. Television is a circus, a carnival, a travelling troupe of acrobats and storytellers, singers and dancers, jugglers, sideshow freaks, lion-tamers and football players. It's in the boredom killing business!"

And on the state of the world Beale said:

"I don't have to tell you things are bad. Everybody knows things are bad. It's a depression. Everybody's out of work or scared of losing their job, the dollar buys a nickel's worth, banks are going bust, shopkeepers keep a gun under the counter, punks are running wild in the streets, and there's nobody anywhere who seems to know what to do, and there's no end to it. We know the air's unfit to breathe and our food is unfit to eat, and we sit and watch our TVs while some local newscaster tells us today we had 15 deaths and 83 violent crimes, as if that's the way it's supposed to be.

We all know things are bad. Worse than bad. They're crazy. Just as we're all going crazy. So we don't go out any more. We sit in the house and slowly the world we live in starts to close up, and all we ask is please, at least, leave us alone in our own living rooms. Let me have my toaster and my TV and my hair-dryer and my steelfelted radial, and I'll just leave us alone."

The self-regulation inquiry will determine the future of broadcasting for a long time to come. The questions are clear. How much commercialism should be tolerated? Are children's programs to be considered seriously? Is Australian television going to reflect Australian culture or continue to feed out foreign product? Is the quality of radio and television to be assured? Can any of these questions be resolved with three commercial television outlets? And most important what will self-regulation achieve?
In Australia at the moment, we seem to be suffering from a lack of idealism. The feature filmmakers are fond of talking about the new ‘Australian film industry’. That emphasis on ‘industry’ is significant — it betrays our present obsession with the pragmatic business side of filmmaking — finance and box-office. Of course, that’s natural at this stage. But I think filmmakers also have a responsibility for the way they can influence society — and if they do have something to say, that often means they will want to change society.

I don’t hear much talk along those lines within the film world here. And I don’t see that kind of commitment expressing itself in most of the recent feature films, with the exception of Devil’s Playground.

Do you think this tendency is peculiar to Australia?

Of course not. Think of Hollywood in the grand old days. Maybe the old style Hollywood film syndrome has infected some of our producers. Perhaps we are living out fantasies conceived years ago at Saturday matinees, though it would not be surprising if the Australian character had something to do with it. As a nation, we do seem to be more comfortable with an escapist, physical approach to life as against a probing, analysing one.

While you were at the BBC you made “The Black Stump” for the “British Empire” series. Was that an attempt to explore the Australian character?

It was a film about the way we used to be, or rather, thought we used to be. That wasn’t the way the Australian press took it up. They attacked it for giving a distorted view of the present. In fact the film presented a view of Australia in the nineteenth century. The headlines on the front page of The Australian said: “With a friend like Haydon, who needs an enemy.”

It was a reflex action. Remember, it had been shown in London and at that stage people in Australia hadn’t even seen the film.

Perhaps the kindest thing I can say about the Australian press is that they just viewed the film in a very superficial way. The film was certainly not a journalistic piece.

I don’t make films in a literal way. It’s not like writing. In a film you can have a whole number of streams running parallel to each other — acting on each other. In the end you just can’t say that such a film is about one thing. It’s about a number of things all at one time — they inter-relate. What holds them together is the overall style chosen by the filmmaker.

I found doing Beyond The Black Stump was a very subjective experience. I had been interested for a long time in the Australian character as an idea — or as a myth. So when the BBC said they wanted a film on the ‘Australian character’ — believing in the myth — I decided I wanted to make a film that was a comment on itself. It’s a film that cancels itself out in a way.

You have had a strong interest in this associative technique — it started even before you left Australia in the ABC documentary “Dig a Million Make a Million”. It’s full of irony and non-logical comment…

It’s all a question of juxtaposition. You can put this after that, and you find that people jump to conclusions. They work out their own idea of what connects the two scenes. Then comes the next scene, or sequence. It seems to carry on the same connecting idea, but at the same time it relates back to the earlier scene in a way that suggests quite a different idea. So there you have two different arguments or attitudes being developed simultaneously. Then come others, as the film goes on.

You work this out at the editing stage…

Well, you have to shoot with it in mind; but yes, it’s mainly achieved in editing. Of course, most documentary making depends on editing because you have no script as such.

I find editing an intuitive process. I try to be systematic, but it never comes out in a straightforward way. I often get to a long rough cut which doesn’t have a straight-through logical argument and is full of irrelevancies.

I remember this happened particularly with The Long, Long Walkabout. At the time I was trying to bring it down I saw a film on Rodin. And it showed that when he was sculpting he used to start
with a title. And after a few weeks chipping away, he would change the title. And then he would do some more and the title would change again. So the theme, the argument developed with the form — and the form was what really governed things. The form was the concept and the concept was the form.

It’s the first thing I try to come to grips with — the form of the film. So you shoot not just for logical reasons, but because the material has some style, some quality you want. It is ambience and atmosphere and character.

**Did you find you had more freedom in Britain to make films the way you wanted?**

Well, yes and no. There is one great advantage in Australia. Because we don’t have so rich a literary tradition, the documentary filmmaker does not really have to reckon with established ways of approaching a subject. Your film could well be the first time the subject has been tackled, in any form. You can just go out and do the film, unaffected by any predecessors. It’s like being in a desert.

In a way, in Britain every thought you have is being related to tradition, and that can make it hard to do the film in your own way. You move in a thick sort of soup of firmly inscribed verbalised notions. They are also very conditioned to sit and listen to the film, rather than look at it.

I had a battle at first — on the British Empire series — actually to write my own films at the BBC. They were documentaries, but the instruction was that the writing had to be done by established literary figures. But I wrote my films in the end.

**Did you produce and direct your films there?**

At the BBC the documentary director is his own producer. He is encouraged to think that he is free within a certain context. He also gets a lot of freedom between the time he starts the film and the time he shows the rough cut.

The rough cut viewing can sometimes be tough. Though even at that stage if the producer and his boss just can’t agree, there is the possibility of referral upwards; you see people up the ladder — even to the managing director of television — until agreement is reached.

It’s a very cunning system that depends on no written rules. So you are never quite sure if it’s a way of allowing individual aspirations to enjoy some reasonable self-expression, or just a way of milking an individual dry. But there is the recognition that the making of the documentary film is essentially one man’s responsibility. He will have the glory, and also suffer the blame.

**With regard to the “Empire” series, did many of the producers-directors come from the colonies?**

Well, no. The others were all BBC hands. I was the only one who had actually come from one of the Dominions’ to work on the series.

**How did you reach the stage of being invited to work for the BBC?**

I began at the ABC as a ‘specialist trainee’ producing schools programs — University of the Air, that sort of thing. Then I found myself in the science unit and there was the chance of doing a full-scale documentary, as long as it had a science angle. So I did The Talgai Skull and it did well, much to my surprise.

A year later, in 1968, I made Dig a Million Make a Million. I had been planning to do a film about the 10-year drought and the day before the critical program met I rang all over Australia. So I had to come up with another project really quickly, and I happened to see a newspaper headline about the mining boom and the way where was ‘selling the farm’ to overseas investors. I had also seen a Canadian National Film Board documentary on Lord Thomson, and that influenced me a lot. It had all been done with ironic juxtaposition. The method intrigued me.

I was struck by the way it could take you along two paths at once. The mining-investment theme offered an ideal opportunity for this kind of contrast. Here were these various men, all over the world, each presenting an attitude to justify their position. Now juxtapose these attitudes with each other, and with the factual data about the whole enterprise, like the huge profits, and you can see these men erecting elaborate moral justifications for what is really straightforward self-interest.

It was this contrast which I sought to explore, not just the ‘issue’ itself; you know, should we or should we not have so much overseas investment to develop mining. That controversy affected the behavior of the people involved; it was their behavior which most interested me. I think that’s a difference between the journalistic television documentary which reports and analyses an issue and the committed filmmaker’s documentary which is concerned with its subject for its own sake.

Usually that subject is mankind in some aspect or another. I think mankind is mankind. We try to deceive ourselves. Most of us don’t accept our ambivalence and we like to pretend to be something we are not. We put up reasons for doing things which are not the true reasons. This is a basic problem for the historian who has later on to discover the true reasons.

You are a history honors graduate. Do you somehow see yourself as an historian in the way you make films?
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Too much foreigner to either film institutes or the cinema, I am very much a foreign visitor to Australia. And in my dealings with even the most enthusiastic and helpful of people, I have been made rather firmly aware of this. With its overtones of colonialism and 'outside intervention', the role of the 'foreign expert' is a delicate one in any context. (It's hard to appraise the laundry system without discovering the occasional cache of dirty linen.)

Without presuming to play psychiatrist to the nation, it seems to me that in Australia the role is made doubly difficult. The lack of any solidly established, indigenous cultural tradition; the physical distance between Australia and the European elements of its heritage; the melting-pot composition of its population; the long-standing dominance of an imposed and imported culture; the relative isolation of Australians, not only from the rest of the world, but also from one another within a vast but demographically sparse country: whatever the reasons, Australians, in discussing their institutions with foreigners, offer a baffling mixture of arrogant nationalism and self-deprecatory comment. It's a combination designed to preclude impartial analysis.

"Australia," the argument runs, "is inferior, inefficient and still in the amateur league.

"But that's the way things are here, and they are as good as they are ever going to be. It's like nowhere else in the world, so don't get your hopes up. There is no comparison, and they couldn't possibly work that way here."

If I mention this all-too-frequently encountered attitude, it is not to negate the Australian Film Institute's board of directors with my touristic impressions, but to suggest that it goes some way towards explaining the perplexing conservatism that underlies even some of the most progressively-minded organizations. (Is it, perhaps, a sense that "At least the status quo is ours, and they shan't take that away from us"?)

Quite apart from the fact that a complacent sensibility is the fossilization on which to build a cultural identity, it seems to me that it's an attitude worth articulating, analyzing and eventually refuting. Especially since it lies at the heart of two particularly damaging and defeatist misconceptions:

(a) That the lack of a clearly defined and indigenous film culture is a condition unique to Australia; and

(b) That the crisis within the film industry in Australia is unique to that nation.

What is generally meant by a 'film culture' is: an informed critical awareness of developments in cinema throughout the world, and an ability to locate and evaluate the nation's achievements in the wider, international context. It implies an ability to view films other than as isolated and unrelated events, and is generally taken to flourish in proportion as a film is seen/presented in the context of an era, a genre, a director's total work, a particular style, a school of filmmaking or — ideally — all these at once.

The term 'film culture' implies a fundamentally academic approach to film — an awareness that, though designed, like Shakespeare's plays, primarily as entertainment for the groundlings, film texts may also fruitfully repay the same kind of detailed study. As film gains respectability as an academic discipline and film studies proliferate, the contextual approach gains ground. But only among a privileged and educated elite.

Though the constituent elements may be radiating nightly from the domestic TV set, a film culture is generally taken to connote an awareness of a single film/text rather than an imbibed with mother's milk. Healthy box-office receipts or viewing ratings are not seen as a direct index of the health of a nation's film culture, though without them there can be little hope that the culture will germinate.

To the argument that people go to the cinema to be entertained rather than educated, the film critic would reply that these are false alternatives; that in the same way as it is hoped that compulsory education for all children will produce fuller and more fruitful adult lives, so increased awareness of what lies behind what's on the screen may enable audiences to derive a heightened and more discriminating pleasure from their entertainment.

Though this seems platitudinously obvious, and though few would dream of objecting to the same line of reasoning applied to music, painting or literature, the same principle is nowhere applied when it is applied to film. Deriving from the fairground, film is frequently dismissed as a popular mass medium, closer to the football pitch than to the opera house. Yet how many of the football crowds, for example, know who their team's manager is, or the names of the players, or the team's precise standing in the league tables? And why is it never argued that a knowledge of the rules spoils the crowd's enjoyment of the game?

If the filmgoer is traditionally encouraged to be more ignorant about his pleasures than either the music lover or the sports fan, this has less to do with film's status as a mass medium, or with the debate about whether it should be viewed as an art or entertainment, than with the industrial situation in which it is produced.

In the unequivocally industrial sphere, no one expects the manufacturers of cars or cosmetics to welcome the attentions of the ombudsman or the consumers' protection groups. Yet, because film is an industry which occasionally aspires to the condition of art, one finds a pervasive expectation that it is for the industry itself to take the initiative in creating more discriminating consumers.

That such an expectation is patently misplaced does not prevent its functioning as a powerful alibi for inactivity. There is also an element of rationality in the expectation; even after their completion, the industry retains a tight control over the products of its artists/laborers, and without its co-operation — if not its initiative — attempts to define and foster a film culture would remain essentially void of substance.

A further complication is the fact that the industry has its own dollars-and-cents criteria for assessing the historical importance of individual films; its own motives for analyzing — and controlling — the laws of supply and demand. A further consequence of their dependence on the industry for access to its products and a piece of their own history is that film-as-culture organizations invariably tend to operate in the margins of the existing industrial structure rather than risk, from an inevitably weaker position, confronting that structure head-on.

In the practical sphere, local talent is most frequently expected to establish itself within the restricted and restricting form of the 'supporting short'. (With one or two exceptions, national success is synonymous with international boxoffice appeal.) In the field of presentation, organizations like the film societies and the National Film Theatre of Australia see their planned and documented programs as alternatives to, rather than models for, the commercial exhibitors.

To some extent this is realistic and right: no amount of exemplary screenings will any number of state film centres is going to dent the complex structures of multi-national business practice. At the same time, the passive acceptance of the them/us, art/commerce, mass/elite dichotomy merely strengthens the stranglehold of the status quo.

The alternative outlets appear content to equate alternative with permanent minority, satisfied with their peripheral, Cinderella role. Moreover, since many of them have grown from a local community's desire to define and express its own tastes, and see themselves as alternatives to the homogenous policies of a centrally controlled industry, they are understandably resistant to the ideas of corporatization or of corporate action.

Understandably, but none the less, regrettably. In too zealously guarding their local autonomy and concentrating the bulk of their energies on purely sectoral policy, they inextricably isolate the alternative circuit unnecessarily undermines its potential power as a pressure group for change. Time and again, members of the film community's alternative society (be they independent distributors, university teachers or metroplitan film festivals) duplicate one another's efforts for lack of any free and open exchange of information. Equating autonomy with secrecy and consultation with interference, they intensify the isolation which is already such a severe obstacle to the emergence of any national movement.

Not only do they frequently fail to recognize that a community of interests exists and, therefore, to act upon it in the interest of unity, but they fail too frequently to view the existence of like-minded organizations as a threat rather than a support, and view with intense suspicion suggestions of closer collaboration.

Isolation induces paranoia, which in turn induces a cosmic vision of the enemy. Fragmented activity takes more time, to less effect, than concerted effort. To the outsider, it frequently seems that a national passion for shadow-boxing has replaced the need for a collective struggle.
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Donald Sutherland was born in Canada in 1935, where he graduated as an engineer. After gaining theatrical experience in Britain and Canada he began his screen career in horror films. Following an appearance in Robert Aldrich's "The Dirty Dozen", his first major role was in Michael Sarne's "Joanna". Then came "The Split", with Jim Brown, Julie Harris, Gene Hackman and Warren Oates, "Start the Revolution Without Me", with Gene Wilder, Robert Altman's "M.A.S.H.", "Little Murders", "Klute", "Don't Look Now" (filmed in Venice), "S*P*Y*S", with Eliot Gould, and John Schlesinger's "Day of the Locust". More recently, Sutherland played the role of Attila the Fascist in Bernardo Bertolucci's epic "1900".

With Fellini's "Casanova", rarely has a director undertaken a project with such antipathy towards its main character. To Fellini, Casanova was nothing but "a stud with cold sperm". He claims he made the film only because the contract had been signed and he had already received an advance.

Every day during the shooting of "Casanova" Donald Sutherland had to submit to exhausting plastic surgery; in the film his chin, nose and forehead have all been artificially altered.

In the following interview conducted on the "Casanova" set, Sutherland discusses this demanding role with Cinema Papers' Rome correspondent Robert Schar.

Historians admire Casanova as a raffinate, cultured man, the perfect gallanter. Fellini doesn't, he detests him and finds his life without any interest. What do you think of Casanova?

As Santayana said: "People who do not learn by the past have to repeat it all the time." Well, that's what Casanova did. When Fellini says Casanova doesn't have an interesting life, it is because he didn't grow.

"The American used to say: "Today is the first day of the rest of your life", but he began as if today was the beginning of the future. That's why he was capable of falling in love all the time, because he had no historical perspective whatever. He literally believed that each love affair was the beginning of a new life. He was completely devoid of all the failures of his past life.

You talk about him being a gallanter or a cultured man. He was cultured in the sense that he was acquisitive and he acquired vast amounts of knowledge, but he wasn't truly intelligent because he didn't use his history. His main ambition was to become a gentleman, he wanted to break the class barrier and he couldn't do it because he was a rogue, a thief, a liar, a fool and he remained that all his life. He lied to himself until he died. All through his books he is lying.

Fellini detests him because he is a fool. I feel for him because he is such a fool.

What is the difference between Donald Sutherland and Casanova?

The difference between Casanova and me is that he had the confidence to live the present as if it was the keystone of the future, and I truly live my present as if it is really governed by the past. The past affects me greatly but it didn't affect him at all.

In the process of making the film I have become a little more infantile, like Casanova. For instance he was a great gambler. I gamble, too, and I generally win. He was a big loser. I gamble and win a little bit then I stop. Just before shooting I went to Las Vegas and started to gamble and gambled the way I always did. Then I started to lose, and I lost... so much that I was chasing cheques all over the place: it was incredible, just like Casanova. He released something in me which was just part of me. But then acting releases a section of yourself, it is just like psychotherapy.

Do you think that for Casanova women were just like objects of conquest?

No, absolutely not, this is wrong. There was never the sensation of conquest; at least he doesn't express it that way in his memoirs. For Don Juan, women certainly were an object of conquest. He was the antithesis of Casanova. He was the leader of a homosexual cult, and was under constant threat of death because homosexuality was a capital crime in Spain. Casanova literally believed that with every relationship he set up it was true love; that it would last forever; that it would last forever.

This is what I mean about not having a historical perspective. He
Bernardo Bertolucci (left) rehearses the drunken wedding scene with Donald Sutherland during the shooting of 1900.

“Bernardo Bertolucci (left) rehearses the drunken wedding scene with Donald Sutherland during the shooting of 1900.”

… and understand them you have to suffer and become a victim of them. Then you can become happy. This is terribly masochistic. A sad state — but that was Casanova.

What happened to all the women he was in love with?

He never left a woman. There is not one woman that he was with who ever spoke badly about him afterwards. They all loved him because they felt sorry for him, because he was a good lover and because he always took care of them.

You have been waiting very long for this part...

No. To anyone else who offered me this part I would have said “you’ve got to be out of your mind.” I only wanted to work with Fellini.

What makes you admire Fellini so much?

He has a secret fantasy, but he isn’t very objective, and he gleans from reality what Brecht talks about. Brecht wrote a poem to the Danish worker actors, on theatre. And he talked about the ability to observe and compare. It is like Alexander Pope, the English poet, who said: “True wit is nature to advantage dressed, what oft was thought, but ne’er so well expressed.”

Fellini has wit . . . has true wit. He is able to observe, to compare and to distil it in his fantasy and coalesce it in a homogenous entity which is film. To me he is one of the greatest filmmakers in the world.

In cinema, directors define what you look like by montage and by the selection of takes. They make all the choices and they really just use you as something to create the character. All you can do is to participate in their process. So you better pick the really good ones.

I decided to work with great directors. I asked Schlesinger, then Bertolucci and later Fellini if I could work with them. You don’t work a lot, but it’s wonderful when you do.

Before doing “Casanova” you worked with Bertolucci on “Novecento”. What is the difference between these two directors?

Bertolucci and Fellini are two extraordinary, creative, intelligent, and brilliant men. But both have totally disparate styles of working. To work with Bertolucci is an intellectual, cultural, political and creative dream. To work with Fellini is to work with someone who can draw you a design of a plant, but draw it in your form and say: “OK, now you get in it and make those leaves move.” He has an imagination, a fantasy, a humanity — and charm.

How does Fellini direct you . . . are his indications very precise or does he give you individual space?

Sometimes he indicates precisely, and sometimes he says: “I don’t know, what do you think?” It varies totally. In the beginning he was very specific and as he got to know me more he would allow a little bit of elasticity.

He gave me the best direction I ever have had in my life, which is to keep my mouth closed. It’s true. As Casanova I have a false chin and a false nose and Fellini says: “Keep your mouth closed!” all the time. I have a tendency to leave it open.

How did you prepare the character of Casanova?

I read and thought a lot about him. I also gave photographs to Fellini and he redesigned my face. Did not learn anything. He believed every time when it happened that it was the real one. So women were not just objects of conquest for him. It was not only a sexual thing. He was often impotent, he often complained about impotency. I mean most of the great lovers in the world do.

In the film he says women are in fact more gentle, more reasonable and more human than men. To love...
In the past few years two factors have dramatically changed the prospects for women in filmmaking. The first of these is the concept of government assistance to independent filmmaking, one which has given opportunities also to men, which made possible the feature film revival and gave many filmmakers opportunities to direct short films.

Other important forms of government assistance have been the establishment of the Film and Television School, and the School's Open Program.

The second factor is the impact of what can loosely be described as the women's movement. These two factors came together in the establishment of the Women's Film Fund, started by the International Women's Year Committee to fund through investment "films by, for or about women". Its first investment — in Caddie — has already been repaid and is beginning to make a profit which will be ploughed back into the fund.

In organizations like Film Australia the significant effect of the women's movement was to make men look positively at women for jobs, whereas a few years before they would either have not been considered at all, or rationalizations would have been found for preferring men. At a producers' meeting at Film Australia in 1973, when ideas were being cast around for possible new producers, Anthony Buckley suggested it was time they had some women. He was met with a burst of laughter.

The Whitlam government, elected in December 1972, committed itself to the principles of women's equality, and to the ideals of International Women's Year, and government departments took the hint.

Suzanne Baker was appointed to Film Australia in February 1974 — the first woman producer in its history. Baker started her career as a cadet journalist on the Sunday Sun. Once a week she used to be sent to make a small appearance on the Ray Taylor Breakfast Show on Channel 7. She came from a family of journalists, and they encouraged her to look away from the traditional field of newspapers towards the new media. When she finished her cadetship she went to London and worked in the press office at ATV. She then went to New York, where she worked at NBC, first as a secretary and then as a researcher for top newscaster Frank McGee. She did a six-week summer intensive course at New York University which, she said, taught her the jargon, "and that's about all". Back in Sydney, she worked for ABC radio, and for Bob Sanders' television session People. Bob Raymond invited her to join his new Project series on Channel 9. "Between us we did everything, with only an editor to help," Baker wrote, directed, produced and interviewed for six one-hour documentaries. She said such conditions were impossible to work under for long and she left for Britain, where, at the BBC, she saw how programs like these were made by experienced people, and realized how they should be made here.

When she returned to Australia, having decided to freelance as a journalist, she was offered the job of women's editor of the Sydney Morning Herald. She stayed there for two years during which time she radically changed the traditionally snobbish and old-fashioned women's section. She began to run lively well-informed articles on community and women's problems never aired so frankly in the Herald before. However, management conservatism turned against the new style, and Baker left because, she said, "boredom eventually got the better of me".

She has produced 27 films at Film Australia, mainly about social issues for such sponsors as the Health, Social Security, Tourism and Recreation departments. With director Bob Kingsbury she made a series of vignettes on problem situations for the Mike Walsh Show. Other films include: Women and Leisure, Sister If You Only Knew, Ultra-Sonic Examination of the Brain in Children, Health — The Australian Concept.

She commissioned Bruce Petty to make the animated film Leisure, which has recently won an Academy Award. She feels her background in television and newspapers has influenced her investigative approach to filmmaking.

Caroline Jones, well known as a television producer and compere, was appointed to Film Australia as a producer in 1974. She produced several documentaries, including a film about the attempt by some idealistic Australians to establish a new Utopia in Paraguay in the late nineteenth century. She has since returned to freelancing for Four Corners and other programs.

Meg Stewart joined Film Australia as a production assistant in the late 1960s, after graduating from the University of New South Wales. She said: "When I first joined, most of the men on the staff impressed upon me — in a kindly way and for my own good — that it was very difficult for a woman to become a film..."
Women in Australian film production

Meg Stewart and Joan Long

In the past few years Film Australia has provided contract work for freelance women filmmakers. Jane Oehr, one of the most talented of the younger women directors, made Stirring, commissioned from Film Australia by the Department of Education to illustrate an innovative social science teaching method. Stirring won a Silver Award in the Australian Film Institute Awards in 1975.

She directed Seeing Red and Feeling Blue, about menstruation, a Film Australia contribution to International Women's Year. Oehr made the film in conjunction with the Women's Theatre Group in Melbourne. It mixes drama with social realism and songs, and, after some controversy over its final length and content, is now in distribution.

Oehr first became interested in filmmaking while living in London. She made a silent film on her own, then went to work for the BBC. There she was put through the BBC film and training course, then appointed to the Children's Department, and to Late Night Line-Up.

In 1970 she made Four Women Filmmakers, which includes segments on Agnes Varda and Mai Zetterling. She made a compilation film, The Black Man in the Cinema, on the role of black actors in films since the early days. She says she was fortunate to be working with people at the BBC who allowed her to carry out some of her own ideas.

With Ian Stocks, she made Tamu (1972) about painter Donald Friend in Bali. Back in Australia her next major film was Niugini, Culture Shock (1973), with script and photography by Ian Stocks. It won the Rouben Mamoulian prize in the Greater Union Awards in 1975. Like other women, Jane found that working in partnership with her husband made it possible to achieve things she might not have otherwise, but she and Ian are now working independently.

Although she feels she didn’t learn a great deal about filmmaking at the BBC it is obvious that her experience there has considerably influenced her flexible and exploratory approach to her subjects. With the help of a Creative Fellowship from the Film and TV Board she has written three dramas designed for a television market.

Jan Sharpe was a production assistant at Film Australia for a few years in the early 1970s, but left, and later was a researcher for ABC Television. But in 1976 she returned to Film Australia on contract to help prepare a series of 10 films on adolescence, Why Can't They Be Like We Were, which were shown on the Mike Walsh Show. She directed two of the films. She is now researching concepts and attitudes for a new series of films on adolescent sexuality for Film Australia.

Janet Isaacs has worked in the television and film industry since 1971. After leaving the University of Adelaide she made a short film, Footage, on an Experimental Film Fund grant. She went to Melbourne, applied for a job at Crawford Productions, and was appointed a production assistant. After a while she asked for and was given a chance to go into editing. Later she became the first woman first assistant director at Crawford's. She says that Crawford's gave opportunities to women, partly because of the position of authority in the organization of the intelligent Dorothy Crawford.

Debbie Kingsland joined Film Australia as a production assistant, also in the late 1960s. She has since become a director, and is at present the only woman staff director there. She was unit manager for the crew which travelled to India to make the India series for schools. She directed two of the films: one about an Indian girl who has an arranged marriage, and one about a Moslem girl attending her first year of university while living in strict purdah.
Meg Stewart directing Just It and a Bit — a film about the women of the Salisbury Care Group.

She left Crawfords' to freelance, and was appointed production manager on the Film Australia 16mm feature Wolkoboi Bilongoten made in New Guinea by Oliver Howes. Her next job was associate producer on Who Killed Jenny Langby?, directed by Donald Crombie, for the South Australian Film Corporation. She returned to Film Australia to be production manager on A Steam Train Passes, and was production manager at Graham Jennings Productions for three months. Then followed a stint of first assistant directing on Caddie.

Her first film as director was Sister If You Only Knew for Film Australia, an hour-long film dealing with the particular problems of urban Aboriginal women, which was shown on the ABC's Chequerboard series. Her next was Looking After Ourselves, a 25-minute documentary about the Adelaide Women's Community Health Centre for One: One Films in South Australia.

Last year she produced a dramatized documentary, Do I Have To Kill My Child?, an independent enterprise devised in conjunction with Anne Deveson and Donald Crombie, who directed it. Film Australia lent their facilities and it was partly financed by International Women's Year.

It has already been sold to Channel 9, Sydney, for viewing in April, Isaacs will attempt overseas sales at the MIFED television market at Cannes this year. She is now working with Jay Bland on a script for a children's feature film, which she hopes to direct as well as produce.

Penny Chapman is a producer with the South Australian Film Corporation, and is currently working as assistant to John Morris, the head of production. Chapman, a graduate of the Australian National University, and a former Public Service trainee, began her association with films as a consultant officer with the Film and Television School in Sydney. It was while working at the school in 1973 that she helped organize Women Vision, the historic weekend meeting at the Sydney Filmmakers' Co-op, which was a catalyst for women's independent filmmaking.

Chapman joined the SAFC in 1974. She coordinated a community video project in Adelaide, then organized an actors' workshop and a writers' workshop.

In 1975 Chapman, while an associate producer at the corporation, managed to obtain a grant of $134,000 from the Regional Economic Development Scheme, and organized what to date has been the most adventurous women's film project undertaken by an institution.

Half the money was to go into research on daytime television — why women watch it, and the attitudes of daytime television programmers. The program began in September 1975 and was completed by February 1976. The results are being written up and prepared for publication.

The other half was to produce a series of films for women, to be screened on television. Production of the films began in October 1975, and nine months later four half-hour documentary films were finished. As well as They Reckon a Woman's World's Just It and a Bit, directed by Meg Stewart, and Looking After Ourselves, directed by Janet Isaacs, it produced Smokes and Lollies, directed by Gillian Armstrong, about 13 and 14 year-old girls' attitudes to the world, and Making a Living, about strippers, directed by Chapman.

The process of making the films was not regarded as a workshop, but was designed to offer an opportunity to as many women as possible of working in the film industry in a professional capacity. Men were used on both camera and sound, but they had women assistants, two of whom, Jan Kenny and Erica Addis, have become the first women to work on the camera crews of Australian feature films.

Lesley Hammond is also a producer with the South Australian Film Corporation. She had formerly set up the corporation's 16mm sales department. Films now in her charge, or just produced are: Family Planning, Waterbirds of South Australia, Adelaide Festival of Arts, What Public? What Service?, Police in the Community, Building Schools, Food From the Reluctant Earth, Manpower Training, and Shapes in Space.

Gillian Armstrong is one of the few graduates of academic film courses to make a mark as an independent director. In a four-year art course at the Swinburne Institute of Technology in
Melbourne she gained a Diploma in Film and Television. The Roof Needs Mowing was her final-year film. She then worked for a year as an assistant editor at Kingcroft Productions, Sydney.

In 1973 she was one of 12 students who gained places at the Film and Television School for its one-year Interim Training Scheme. There she made One Hundred a Day, adapted from an Alan Marshall short story about a girl who has an abortion. The film won a Bronze Award in the 1975 Australian Film Institute Awards. She also made a documentary, Satdee Night and Gretel, adapted from a short story by Hal Porter.

After leaving the Film School she worked on three feature film crews: art director on Promised Woman, assistant art director on The Removalists, and art director on The Trespassers. In 1975 she raised the money, partly from the Advanced Film Fund, to make an hour-long story film, The Singer and the Dancer, which won the fiction section of the 1976 Greater Union Awards. An adaptation of another Alan Marshall short story, the film has been bought by Columbia, blown up to 35mm, and is to be released with The Hireling in Sydney in April at the Village Cinema, and in Melbourne at the end of March at the Australia Cinema.

In November 1975 she directed Smokes and Lollies for the South Australian One: One Film Unit. She is now working on a feature film screenplay from her own idea, and she is also collaborating with Elinor Whitcombe (who wrote the screenplay for My Brilliant Career) on the screenplay for A Handful of Wisdom. She is working on a children's film, The Battle of Broken Hill, which has just been given an investment by the Australian Film Commission. A migrant from Turkey, she wrote radio plays and film scripts in Istanbul between 1950 and 1964, and acted and sang with the Turkish State Theatre, the Turkish State Opera, and in private theatres.

After leaving the Film School she worked on three feature film crews: art director on Promised Woman, assistant art director on The Removalists, and art director on The Trespassers. In 1975 she raised the money, partly from the Advanced Film Fund, to make an hour-long story film, The Singer and the Dancer, which won the fiction section of the 1976 Greater Union Awards. An adaptation of another Alan Marshall short story, the film has been bought by Columbia, blown up to 35mm, and is to be released with The Hireling in Sydney in April at the Village Cinema, and in Melbourne at the end of March at the Australia Cinema.

In November 1975 she directed Smokes and Lollies for the South Australian One: One Film Unit. She is now working on a feature film screenplay from her own idea, and she is also collaborating with Elinor Whitcombe (who wrote the screenplay for My Brilliant Career) on the screenplay for A Handful of Wisdom. She is working on a children's film, The Battle of Broken Hill, which has just been given an investment by the Australian Film Commission. A migrant from Turkey, she wrote radio plays and film scripts in Istanbul between 1950 and 1964, and acted and sang with the Turkish State Theatre, the Turkish State Opera, and in private theatres.

From 1964 to 1971 she lived in Sweden, where she sang with the Swedish Royal Opera. Her first film, made with a grant from the Swedish Film Institute, was an hour-long black and white television film, The Outsiders, which has been distributed in Scandinavian countries.

Since migrating to Australia in 1971 she has written and directed two 16mm films, A Handful of Dust, and The Golden Cage. A Handful of Dust won the Greater Union Fiction Award in 1974. Neither have been commercially released in Australia, although they have been shown at Festivals. All three films so far have dealt with the problems of Turkish people caught in the conflict between the cultures of their birthplace and of their adopted land.

The Battle of Broken Hill expands this theme — based as it is on a real historical incident in World War I, when a couple of Moslems living in Broken Hill shot up a trainload of Australians during the Gallipoli confrontation. She has worked on the screenplay with Ralph Peterson, an Australian writer, and she is now setting about the task of raising the remainder of the finance. Donald Crombie is to direct the film.

Anne Brooksbank is an experienced Sydney scriptwriter who has written a number of film scripts. She has won three Awgie Awards: for The Choice (documentary 1970), Moving On (co-written with Cliff Green 1972), and a children's film, Avengers of the Reef (1971). With Bob Ellis she has written some feature scripts which have not yet been produced. She has also written many television scripts, and a stage play with Bob Ellis Down Under, produced at the Stables Theatre in Sydney last year.

Sally Blake wrote the prize-winning hour-length film, Matchless (1973) which was bought by the ABC, and she collaborated closely with John Papadopolous on its production. She has since written Jogstrot, again with John Papadopolous directing, and she has worked on its production.

In recent years groups of women have taken the training initiative themselves, and have run workshops with the assistance of grants from the Film and Television School. These workshops are a manifestation of women's frustration at not being accepted into the professional mainstream, as well as of their need to say things not being said in professional filmmaking. They have already had an influence on the industry, both by giving practical experience to women who would not otherwise have been able to achieve it, and by exposing areas of experience and points of view as yet rarely glimpsed in professional filmmaking.

Some extremely interesting and useful films have come out of these workshops. However, they are beyond the scope of this series of articles, which are a record of women who work, or have worked professionally in the Australian film industry.

A future article, to be written by Elizabeth Knight, will deal with women working in the film industry in other capacities — editors, production managers, continuity, art directors, costume designers, sound recordists, cameramen, etc.
The legal owner may sell the whole of the property in the film to a distributor, or to some middleman who will in turn seek to resell the film for exhibition purposes. He may sell particular items: e.g. the copyright subsisting in certain countries; or he may sell a partial interest on some other basis. Not that sale means outright sale: if a purported sale contract provides for the property to revert to the vendor after a certain period or on the happening of a certain event (other than by exercise of an option to repurchase reserved by the vendor), it is not a true sale, but a licence or hiring out. It is not necessary, however, for a sale consideration to be a lump sum. There may be a sale for instalments, or indeed for any form of consideration.

Marketing a film usually involves marketing some or all of the rights of ownership in the film, but in countries and geographical areas that are deprived of copyright law (e.g. the international waters traversed by planes and ships) only the tangible property can be marketed.

**SCHEME OF THE AUSTRALIAN INCOME TAX LEGISLATION**

Income tax in Australia is at present levied only by the Federal government, by the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936. It is levied on each person's taxable income, which is the amount, if any, remaining after deducting, from the total of such of that person's gross receipts in each financial year as are classed as assessable income, such of that person's outgoings which are deductible. The Act applies to non-residents of Australia as well as to residents. For non-residents, the rate of Australian tax is sometimes limited, pursuant to international tax agreements entered into by Australia. Subject to any limitation, an individual is assessed at a flat rate including his taxable income, while a company is taxed at a fixed rate.

**Assessable Income and Exempt Income**

The Act does not define 'income', though it specifies that certain categories of receipts (e.g. royalties, interest, dividends, income received from a trust) are to be included in assessment. In determining what other receipts are income receipts which may be included in assessable income, as distinct from capital or non-income receipts (which are called 'gains and losses', as already defined), there is a vast body of case law concerned with this distinction. The proceeds of selling property that forms the whole or substantial part of a person's trade or business are regarded as capital receipts. The proceeds of using or hiring out such property, or of realizing assets (e.g. trading stock) in the course of operating the business, are regarded as income receipts.

The proceeds of sale of a capital asset may, however, include amounts that are attributable to the Act to be treated as income. Thus, special provisions categorize as income any profit arising from the carrying out of 'a profit-making undertaking or scheme', or from the sale of assets acquired "for the purpose of profiteering by sale", or from the sale of assets within 12 months after their purchase.

The assessable income of an Australian resident includes all income derived by him beneficially from all sources, whether in or out of Australia, other than 'exempt income'. The assessable income of a person who is not resident in Australia is confined to non-exempt income derived by him from sources in Australia. For present purposes, a relevant category of exempt income for an Australian resident is income (other than dividends) derived by him directly or indirectly from foreign sources where that income is subject to income tax in the country of source, provided the Commissioner is satisfied that the foreign tax liability has been or will be credited to Australia. The Act provides a case in point. The idea for the Australian Film Development Corporation, and for good reasons. Australia and Canada share similar problems in the film and television industries. Both are English-speaking countries, and they have small populations, and cultural backgrounds similar to the U.S.

In Canada, the attempt to establish a viable national film industry has involved both direct and indirect assistance through tax concessions on the one hand, and indirect assistance through tax concessions on the other. Canada now allows an investor in a defined
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In 1962, after seeing Orson Welles in “Compulsion”, Bert Deling decided to enrol in Law School at Melbourne University. He ended up running the University Film Society and studying American cinema and the ‘new wave’ of French films.

Deling then went to the ABC for a short while working as an editor. Then, over the next three years, he evolved the idea for his first film, “Dalmas”. However, having no professional experience as a director, Deling decided to join a company making television commercials by convincing them that he was an expatriate commercial maker recently returned from Britain. Having acquired some of the necessary skills, he completed “Dalmas” and went on to make “Pure Shit”.

In spite of a stormy reception from film critics, social commentators and censors, “Pure Shit” shared the prize for the “most creative entry” in the 1976 Australian Film Awards.

At present Deling is working on several projects, including a script centred around the Australian press, a comedy about matriarchy and madness, and a ‘road movie’.

Bert Deling was interviewed for Cinema Papers by Beryl Donaldson and John Langer when he was in Melbourne recently assessing scripts for the Australian Film Commission's Creative Development Branch.
What was the background to your decision to make "Pure Shit"?

Since I was very young, I seem to have been surrounded by people whose lives are modified, controlled, and changed by new experiences they have had as the result of drugs — an experience which the generation before that just didn't know.

I think drugs generally have been an extremely mixed blessing for this generation, and I think there's an excellent case to be made that drugs have channelled off a lot of energy, which under other circumstances might have been used very productively. Depending on how paranoid I am at any given moment, I think of that as either a historical accident or a brilliant example of social engineering.

We had a two-pronged motivation to make the film. I had known the people at the Buoyancy Foundation for a long time, and they said that they would like to set up a film they could use, because the sorts of films they could get were either made by the Food and Drug Administration in America or else they were made here by the Catholic Television Association. You could show these films to kids in fifth and sixth form and they would just sit there and laugh — this generation's version of Reefer Madness.

I also knew a lot of people who had got into smack over the past two or three years. A really interesting thing had happened, in that many people, middle-class intellectuals who had always been extremely scathing about smack and the people who got into it, had become involved themselves. So I was interested in talking about that.

I knew a lot of people in that situation, and the major thing that got us into the film was that we wanted to work with these people and give them the positive experience of creating something. Because when they finally decide they don't want to do dope any more, they stop and look around and see a world that is just as depressing, just as uncreative, just as bitter and sterile as the world that caused them to get on in the first place ... nothing has changed. Why shouldn't they go back to dope — they're certainly not being offered anything else.

We started having meetings at Buoyancy a couple of nights a week, and they would come and rave about their life experiences. That went on for months. The idea was to make it fairly arduous so we could stick out the high and edgy stuff that happens when you are shooting a film.

Everybody around the industry freaked, saying: "What are you getting into, man? You're making a feature and going to crew it and cast it with junkies. You're going to make three days if you're lucky!"

But they never missed a call, they were never late, they worked like crazy 14 hours a day for five weeks for no money. They worked faultlessly and they worked harder than any film crew I have ever worked with. We had our dramas, but I think ultimately it was more positive than negative for all of us.

We wrote the script out of their experiences. There is nothing in the film that they hadn't experienced themselves. The only kind of distortion is that instead of it being made up of all the stories about what had happened in the Melbourne drug scene in the past two years, it was set in a 48-hour period. The idea was to make a film that was accessible, so it was a conscious decision to put it into a kind of melodramatic cinema situation — melodrama because that's the way people relate to films, comedy because without it it would have been unbearable to sit through.

To a certain extent there are criticisms to be made of that. There isn't a lot of comedy in the day to day life of a junkie, and some people have pointed out that if you are going to make a film about 48 hours in the life of a junkie you'd probably just sit him down in a real scungy room and have him staring at his toe. This was discussed and there was a hell of a lot of political discussion about the attitudes of the film and who the audience was going to be.

From what you have said you obviously don't see yourself as a traditional director. Just how do you see the director's role?

I guess it varies from project to project. What we have managed to do over the last two films is to get rid of the hierarchy. But ultimately it comes down to a decision about what would be in the script and how the lines would go: and at this point people with skills, which are based on experience, will tend to dominate.

The way it functioned on Pure Shit was that it did require a consensus for something to get into the film. For instance, I feel the way the junkie's smack the way Burroughs does — he says it's the ultimate consumer item, the peak of the capitalist process. I consider that people who work 40 hours a week in factories to buy a $1000 television set, have been conned, and I think people who are addicted to smack have been conned, too. I wanted to talk about that, but it's very hard for junkies to talk about, because they are being manipulated, so it was vetoed and it didn't get into the film.

The expression of those four people as outlaws is a kind of romantic image of what junkies are — it's the junkie image of it. The film was as close as we could get to a kind of analysis of the problem while still embodying their view of themselves. It would have been an ultimate rip-off not to have that — you would be using their energies and lives to represent something that they didn't endorse.

In those terms, they had a reasonable amount of control. How the script was actually written was a decision that was mine, and I don't know any way around that problem. There are a whole series of problems that we still don't know how to resolve; problems that relate to the mystification of skills and the need for technical expertise.

How did you feel about the way "Pure Shit" was treated in the press? One reviewer described it as "the most evil film ever made". Did you expect this kind of reaction?

Well, you always foresee that possibility when you are hitting at very primal sorts of areas. Thomas Szasz says that every period of history has had its pariahs — people who have had the group terror of existence projected on to them. In the Middle Ages it was witches, for the past hundred years it's been lunatics, and now we have drug addicts.

Drug addicts represent an absolute challenge to the capitalist Christian ethic which demands that you deny yourself fulfilment, creative outlets and pleasure for some kind of future reward. Then along come these people who say: "All I want to do is lie on this bed and feel orgasmic all day, and I'll just keep sticking this needle in my arm, and if I have two years of this and then I die, I will consider my life has been infinitely more positive than if I had spent 65 years
Between takes during a night shoot on Pure S.

Garry Waddell as Lou in Pure S.

Working for Ford."

So when you put out a statement which says that drug addicts are not psychopaths, they are human beings, and in many cases they are the best minds of their generation who just can't bear to look out into that world and realize that nothing is ever going to be done and nothing is ever going to change, you know you are going to freak some people out — you know that's going to happen.

The media response to "Pure Shit" has meant that you have often been presented more as a controversial figure in the drug debate than as a filmmaker. Does this bother you, or do you in fact see your films primarily as political statements?

I think every film is a political statement. The lack of a left-wing statement in a film does not make it apolitical. All films are political, but it is only when a film has a left-wing stance that the media call it a political film. That is the first distinction that you have to make.

I am into making films that are relevant to my life experience, and I am also interested in making some kind of Australian experience accessible to other Australians, particularly the people who go to the commercial cinema.

I am not interested in making art films. In that sense Pure Shit is a failure, because while it has been seen by more people than Dalmas, it's still pretty much locked into the sub-culture, preaching to the converted.

You see yourself as an Australian filmmaker then, concerned with creating specifically Australian images...

I am trying to be an Australian filmmaker, which means purging myself of a whole life's absorption in an alien culture. It's amazing what has been done in this country in terms of myths, particularly by the British. The British have totally manipulated our culture.

Every major cultural prop in this country is about some situation where Australian soldiers have been wiped out fighting wars that had nothing whatsoever to do with them. That kind of manipulation begins the moment you hit school. Then, the more you get into film, and the more you go to the cinema to learn, the more you are totally brainwashed by American culture. When you start to make Australian films, what you find yourself doing is making American films with Australian accents.

This is not new. Every one of the Third World filmmakers talks about this, and the Canadians are dealing with the problem all the time — trying to set up some kind of national culture in the shadow of the beast. It's not just that you are dealing with an audience that will only accept American metaphors — you've the fuckers in your head! But if you can handle it, if you can understand the process, it can be like a joint exploration, you and your audience moving step by step into some kind of national space.

It's such a subtle, contextual thing that most filmmakers are just trying to make as good a copy of the American cinema as they can, hoping to demonstrate that they are so good that they will be grabbed and become the next Steven Spielberg.

That's been the process in this country from the word go: the best creative minds, the best analysts of the situation demonstrate some sort of capacity and they are just yanked straight out. What you begin to understand is that it's a political process, and somewhere there has to be a generation that says: "No more! This is my place, this is where I have to function."

The Australian film scene is dominated by men, and the films have so far presented a male view of a profoundly sexist society. Do you see this as a problem, and is there any way of changing it?

It's certainly a problem on any kind of level. I would imagine that there are more women going to films these days than men, and just because they support male views of women isn't to say that that's what they want or need. And it's not to say that they wouldn't support a female view of women twice as much.

It's a really insidious problem, because a film funding situation has been set up where assessors are free to follow their taste, and there cannot be a directive. There can be a general statement of the problem, but it has been left to individual assessors to decide how that's going to be interpreted. And there are a lot of men around who haven't done very much assessment of their sex roles at all. So they are very threatened and there is a tendency in some cases to see women's scripts — which are demonstrably different to those of men — not as some kind of alternative, but as poor attempts to reproduce what men do, and consequently they are rejected.

That can be dealt with by making sure there is at least one woman on each of the funding groups. But then you get into another problem, etc.
it's the men who select the women, so they choose women who in many cases function like men. Unless you have a situation where women are selecting someone who they are prepared to accept as representing women, you have a situation where men are dominating. Having men select women and put them in those situations alleviates the problem to a certain extent, but it's more a kind of liberal absorption of a contentious group than something that is effectively going to change the situation.

Men, with the best will in the world, are not the best people to be making decisions about how the women's situation within the film industry can be resolved.

We understand that the AFC is handling the distribution of "Pure Shit" in Sydney. How has it worked out?

It's the beginning of a new process for the AFC. They are interested in getting into distribution because there have been a series of extremely successful Australian films which have made huge quantities of money at the box-office, but most of that money is being creamed off by the exhibitors and the distributors, and the filmmakers and the commission are not getting much back. There are also a number of Australian films in which the commission has invested which, for various reasons, have not been distributed in certain Australian cities.

So the initial decision to distribute the film was absolutely fantastic as far as I am concerned, because "Pure Shit" was not a very commercial film — in traditional terms — and given the problem of how to get this industry functioning it was a really positive step to take, and for which I am grateful. From then on I am extremely critical of what happened.

One of the problems, basically, is that the Film Commission has nowhere near full time who has had experience in selling to the Australian public. They have people who are experienced in overseas selling, but it seems to me that if the commission is seriously going into distributing films locally, they are going to have to bring someone in who knows what they are doing.

The other aspect of my experience with the commission that I am critical of is that I was completely isolated from the decision-making process concerning how the film was to be sold. On principle I think that's pretty heavy, because filmmakers should be given the chance to learn.

In this case I had already been involved in selling the film in Melbourne and Adelaide, so that I had some idea of how to make "Pure Shit" palatable to Australians. I went to Sydney with that expertise and expected at least to be listened to. I went to some trouble to get people who already had success in selling films to a youth market in this country, and graphic designers who had spent a lot of time working in that area. All those people were prepared to work on the sale of "Pure Shit" for nothing because they believed in the film, but their suggestions and offers of work were vetoed by the commission.

The AFC operates on the principle of the shotgun, and in selling "Pure Shit" put up a fairly neutral image designed to relate to a large cross-section of people — terrific if you are selling motor-cars, but with films you have 85 per cent of your audience under 30, and it becomes very critical just what the graphics are and how the film sold. The graphics that were produced for "Pure Shit" bore no resemblance to the nature of the film. I came up against a mixture of arrogance and incompetence I was unable to break through.

But when I speak about the AFC, I want to be specific about what I am talking. It's not the whole commission; there are people in the AFC who are amazingly perceptive, and who have been extremely supportive. The last thing I want to get into here is an attack on any individual. You are dealing with a process, and what I am trying to say here is that that process needs to be modified before it can either be productive or very attractive to Australian films.

The thing that makes it critical is that the AFC must get involved with distribution. If they don't, then we are going to continue to have the situation where we have a situation where some Australian films have been more successful than anyone ever thought, but the filmmakers and the AFC are not seeing much of the money.

We understand that you have run into censorship problems with "Pure Shit".

Yes. Most people have the idea that censorship is less of a problem in Australia than it's ever been, which is just not true. The problem is in the nature of censorship itself, since nobody outside the AFC — which specifically states what is going to be censored and what is not. So much of it comes down to the taste of the person who is the censor, and interpretations of what censorship should be and how it should function vary astonishingly, depending on the personality of the man in that position.

Now, we have a person who sits in that position in Australia — Mr Richard Prowse whose concept of prevailing public standards varies drastically from my own, so that over the past few years I have been in confrontation with him on many occasions and have had more than a taste of how censorship functions in this country.

I have had a lot of problems with him over "Pure Shit", to the degree that he has insisted that all advertising matter be presented to him for approval. We got into a situation where we had a poster designed in Melbourne, and knew we had to present it to him, but the artwork was running late, and we looked at the poster and thought well, there's nothing on that that anyone could take exception to, and had it printed. He objected to a line on the poster — "the next best thing to dying" — so all the posters had to be scrapped. We were summoned, and the director of the Australian Film Institute and I spent four hours in D-24 making statements to the Vice Squad! They haven't yet proceeded with those, so we don't know what is going to happen about it.

Anyway, in my opinion, dying is the worst thing that can happen to anybody, and the next one is being addicted to smack.

While I was in Sydney, I went on 2JJ and talked about the problems that I had had with censorship. I didn't say anything that hadn't actually happened. I described the situation exactly as I just described it to you, and our censor freaked out. He told the AFC that I was not to make any more statements about him anywhere.
Films about Children

Greg Rowe as Mike in Storm Boy: deeply in tune with the natural optimism of children.

Virginia Duigan

After watching four recent Australian films made for children — Storm Boy, Ride a Wild Pony, Let the Balloon Go and Barney — I came to one firm conclusion about what constitutes such films.

Children find grown-ups either boring or puzzling, and are more interested in other children. So a film made for young audiences has children as the central characters; an adult film, generally speaking, is about adults.

All very simple and self-evident. Yet it does have certain important implications. If one accepts that a film directed at children need not talk down, need not compromise artistic standards, and can encompass many, if not most, of the subtleties, ironies and sophistications that adults relish in their own entertainment, a child's film doesn't fall into such a greatly separate category.

Indeed, a measure of the achievement of a successful children's film can be its reception by an adult audience. A first class feature, like the South Australian Film Corporation's Storm Boy, is just as enthralling if you are 8, 80 or 30 and cynical. Columbia Pictures' Barney, on the other hand, while fairly favorably received by children leaves an adult distinctly cold, and by this criterion at least is an inferior film.

The obvious danger in all this, where adults control the purse strings and select the options, particularly for the under-10s, is for grown-ups to take children only to films they think are good (i.e. films they think they are going to enjoy too) rather than letting the children wallow in substandard rubbish now and again. Just as Enid Blyton never did anyone any harm, until adults decided she was shallow and therefore bad, a foolish flick like Barney isn't going to permanently warp any aspiring young Peter Weir.

So what's wrong with Barney? Merely that it presents a sanitized, fairyland Austramerica and is written and directed with an airy disregard for children's intelligence and discrimination.

Something like a Paper Moon for the tinies, it chronicles the adventures of a rather stodgy young hero (Brett Maxworthy) who teams up with a singularly unattractive Irish convict (Sean Kramer) after both survive a particularly unconvincing shipwreck. The period is the gold rush, setting quasi Wild West, characters uncomfortably drawn (the Irishman changes from calculating opportunist to reformed reprobate under Barney's purifying influence) and goings-on thoroughly unlikely.

All of which wouldn't matter a great deal if it were not compounded by constant evidence of cost cutting, blatant plot holes, inept editing and graceless, fumbling humor. The film is a sham, and an alert child will probably see through it without much prompting. There are countless adults' films like it — Moll Flanders is one — and they serve a useful purpose as negative yardsticks, if nothing much else.

Two examples in roughly the same commercial category which manage to be better films than Barney are Ride a Wild Pony (directed for Disney by Don Chaffey) and Let the Balloon Go (Oliver Howes for Film Australia). Both are brisk, entertaining and honest, and obviously made with a degree of professional enthusiasm which, as well as being infectious, also puts one immediately on the side of the film.

"Please, Storm Boy — don't run away! We'd love to have you at the school."
The two also star the same young actor, Robert Bettles, a spunky little kid with a handy Churchillian scowl (employed to effect by both directors) and an engaging grin. He plays the son of a struggling bush family in the first, and the crippled child of worried middle class parents in the second.

It is worth mentioning at this point that there are three other apparently essential ingredients in a children's film. Animals (dog, pony, wombat and pelican in the four films under discussion), misfortunes of some kind or another (and resultant pluck in the face of same) and a Just William style of naughtiness which mainly manifests itself in outwitting parents or other tiresome adults. And the protagonists are mostly boys; screenwriters do not yet appear confident that girls have the same drawing power for both sexes. Fine if you are a boy, potentially disastrous for your lifetime self-image if you happen to be a girl.

Ride a Wild Pony scores audience points for its lyrical shots of boy galloping pony through the Australian countryside — which, since Break of Day, has never looked so good. But the film also sets up a situation of some complexity and subtlety. The boy's pony is taken, unwittingly, by a neighboring rich family for their crippled daughter's use.

The audience is torn between the rival claims, both of which have emotional and rational support. The two children are equally spirited and determined; one is disabled by physical injury, the other by economic hardship. It is a nice, tricky moral predicament, approached sensitively in the screenplay by Rosemary Anne Sisson and intelligently in the performances, particularly that of John Meillon as the sympathetic local lawyer.

Let the Balloon Go, after a story by Ivan Southall, is a yarn of Alan Marshall simplicity, only this time our hero climbs a tall tree instead of jumping puddles. The film has speed, child-oriented humor and a healthy scorn for pathos, and like Wild Pony it makes quite a good fist of engaging the audience mentally and imaginatively.

These two films and Storm Boy are, to differing extents, an authority that comes, I suggest, from not shirking the problem of giving moral directives to children. It seems to me that adults are often unnecessarily uptight about this; children, like most people, need values to aspire to and heroes to believe in. The best children's films don't preach; nor are they remotely pious. They work by implication, giving the audience a framework in which to make up their minds.

This is seen most clearly in the dilemma posed by Ride a Wild Pony — which illustrates tellingly the truism that there are no easy answers to the real problems of life, and justice is neither automatic nor guaranteed. Life is not fair. Even the happy ending has an appropriately contrived flavor.

Storm Boy illustrates a similar lesson from the same school of hard knocks. But much of its impact lies in constructive implication. All men are not senseless destroyers; therefore it is possible to imagine a better world in which no men are destroyers. From a child's point of view, it is a very hopeful film.

On this level Storm Boy is deeply in tune with the natural optimism of children — one of their best and most fragile characteristics. It has a beauty and simplicity that strike a responsive chord in children, and it also has, in Fingerbone Bill, the Aborigine (Gulpilil), a hero approaching mythical stature.

The film has been criticized in Cinema Papers for failing to develop its statements. To me this is its strength; it is a quietly provocative story at an unusually profound level, and unlike most children's films it has absolutely no surplus fat on it. ★
Which are the most important films you have designed costumes for?

All Visconti's films except for La Terra Trema and Ossessione. Then Fellini's Toby Damnit (an episode of Histoires Extraordinaires) and Satyricon. Bolognini's Il Bell'Antonio, Senilita, La Viaccia, Metello, Bubu, Per Le Antiche Scale. Monicelli's I Compagni, Pasolini's Medea, With De Sica on Matrimonio all'Italiana, Jerei, Oggi e Domani.

In the theatre, I have also worked with Visconti on many productions — "Medea", "Macbeth", "La Sonnambula", "Zio Wanja", "La Locandiera", "Munon", "Dommage Qu'elle Soit Une Putain".

Your collaboration with Visconti has lasted for several decades — how did the association begin?

It began because I studied at the Academy of Fine Arts in Florence. However, my ambition was to work in films, in the cinema, and a friend of mine, Franco Zeffirelli, had studied there at the Academy and had come to Rome and began to work as a collaborator with Visconti. Every time he came to Florence I showed him my work. When he came down to get these, I helped Franco Zeffirelli, and Maria de Matteis who did the costumes.

From then on we began to keep in touch. I showed my work to Visconti — I was 22 — and he asked me how old I was. He said: 'Well, you've got plenty of time.' How this offended me. What desperation. However, the year after that, in 1949, he was preparing Merimee's La Carrozza del Santissimo Sacramento with Anna Magnani. Then I prepared for the film, which, as an idea, was very good, especially the part played by Magnani, which was beautiful. But the film was abandoned. I then began the preparations for Cronaca di Poveri Amanti by Pratalini. I started the film, always with the assistance of Maria de Matteis. But that was also abandoned. Lizzani made it many years later.

Then in 1951, Visconti began to work on Bellissima with Anna Magnani. I was called on to do the costumes. So I began with Bellissima, and two years later did "La Locandiera" in the theatre for Visconti.

I began with distrust in Visconti's opinion. But after "La Locandiera", which was an enormous success both in Italy and Paris, our collaboration began, and lasted for 27 years. A very fine collaboration, exhausting but good. In later years we had such an understanding that we only needed to meet and talk about it for one day before seeing each other on the set for shooting. Visconti was a man of great character. He began in one direction and continued along it, even when it meant making mistakes, but he never went backwards. It was, therefore, easy for me once we had chosen a line of visual interpretation. The mistake would have been mine if anything went wrong. All that I had to do was to continue in the direction he indicated.

In his films the costumes have always played an important part: for him the costume designer must have been one of the most important collaborators...
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In concrete terms, what does the work of a costume designer involve?
First comes the research — where possible, from photographs, where that's not possible, from pictures. You try to get as much material as possible — historical material that is. What's involved is searching for reality in order to recreate it, to resurrect it in some way. Not certainly through fashion sketches. These have never conveyed reality. Today, if you open a copy of *Vogue*, the people on the street are not dressed like those you see in *Vogue*.

For Visconti's *Il Gattopardo*, to give you an example, I went to Sicily to search for daguerreotypes, photos — all that it was possible to find. Also real costumes. For the Garibaldi soldier I went to the museum at Palermo. Then to the houses of the Sicilian nobility to find drawings, photos of the period — the 1860s.

This is how you lay the groundwork. The moment the actor comes into it, you have another job to do. You begin from the beginning again because the design doesn't count anymore. What counts now is the actor. You can't fit a man or woman to a costume; you have to try to suit the costume to the actor. This is the real work.

And is it here that problems arise with the actors?

No, I wouldn't say so. All that's necessary is to be able to convince them or adorn them. And the real job is that which will be seen on the screen when the film is shot, the work on the head — the make-up, the hairstyle. The head is part of the costume. Films are like heads looking through portholes which can, at best, become windows. What you have to see are the close-ups.

Then there has to be close collaboration between the set designer and the costume designer. I have to know the colors of the surrounding, then, knowing these, I can test my colors against it or can set the color scheme myself. If a set designer has character in certain colors he busies his work on those colors.

Do different problems arise in making black and white films?

Yes, but the problems are not as serious. Black and white film is easily adaptable. There were problems: for example the color black, although film has recently been refined to such a degree of sensitivity that you can photograph black and white very well. But not at the beginning. There were problems because pure white became light and the blacks became dead, utterly dark. Therefore, you had to choose certain shades of grey, certain very dark greens to produce a softer black, and certain light beige tones if you wanted white. But it's the same with color — I have yet to see good color. We still have a terrible mechanical reproduction.
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In this fifth part of a 19-part series, Cinema Papers contributing editor Antony I. Ginnane and Melbourne solicitors Leon Gor and Ian Baillieu continue the discussion that began in the last issue on the various methods used in Australia and abroad to finance film production. 'Angel' financing and financing by a distribution company were dealt with in part 4. Other methods of private and government funding are now examined.

ADVANCE TERRITORIAL SALES

Attempting to sell the distribution rights to a film yet to be produced and to use the proceeds as production finance is a relatively recent device. It was first used in the early 1960s and coincided with the emergence of major independent producers and distributors worldwide.

The Samuel Bronson organization first brought it into favor with a series of pre-sold Madrid based spectacles — El Cid, Fall of the Roman Empire and Circus World. The British based World Film Sales organization took up the concept in the mid-sixties when it acted for a group of independent producers.

It was not until the mid-seventies, however, that pre-sales became fashionable. Today the liquidity of the feature wing of Independent Television Corporation-Associated General Films is heavily dependent on pre-sales cash; two likely blockbusters for 1977-78, A Bridge Too Far and Apocalypse Now, might well not have got off the ground without pre-sales cash.

But while major independent productions have been the main recycling vehicle of the pre-sales technique in the past, it is now general practice for even the smallest independent productions to be touted around the world before filming.

The practical details of a pre-sale vary from deal to deal according to the bargaining powers of buyer and seller. Essentially, however, a pre-sale is simply an advanced-in-time distributor deal, but with the distributor-buyer gaining no revenue as production funds.

The distributor’s profit, if any, will come from his distribution fee and expenses. The advantage of this arrangement to the producer is that it enables him to maintain a higher equity in the production.

- Normally the distributor does not pay the total pre-sale price until the film is ready to be delivered. There will probably be a stepped arrangement, for example 25 per cent after the first print run is sold, 50 per cent on commencement of principal photography and the remaining 25 per cent on delivery of the first print. And depending on the size of the production and the amount of money involved, the distributor may require the production company to furnish evidence of a completion guarantee * of some kind.

The form of agreement used for pre-selling is usually an amended distribution agreement. If the producer’s other financiers are ‘angel’ investors, it is also common for the producer’s investment agreement to give them priority in recouping their capital investment from first profits. This is done to compensate the ‘angel’ investors for their potential earnings by the use of potential territorial sales revenue as production funds.

Several other points relating to pre-sales should be noted:

1. Pre-sales agreements are normally made on a country-by-country basis, and therefore the dangers of cross-collateralization between territories, handled jointly by a distributor, are avoided.

2. The Australian producer can engage in pre-selling activity because Section 197 of the Copyright Act allows assignments of interests in copyright which has yet to come into existence. The role of the foreign sales agent has been discussed previously in this series. Our model producer will need to have recourse to his assistance in floating the production on the world market.

3. To sell an Australian production in advance international sales, such a package will probably need to contain at least one recognizable American name in the cast.

Although in the past most major foreign independent producers who have engaged in pre-sales have combined pre-selling with a sale to a major American distributor for the U.S. and Canada, there is no reason why an Australian producer could not approach an independent U.S. distributor as part of his pre-sales thrust.

NEGATIVE PICK-UPS

The negative pick-up concept is yet to be used in Australia, primarily because it is generally linked to 100 per cent financing by major American distributors. In essence, it is an arrangement by which certain rights to a proposed film production are licensed to a distributor for a territory (frequently the U.S. and Canada) in return for a guaranteed sum of money payable in advance of the release of the film, sometimes partly on signature of the agreement, but usually on delivery to the licensee of a completed release print and certain other materials.

A negative pick-up deal resembles a pre-sale arrangement. However, its chief difference is that the payment of the agreed advance is generally made only on delivery of the completed film complying with certain requirements laid out in advance in the negative pick-up contract.

It has been a popular mechanism by which American majors have acquired product in the past, and abroad in a number of countries with little or no cash outlay upfront and no responsibility for budget overages.

The producer will then attempt to use his negative pick-up contract as collateral for a loan from one of the American banks that specialize in film lending, and in theory should have little difficulty in getting such a loan if the licensee is a reputable major distributor. Problems have frequently arisen with negative pick-ups, however, for two reasons:

1. Often the amount of money to be paid under the arrangement is less than the total production cost of the film, and producers have had trouble making up the difference because the incentive to finance a production is greatly diminished when the U.S.-Canada rights are gone; and

2. In the past many distributors have settled their negative pick-up contracts in such a way that there is always a number of grounds on which the distributor can reject the production and consequently not have to pay the advance. If a bank has accepted such a contract as collateral and the distributor subsequently refuses to accept the production, then the producer will have extra equity, but he will also have a loan falling due which he has little or no capacity to repay.

If we examine a typical negative pick-up agreement, it can be seen that there are a number of areas where loopholes can be found:

1. Introductory clauses to the agreement will describe the production, listing the director, the stars and the writer of the screenplay as well as the territory for which the distributor-financier will acquire rights.

2. There will be a delivery date specified and this will be strictly adhered to by the distributor. Delivery will be defined to mean

* A precedent for a negative pick-up agreement will be provided in the subscription service.

**A completion guarantee — which is virtually unobtainable in any meaningful way — is a specialized form of insurance ensuring the completion of the film. It will be discussed in a further article in the series.
3. The agreement will clearly state that the distributor is under no obligation whatsoever to advance money towards the completion of the production;

4. A detailed description of the technical standards that the film will have to meet are included both as to running time and aspect ratio;

5. The Motion Picture Association of America code rating to be obtained will be included and the producer will have to warrant that the film will receive no less a rating;

6. Normally a copy of the final approved draft of the script will be made available to the company. The distributor may argue that certain slight divergencies from the words of the shooting script made on the day of the filming are enough to bring the agreement to an end. If the producer is using the distributor’s laboratory, he may find that there is argument whether his pre-print materials are satisfactory;

7. In the event of a star or the director taking ill, conflicts may arise between the requirements of the negative pick-up agreement as to maintenance of this or that name, on the one hand, and the requirements of the production’s insurer to replace the director or star on the other.

The completion bond guarantor, without whom the negative pick-up contract may have been acceptable to a bank in the first place, may also pressure the producer and create a situation whereby the distributor can renego on his agreement.

These and other problems the producer may encounter with film insurance will be dealt with in a later article in the series. Even assuming, however, that it is possible to draw the contract so that the delivery requirements can be met with reasonable diligence, and the letter of credit that the distributor lodges with a bank for the producer can be cashed, the negative pick-up may still be the wrong way to finance the production, because the negative pick-up contract will also lock the producer into a distribution agreement better than other national film funding bodies such as the Canadian Film Development Corporation.

It has recently moved to assist and encourage private sector investment by providing that in future three-quarters of the budget will be funded by private capital. However, if the AFC is not liable for income tax it does not appear to have fully considered the income tax problems that some of its practices may create for investors and producers. And so far it has taken a fairly low profile in the attempt to create for investors and producers. And so far it has taken a fairly low profile in the attempt to create for investors and producers.

On the positive side, however, it is fair to say that the AFC and the AFDC there would be no Australian film industry today. Its one-in-three distribution ownership and the requirement of national film funding bodies such as the Canadian Film Development Corporation.

The AFC has endeavored to supply one answer.

Unfortunately its very success has led to problems. It is now virtually impossible to obtain finance from the private sector without AFC involvement in the production as a seal of approval. For far from phasing itself out of the market in the next few years, the AFC appears to be getting more and more indispensable.

Perhaps most troubling is the fact that without the AFDC and the AFDC there would be no Australian film industry today. Its one-in-three distribution ownership and the requirement of national film funding bodies such as the Canadian Film Development Corporation.

Experimental Film Fund handled by the Australian Council, not the AFDC.

In 1975, the AFDC was disbanded and the Australian Film Commission was formed. The AFC has continued a policy to fund local production by way of investment and loan, and has taken over responsibility for Film Australia and for the Film Finance Corporation, formerly of the Australian Council.

The activities and powers of the AFC are clearly set out in the establishing Act, No. 6 of 1975, and would-be applicants should obtain a copy from the Australian "Cinema Papers Monthly Review of current activity in the industry and the World Film Industry, April 1976.“ The section goes on to give guidelines for "significant Australian content".

There appears to be strong divergence of opinion within the AFC concerning the extent to which these guidelines are to be strictly enforced. However, it seems clear that until of official co-production treaties are negotiated between a number of English-speaking and European filmmaking countries, it will be difficult for the commission to become involved in a real co-production. As budgets increase, such productions may be one way of sharing the risk.
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relevant laboratory to hold the negative and a procedure for ordering release prints. Certain reporting procedures are to be followed during production, to protect against divergence from the budget for the producer.

There is a detailed discussion of the results of a breach of the agreement by the producer in clause 5, and the AFC, as it tends to do in this agreement, purports to act as a sort of 'agent' of the other investors. Details of the insurance required are provided. An over-budget facility is set up in lieu of a completion guarantee requirement, and a formula is set out similar to clauses found in completion guarantees or production-distribution agreements by which the budget overage, if more than 10 per cent, reduces the production company's equity in the project.

In dealing with the marketing and licensing arrangements for the completed film, the AFC again attempts to lay ground rules for the other investors to follow.

The distribution proceeds clause provides for (after deduction and distribution expenses, fees and advances), repayment of the investors' capital (excluding the AFC capital, repayment of the AFC capital, and then a split according to the agreed formula between investors and the production company).

Producers may need to lobby the AFC for an increase in the producer's share of the capital and a distribution of proceeds, whereby the production company shares in returns at the same time as the investors' capital is being repaid.

The other major problem with this clause is that it envisages all payment of moneys by the distributors being made to the AFC and then disbursed by the AFC in accordance with clause 1.2 of the precedent.

The present structure of the AFC is such that it is difficult for it to dispose funds as quickly and as accurately as done by the hungry producer with one film only of interest to him. It may be more appropriate if an accountant to the production company, or appoint the production company as the corporation's agent.

A representative of the corporation will attend to the financial success of the film. They then have no responsibility to finance the exploitation of the ancillary rights. The profits as such belong to the producer, or to the persons who take the risks to earn them.

Clause 17 contains a qualification to the arbitration clause concerning the takeover of the production by the investors in the event of the producer's breach which puts the AFC in a most privileged position, divorced from the merely power of its equity.

There is no provision in the agreement concerning breaches by the AFC, and apart from the need to control certain funds, it makes no real warranties or covenants. The producer might consider requiring the AFC to indub in a certain amount of marketing activity on behalf of the film, both here and overseas, and to provide consultative services in respect of local distribution contracts.

The AFC could also be required to warrant that if it insists on monitoring proceeds of the production, it distribute to the investors within 28 days, accompanied by statements of account in a form acceptable to the producer.

The AFC should also be obliged to give the producer regular reports on the performance of its functions as collector and distributor of the film proceeds.

The AFC's loan agreement, a copy of which is contained in the subscription service, is similar in layout to really the investment contract, except that it is marginally less onerous in its requirements of the producer.

There are, however, many clauses in the loan agreement that a producer may wish to negotiate, depending on the amount of the loan. The producer should pay attention to the income tax aspects of the AFC loan, particularly where the loan is for production rather than for marketing.

Sometimes the terms of the loan may require the investor to apply his share of the film hire towards repayment of the loan to the AFC before any other obligations. In that case, if the film hire is normally assessable income (whether or not collected on behalf of the producers by the AFC), the AFC has available tax deductions equaling the amount of the loan, the producer will need additional finance in order to pay the Australian income tax assessed on such film hire. (It should be noted that much of the profit on Australian films is a capital gain which is not a tax deductible outlay. Cinema Papers forum on tax law and the film industry, which will be available in booklet form, should be referred to in this regard.)

STATE FUNDING

At present, Australia has more facilities for government funding of film production than any other country in the world. The South Australian government led the way for state governments to invest in local production — with the establishment of the South Australian Film Corporation in 1973. More recently the Victorian and the NSW governments have set up their own film corporations, and the Queensland government is reported to have established a preliminary committee in this area.

The SAFC has a large permanent staff whose expertise in marketing and promotion can be of assistance to other states, and they also manage the taxation on the income generated by the corporations. The SAFC now has certain residence requirements for its employees and the government is reported to have established a preliminary committee in this area.

The SAFC has a large permanent staff whose expertise in marketing and promotion can be of assistance to other states, and they also manage the taxation on the income generated by the corporations.

A representative of the corporation will generally serve on the production as executive producer, and there may also be a resident accountant. The corporation's track record in regard to quality and box-office is very good and would-be producers with properties that could accept South Australian elements would do well to approach it.

Usually, though not always, the corporation has jointly invested in productions (apart from its own in-house productions) with AFC investment.

The Victorian and NSW corporations are still in embryonic form and it is too early to make any predictions. There appears to be a tendency on the part of the Victorian corporation to allow considerations of quality to override that of box-office. Both corporations appear to provide investment and loan moneys and they don't appear to be as strict on residency requirements as the SAFC.

SERVICE PARTNERSHIPS

A method of film financing which has not been used in Australia, but which has become very common in the U.S., is the so-called service partnership. The Great Gatsby, Funny Lady, Bite the Bullet and Shampoo are examples of films financed in this way. The essence of this method is that the investors, acting in partnership with each other, undertake to produce the film for the production company, in return for a fee that is dependent on and increases according to the financial success of the film. They then sub-contract the actual production tasks to the production company or to an associated company, or appoint the production company as their production manager. The investors are, therefore, not personally involved in producing the film, though they remain responsible. They do not acquire any ownership of the film, which belongs wholly to their client, the production company.

In the U.S. this method is facilitated by the existence of limited liability partnerships, ready availability of production completion guarantees, and special tax advantages which are not available in Australia. It is thought that the method could have tax advantages for investors in Australia, too.

The tax problems affecting film producers and investors will be the subject of separate articles in future issues, but briefly it may be said that one of the problems in Australia is the extent to which the costs of producing a film can be treated as tax deductible against the gross proceeds of the film. Since film production is a manufacturing industry, it seems that production costs incurred in the course of acquiring ownership or a share of ownership in a film are essentially capital outgoings, and as such unlikely to be deductible, except under Division 10B of the Income Tax Assessment Act, which allows the cost of acquiring an interest in the Australian copyright in a film to be depreciated over a 25-year period (the deemed life of the copyright), i.e. at the miserly rate of four per cent a year.

Since the service partners would not incur the production costs in order to acquire any equity in the film but in order to earn fees, it appears that the service partnership method of financing may provide investors a means of deducting the whole of the production costs against their current assessable incomes.

On the other hand, such investors must be prepared to accept unlimited legal and financial responsibility for the production of the film, and the mutual obligations which partnership entails the mutual obligations which partnership entails. For that reason the service partnership method may be impracticable where there are numerous investors who are strangers to each other, or where the Australian Film Commission or a state film corporation is one of the investors.

The section of the subscription service on production financing will also contain material on the appropriate format for an investment proposition, package finance deals, the use of deferments, the rise and decline of IPOs, off-the-books financing and exhibitor financing — with reference to Billy Jack Productions and Exprodico.

It was considered for reasons of space and day-to-day practicality to exclude this material from Cinema Papers.
The 8th Tehran International Film Festival, with its 150 odd features spread over eight different sections in six separate cinemas, is a mammoth affair staged in a city of five million people, and a reported 1.5 million cars, the festival attracts an audience of nearly 400,000, with guests and celebrities in the hundreds.

The festival is a market place, numerous conferences and forums, and a hectic schedule of screenings and receptions. For a filmmaker who has been living film, and though director Hagir Dariush hopes to move the festival to the quieter and more picturesque city of Isfahan, one can be certain the 8th Iran Film Festival will be a major cinematic event.

It was, of course, physically impossible to see all the films, but I have reviewed all those I managed to catch, and have listed some I didn’t. Tehran is a competitive festival and the major awards are listed in the text. The jury included Andre Delvaux, Mark Robson, Emmanuelle Riva, Arthur Hill and actress Shabara Azmi. Four Australian films — Caddie, Picnic at Hanging Rock, The Devil’s Playground and The Singer and the Dancer — were screened and all were well received.

The award for Best Direction went to Nikita Mikhalkov for his film, The Slave of Love. Scripted by Friedrich Gorenstein and Andrei Mikhalkov-Konchalovsky, the film is a pastel-colored romance of love and revolution in the Russia of 1917, with a time commitment to either side became a necessity.

A group of commercial filmmakers, having fled from Moscow and the October Revolution, reside in a small southern town, dividing their time between long afternoon siestas and occasional bursts of professional activity. It is a charming existence, a state of suspended animation and an atmosphere well captured by the visual and aural effect of filters, costumes and lighting. In a sense, the group typifies the idyllic life in White Russian society before the revolution.

Bored by delays and the unavailability of film stock, the group falls prey to depression. "We can't live by avoiding politics," someone suggests, only to hear the reply: "Are we really alive? Only if we are fighting, otherwise we are damned." This political guilt is aggravated by the visits of Captain Fedotov, head of a White Russian counter-espionage group. Fedotov is searching for an anonymous person he finds he has to change, renounces his role as judge and visits his son and daughter-in-law. Their marital unhappiness, and Emilia's sensitivity to his unfaithfulness, push him further towards a kind of self-discovery. He then hears of Irene's death in her native village.

The film concludes with Guido embarking on a journey to an unknown place, only to die in passage. Emilia visits his tomb-like home and there finds his letters.

As this is also the beginning of the film, Dir. Fedotov is suggesting that Emilia will begin her own search — not only for herself, but also in memory of Guido's character, in the arbitrariness of his power at a time of life when others hope to sink below it. The comforting knowledge of having acted according to the Best Actor Award.

Irene, Irene is a very quiet film without a purpose to the story and explanation. At times, the film is over-muddy and gestured, but Del Monte shows reactivity that its search and control of oil is greatly aided by his cast, in particular Olympia Carlisi as Emilia, Bibiana Sedat as Alma, and Alma as Guido (winner of the Best Actor Award).

Another film in which the central motivating character has disappeared is Marie Monicelli’s Dear Michael. It is a film of two worlds, of two levels of existence. Monicelli charts the painful disintegration of a middle-class family as it withdraws into the shadows of an uncaring and bound life. This world of failed values, of abortive grasping at reality, is beautifully conveyed by nuance and carefully structured scenes. The acting is excellent, from a cast that includes Delphine Seyrig as Michael’s mother, Aurore Clement and Marcella Michelangelo.

Christian Braad Thomsen’s Well-Spring of My World is a journey back to the director’s childhood. In describing his film Thomsen said: "I remember the area around Bjørtrup as the most beautiful in Denmark, but today it looks more like a bombed out wasteland. But even if Bjørtrup will someday vanish from the map, the memory is a permanent one for the landscape of mind. A journey back to Bjørtrup will be a journey in memory."

With utmost simplicity, Braad Thomsen records in a series of interviews the recollections of residents: in particular of their childhoods, their hardships, and their feelings on the changing nature of the village. One man remembers it as a world of love; another remembers it as a world of hate; and a third, a man recalls a dream in which he must raise his father as if to wash away all the evil that existed between them.

What is so remarkable about this documentary is that it is a world of false sentiment, nostalgia, or moralizing about a people raised in a harsh punitive climate. It is a world of true love for all people and that, together with its other virtues, made Well-Spring of My World for me the best film by far at Tehran.

Francois Truffaut's L'Argent de Poche is a delight, although in its ceaseless efforts to charm it occasionally descends into the realm of self-indulgence. Regrettably for some critics it is not a remake of 400 Blows, nor is it an essay in realism.

Here is a deliberately precious world, Truffaut's view of that fragile state of childhood on which adults can and do wreak havoc. At the end of L'Argent de Poche his plea for the rights of the world's children is a tacked-on code — it is the verbalization of what has progressed in the film. Truffaut’s children are related only by the school they attend, and the film is a diverse selection of their stories, the girl alone in her parents’ flat calling out “J’ai
faint" through a megaphone to the other tenants, a call answered by a basket full of cheeses, sausages and wine ingeniously conveyed by a series of pulleys and ropes; the school outsider takes on a life of petty theft and self-preservation and whose home is a cavern of brutality and deficiency, and the saga of a first kiss at the cinema.

In the best episode — one through which effortlessly brilliant filmmaking drains every potential ounce of suspense — a baby crawls out of a 100-storey window to retrieve its doll. It would be unfair to mention the resolution, but Truffaut cleverly makes full use of our disbelief that anything horrible could occur in one of his films.

The most awaited screening at Tehran was undoubtedly Valerio Zurlini’s film of Dino Buzzati’s famous novel, II Deserto dei Tartari. The setting-up of the film alone took seven years and many screenwriters and directors were employed at various intervals. The final script, written by André G. Brunein and Jean-Louis Bertuccelli, remains very faithfully some of the book, although it changes the period to 1908-1914 and the location to the Macedonian border of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

II Deserto dei Tartari tells of a garrison on the edge of a desert frontier as it awaits an attack that will never come. The wait takes its toll, officers come and go, and the soldiers’ spirits crumble. For Drigo, who lives only in expectation of the attack, the result is illness and confinement to another station. But as he is carried away in his carriage he sees a line of a thousand horsemen approaching from the desert. Perhaps the dream of a dying man?

For all its over-deliberate posing and poor sense of time passing, II Deserto dei Tartari is a monument of intelligent film spectacle. To make a three-hour film on so introspective a subject and not fall victim to unnecessary action or intrigue, is a triumph of artistic rigor.

Perhaps this was a commercially dangerous strategy to take, but once again, as with Z and State of Siege, producer Jacques Periss has shown great conviction. Beautifully shot by Luciano Tovoli and well scored by Morricone, II Deserto dei Tartari fully justified the expectations held for it.

Jerzy Antczak’s Nights and Days, a Polish family chronicle of two generations from 1863 to 1914, was shown at Tehran in its shorter export version of 100 minutes. While it is notable on some levels, it ultimately suffers the fate of most family sagas — superficiality.

In this tale of an ill-matched marriage told through flashback as the wife, Barbara, flees the German invasion — the husband’s story holds the most interest. Bogumil’s existence is the land, he is rooted to the soil, and conquering nature’s harshness is his life’s goal. Helped by a convincing performance by Jerzy Brzozski, one clearly understands Bogumil’s passion — although the land he loves is not his own. In directing these scenes, with Bogumil striding proudly through rich corn, Antczak evokes more than the mere technical proficiency shown elsewhere.

In comparison to Bogumil, his wife’s character is thin, and lacking in identifiable quirks. Extensive rewriting of the plot would have perhaps enlivened her and helped weld this family’s saga together. But as it stands, Nights and Days is mostly dull. A far cry from the passionate energy of Wajda’s Land of Promise.

Of the four Iranian films in the main body of the festival, I saw The Stone Garden and The Magic Lantern, missing unfortunately The Divine One and The Son of Iran has no News of his Mother.

The Stone Garden is a rather loaded parable about an eccentric builder of stone sculptures in the desert. With the use of wire and dead, stunted trees he manages to create a monument which is both crude and mystical. His wife then exploits his work by placing money in the trees and thereby encouraging a cult of mystic worshippers. But, inevitably, disillusionment comes and the followers attack and destroy the garden.

While intriguing, the film is disappoint­ing because it fails to gain any new perspectives on a tale that has been told so often in the cinema. At times director Parviz Kimiavi exhibits flourishes of unusual and eccentric filmmaking, but as a whole the film is too dependent on clichés and a structure too well-known to be now readily enjoyed.

The most heated reception of the festival was saved for Mohammad Reza Aslani’s first feature The Chess of the Wind. This exercise in controlled melodrama concerns the struggles within a family to grab the family inheritance.

Though great care has been taken, both in its structural rigor and studied compositions, the film is tedious. Through bad casting and the inability of the director to judge when seriousness becomes mistaken for unintentional humor, the film ends entangled in its own implausibility. Whereas, for example, Glouber Rocha made a point of the extremely long death sequence at the beginning of Antonio das Mortes, here the extended death scene on the grand staircase are meaningless.

To round off the Iranian selection was Bahram Reypour’s documentary history of Iranian filmmaking, The Magic Lantern. With the aid of brief excerpts, the film swiftly chronicles the evolution and recognition of the nation’s cinema.

The emphasis is on the more artistic films and The Magic Lantern relives the sudden explosion of Iranian film on the world with the release of The Cow and Qasir in the late sixties. Since then, there has been The Postman, Downpour and Prince Ehtejab, for many the pinnacle of Iranian cinema so far. As well, there is Sohrab Shahid-Sulieman’s Simple Event and Still Life. The documentary closes with Bahram Beza’s The Stranger and The Custodian by Khosrow Harshaf.

For those only vaguely familiar with Iranian films, this documentary is a good starting point, for those better versed, it is a pleasant reminder.

In Mauro Bolognini’s The Inheritance, Dominique Sanda plays a young woman bent on inheriting the Ferramonti fortune by seducing the family’s cold, unapproachable patriarch. As a story of intrigue it has its moments, although the intentionally ironic ending, where the family unite to defraud her of the money, is unconvincingly dovetailed. It is also not helped by Sanda’s acting. Once again she is entrapped by foolish facial gestures (gestures which reach the point of absurdity in Bertolucci’s 1960 Anthony Quinn, however, is convincing and his performance, together with an unexpectedly rich score from Morricone, are definitely saving graces.

The Inheritance really suffers in its period reconstruction. The delicate balance between period feel and narrative — a balance so perfectly achieved in Visconti’s L’Innocente — is missing. The exterior photography, with its persistent use of heavy filters, is unsettling and pretty, while the muted interior decor is almost monotonous.

This over-insistent grasping for period atmosphere is not evident in Bolognini’s non-cinematic productions, although it has ruined most of his previous historical films.

There is no doubt that Bolognini is a director of ability, but The Inheritance evidences little of it.

Marta Meszar’s Nine Months is, after her insightful and sensitive Adoption, a major disappointment. The film has the same observant eye, but it is too much like a tract, with characters like pawns in the hands of the director. Consequently, while one can sympathize with the plight of the single mother in Nine Months, and recognize the dangers of her choice and the courage that helped her make it, one yet remains unmoved and distant.

As the single mother, Lili Moroni, winner of the Best Actress Award, is excellent, and in spite of the script’s limitations, does much to make us un-
The Resistance fighters flee through marshes in Guido Montalbo’s *Agnes is Going To Die*. The film opens on July 18, 1936 with General Franco’s attack on the government of the Republic. Then, as the war spreads, the families find their holiday stretching to three years. They become affected by the shortage of food, black marketeering and diminished wealth. Illness becomes widespread and the one boy who goes to war is killed. The film ends a few days before the final defeat with the Republican Army evacuating the town.

*The Long Vacations of ’36* is a study of the effects of war on an uninvolved group, who do not take sides and close in around their families. Directed with great control, the film is level-headed in dealing with an explosive situation so soon after Franco’s death. Where the film is marred, however, is in its depiction of human drama. The boy’s death, for example, carries no sympathy for the people concerned, it is a disquieting film to watch.

**Equally uninvolved is Guido Montalbo’s *Agnes is Going To Die*. Set at the time of the German occupation of Romagna, this simplistic film is about an Emilian farm worker avenging her husband's death. Joining a group of resistance fighters she kills a German soldier, then goes with the group into the countryside hiding amid the towering reeds of the marshes. At first the group is sceptical, but as members of the outfit are killed and wounded they make the fighter increasingly difficult, she gains in strength. Finally in desolate country, often early in the morning, with the ravages of winter ever visible, the film conjures up a bleak and disturbing mood. But few issues of importance have been raised except during the final massacre which occurs in front of uncaring Allies. The Nazis are typically brutal, and the fighters typically heroic. And to lay stress upon power, the film concludes with Agnes lying dead in the middle of a Swastika (made of sentry boxes) at the bottom of an inverted cross.

*The Female is the Deadliest of the Species* has an impressive logic and irony. One marvellous scene has Ros trying to buy Marcella’s wife with an open cheque. Marcella, however, returns it across the table having covered it with an endless series of zeros. But this scene is an exception; the rest of the film is grossly excessive in direction and acting. Breviacci is a novelist and screenwriter of note, but he is not a filmmaker, and it shows. Drenched in visual style or any recognition of montage, the result is all too reminiscent of the worst of Italian cinema.

*Dieu le Veut*, a Belgium film by Luc Montheim, is a far too serious recreation of life in Europe during the crusades which emphasizes the squalor and struggle to survive. Where the film is notable, is in its obvious desire to avoid employing romanticism to deal with this bleak period in history.

*Harry and Walter Go to New York*, an American comedy with James Caan and Elliot Gould, is a feeble film, both in intent and execution. Mark Rydell’s direction is undisciplined and the acting, as one critic unkindly notes, “shameless mugging”.

The only other film I was able to see was *The Ritz* (Dick Lester), the sequel to *The Ladykillers* (Ealing), which has a notable cast, including Albert Finney and Oliver Reed. The film is not as good as the original, but it is still entertaining. The other French film that was shown was *Theatrical* by Peter Stein, a film about the summer guests at a small hotel in the French countryside.

*The Legend of Ubijara*, by San Paulo filmmaker Andre Lutz, is a striking attempt to retell an ancient Indian legend, with political resonance. While the purity of the legend is preserved, one is however distracted at times by the abrupt and ragged filmmaking. The epic fight over 24 hours, for example, is dealt with in three shots, the second a cut-away to the moon to signify time passing. But instead of experiencing the passage of time, one is merely conscious of the director’s attempts to achieve this effect. Consequently, the mystery and power of the legend is passed by.

*Oh Serafina* is definitely a curious film. Manufactured by Alberto Lattuado, this calligraphian-ridden study of the edges of insanity is rendered senseless by a near total lack of sensitivity. Augusto Valle, friend and confidant of the writer of note, but he is not a filmmaker, and it shows. Devoid of visual style or any recognition of montage, the result is all too reminiscent of the worst of Italian cinema.

*Jaime Camino*’s *The Long Vacation of ’36* is a study of the effects of war on the uninvolved. New French cinema was represented by Frank Cassenti’s film of the Resistance, L’Affiche Rouge. **During a festive day in a quiet French village, a theatrical group, together with some surviving resistance fighters, plan the production of a play based on the famed Manouchian Band, a group of mostly immigrant workers who carried out daring attacks against the Germans in Paris during the occupation. When they were finally caught and tortured by the Gestapo, they remained silent and were placed in front of the execution squad in 1944.**

The film is a very intricate cross-cutting between the past and present, and even uses the same actors in both time planes. Unfortunately, the result is gibb: an intelligent exercise with no expressed sympathy for the people concerned, it is a disquieting film to watch.

**Equally uninvolved is Guido Montalbo’s *Agnes is Going To Die*.** Set at the time of the German occupation of Romagna, this simplistic film is about an Emilian farm worker avenging her husband’s death. Joining a group of
Should there be film censorship?

That is a decision for Parliament to make. My personal opinion is irrelevant.

Why is there censorship?

It has always existed. Entertainment in Britain has been censored for about 400 years. Films are censored in most countries in the world.

There are many reasons suggested for censorship. Some would say the offensive material should be censored. If you are only judging films on offensiveness there is no justification for censorship. People don’t have to go into the theatre if they don’t want to.

Some people complain about material shown at drive-ins. Queensland is the only state where there has been no complaints.

Before any film is banned the board must come to the decision that the exhibition of that film would have an immoral or mischievous tendency to incite.

Are you aware that perhaps an NRC film could have a mischievous effect on a person?

Right. A film can have an imitative effect but that’s not... it’s more trends and tendencies in films that are important. Maybe a film won’t incite a normally peace loving person to violence, but it will affect his tolerance of it by others.

Should a film be banned if only a small minority of people will be incited to commit an abnormal act?

Take Cinema Papers. I have no doubt there is at least one person who is teetering on the balance of abnormality, who would commit an anti-social act after reading that. There is bound to be one. You wouldn’t justify banning Cinema Papers for one person.

Do you think you are making exceptions for a minority opinion?

There are many legislations that cater for a minority. I think the majority of people can be desensitized. I think the majority of people can have their level of tolerance lifted.

How is a film banned? Do complaints have to be received?

The Act contains no mention of complaint as a prerequisite to review by the board. Not everyone has to see the film; a majority decision is required before a film is banned, to use that term.

What term would you use if it is not banning?

Well, banning is a colloquialism.

It’s just that the Act refers to reaching the opinion that the film is objectionable under the meaning of the Act and prohibiting distribution.

Do you suggest to a distributor that if certain scenes are cut out a film will be allowed to be screened?

Under the Act there is a provision for a distributor to re-submit a reconstructed version of a film that has been banned.

How do you feel about tampering with the finished product of an artistic filmmaker?

I haven’t seen many films that could be classified as a work of art.

What about, say, “Immoral Tales”?

Well, someone on television last night was suggesting that beer cans were a work of art.

Why shouldn’t someone be allowed to see “Immoral Tales”?

Because scientific evidence suggests that a film can have a harmful effect on society. The scientific work says it’s not just a case of offensiveness. See, everyone’s hung up on this offensiveness thing: “Too many tits and bums...” You should be allowed to see people rooting... “I don’t mind watching blood and gore on the screen or watching people being tortured.”

People say I don’t mind watching it so what harm can it do... that’s the wrong approach. To say it again, it’s not a question of whether a person is offended by it, whether it can cause harm.

Are there any psychologists on the board who might be able to determine which films may or may not harm?

No. All the work and research has been done. People like Berkowitz. Most of the work has been set out in a book by Professor Johnson called Aggression in Man and Animals. There was a story about a couple of youths who stripped and smashed a car after watching Duel. Now, if you just look at it on the surface you could say the film had something to do with it, but it wasn’t so. But you can clearly establish an imitative effect through the Mr Brown bomb hoax after the bomb films and violence after A Clockwork Orange.

What qualifications do members of the board have?

The Act doesn’t mention any. We are appointed by the Government.
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December 21

FILMS REGISTERED WITHOUT ELIMINATIONS

For General Exhibition (G)

Aristotile Tzi Kousina (The Lady of the Kitchen) (C. Laemmle Jr., U.S.) (2503.60 m)

Badia Meschiti (15 mm) (D. Harouli, Egypt) (1471.00 m)

Believe Me My Love (Greek subtitled) (Not shown. Bogdan) (3256.00 m)

Chaplin Revue (C. Chaplin, U.S.) (2765.00 m)

The Clock (C. Chaplin, U.S.) (2765.00 m)

City Lights (C. Chaplin, U.S.) (2365.00 m)

Die Schwermutigen (16 mm) (N. Thulai, West Germany) (1200.00 m)

El Prado (Professor Ayoub) (16 mm) (Not shown. Syria) (1022.00 m)

Gari's (El Mouhamed) (Love of the Foot) (Z. Moulay) (3120.00 m)

Grazia vs Mephisto (E. E. Co., Japan) (2465.00 m)

The Gold Rush (C. Chaplin, U.S.) (1967.00 m)

Happy and Walter Go To New York (D. Devlin, G. tier) (3276.00 m)

Honeymoon (M. Powell, Britain) (2410.00 m)

A New York Night (A. Fox, U.S.) (2646.00 m)

Limelight (C. Chaplin, U.S.) (3735.00 m)

Little More Than A Love Story (Greek subtitled) (Not shown. Egypt) (1327.00 m)

Little Girl Big Tease:-

The Travelling Players:

Viskin, Mexico (2331.00 m)

Film/Ortf/Paris/France Films, France (2852.72 m)

The Lost Talisman:

Dixie Dynamite:

Cannonball:

Andrea/Once Upon Andrea:

The Front:

The Scarlet Buccaneer:

Germany (2713.00 m)

Barlett, U.S. (1053.12 m)

Trial By Combat

Not shown. Syria (1325.00 m)

The Wind Took Away My Dreams

Killer Clans:

Get Mean:

Drug Queen:

Blow Up

The Gold Rush:

Bruce Lee And I:

U.S. (2989.00 m)

Surrender In Paradise

Pork Chop Hill

Not Now Comrade:

Not Recommended for Children (NRC)

at the Caddie's Cove...and then some (C. Wah, Hong Kong) (2876.00 m)

Buster Keaton. U.S. (1967.00 m)

(b) Reduced by importer's cuts from 2520.00 m (Film importer's request in 1959. (16 mm): Morris/Wozniak, U.S. (1097.20 m)

A. El Haroufi, Egypt (2322.87 m)

(a) Reduced by producer's cuts from 1009.24 m (16 mm version) in Film Censorship Bulletin No. 7/76.

C. Laemmle Jr. U.S. (2105.30 m)

D. A. M. (16 mm): Not shown. Egypt (1800.00 m)

Reason: Excessive violence and indecency.

Reason: Excessive violence.

Reason: Indecency.

Reason: Excessive violence.

Reason: Excessive violence.

Reason: Indecency.

Reason: Indecency.

Reason: Indecency.

Reason: Indecency.

Reason: Excessive violence.

Reason: Excessive violence.

Reason: Excessive violence.

Reason: Indecency.

Reason: Indecency.

Reason: Indecency.
How did you come to write for films?

Well, it came out of the blue. It was quite a surprise as a matter of fact. My philosophy had always been that music should be pure, and I rather looked down on any sort of music that needed other creative media to make its point. I had never liked ballet or opera, and I had always thought of film music composers as rather poor relations.

So when I got a request from Karel Reisz to do the music for a documentary for him — a documentary that was going to be an entry at the Cannes festival of that year — I really didn't know what to do about it. I was intrigued by the medium and the technicalities involved, but didn't really feel that I could do it very well, not being very keen to do it.

Anyway, I arranged to meet Karel Reisz and he explained what he wanted. He showed me a film — a previous documentary of his, which was for the Ford Foundation, I think — where he had to replace the score. So he was able to play me the documentary twice, once with the score he didn't like, and once with the score he did. This gave me an idea of what he liked and also made me see the points he was making of what music works for films and what doesn't.

Then he told me that the new documentary was one called We Are the Lambeth Boys, about a youth club in South London in a rather deprived area where it merely showed how the kids were being treated to do something useful, rather than going about stabbing each other. He showed me the film, and told me the sequences that needed music, and I set to work.

I found myself actually imagining sorts of music that I had never imagined before. I realised that the image was doing something to my mind that was helping the creative process. So I became quickly converted to film music, and finished it to Karel's satisfaction. The film won an award in its class at the Cannes festival that year, and soon after Karel got his first full-length feature film, Saturday Night and Sunday Morning, with the then unknown Albert Finney. He asked me to do the music for that film.

Just about that time another director, Joseph Losey, was working in London, and he asked me to do the score for his film, The Criminal.

Was this as a result of the "Lambeth Boys"?

I think it was pure coincidence. I think he had heard something I had been doing with the London Philharmonic Orchestra involving fusions of different sorts of music, and he thought I might be suitable, so he spoke to me. He had also heard Cleo Laine's voice, and he wanted her to be involved in the soundtrack as well.

So at that point I found myself with two first feature films on my hands: one at film studios in the north of London, and the Joe Losey film being shot at Merton Park Studios, which was very much in the south of London. I was like a man with two lovers.

I was very anxious not to let one know that I was working with the other, in case they thought I was splitting my endeavor. So I was darting between the extreme north and the extreme south of London, doing two scores almost at once. They both turned out reasonably well as far as the directors were concerned, and I thought: 'Oh well, now I've really broken into films', and waited and waited and waited, but nothing else came along.

There was an occasion when Joe Losey asked me to go to Rome where he had shot a film called Eva — a film which turned out to be very controversial, because he disclaimed the final cut of it, and there were all sorts of financial troubles. The financial troubles extended to my experience, because my agent couldn't agree in any way with the sort of terms the executive producer was offering for a composer. Eventually I came back, having seen the film three or four times, but didn't do it.

Then came The Servant, and Losey asked me to do it, which I did and enjoyed very much. Of course The Servant was a big box-office success for Losey, and I think he has since not really had one to match it.

The result was that a lot of other people saw the film and heard the music, and I think it was just lucky that it was probably one of my best scores. One of the people who heard the music was John Schlesinger, who was then completing Darling and he asked me to do the score of that film.

With those two under my belt — The Servant and Darling, which was another blockbuster — it was a fairly natural consequence that I was from then on offered almost every film made in Britain over the next five or so years.

You more or less had your choice at that time...

A great deal, yes. The difficulty was trying to pick out the good ones from the bad ones early on, and I had probably a good share of good ones. Being with someone like Joe Losey meant that there were some...
other good films like Accident and Modesty Blaise to follow. And with Karel Reisz there was Morgan.

Then later there was a film for J. Lee Thompson (who directed The Guns of Navarone), called Return from the Ashes, featuring Maximilian Schell, Herbert Lom and Ingrid Thulin. The music was nominated for an Academy award, which I unfortunately didn't get.

Is your approach to composing film music different from writing for a concert, or stage musical? Do you find you are rushed more?

Oh, certainly. You are always caught in that terrible sandwich between the film's projected finishing date — which gets later and later — and the date of delivery to the distributor, which remains constant. You are usually promised 12 weeks of uninterrupted time, and then you end up with five or four, or even three.

At what point do you become involved with the film? Before, at the scripting point, or when it's finished?

Well, it varies very much according to circumstances and directors. Some directors really don't think in terms of music, and don't even start looking around for a composer until the film is almost completed, and they realise that's the next thing to come — the last touch to be added. They leave it till pretty late.

When John Schlesinger asked me to do Darling I was able to see the completed film. Losey was different; even before the thing was sewn up he would call me and say: "I have a film I think you would like to do. I'll let you know when it is and send you a first draft script, or even send you a first draft script before it is sewn up."

You prefer to be in right at the beginning...

Yes. I think it is advisable really, to know something about the general sort of structure of the film and its purpose, and 'live' it. Live, breathe and exist it, at least part of your time.

Have you ever directly or indirectly influenced the script of a film? Or perhaps made suggestions to the director that he should do this or that as a result of your music?

I don't think so. No, I would have obviously commented on the script afterwards if I was asked to. If I had any comments to make, I would make them then and there, but whether they were ever taken into account, I don't know.

Quite often it would mean meeting with the scriptwriter, especially in a couple of cases where I had to set words that the scriptwriter had written. For instance, the Harold Pinter words in The Servant, which I had to set, and the Alun Owen words of "Thieving Boy" from The Criminal. Those sorts of things meant that you found yourself talking to the script-scenario writer quite early.

When you write the music, do you have any specific scenes in mind, or does the director allocate these later?

No, every piece has been tailor-made for the sequence in mind, sometimes with detailed suggestions or instructions on what that sort of music is going to be. Over a 40-second piece, the director might say: "The mood should be tranquil for the first 10 seconds, and then at this point I think it should swell up and then go down." Some directors are very explicit about that, others leave it entirely to you.

I think good directors don't record music willy-nilly, and just add it where they want to — except, of course, in an emergency. If they are stuck for a bit of music and all their music sessions are finished, then they would either do that with or without consulting the composer.

Have you ever had some of your music cut, and felt this has spoilt the general effect you have aimed for?

One of the things you need in your mental make-up is not to be too upset with what happens to your music after you have recorded it. I think it was Leonard Bernstein who said that for On the Waterfront he wrote a magnificent crescendo to a sforzando tutti from the orchestra, and when he got to the dubbing found it had been doffed down to be underneath a whispered line from the actor, or something like that. Those sorts of disappointments come to you all the time.

You record when you hear this great ring of the orchestra in your ears, and then when you hear the final thing — and it's all done at that level on mono — it is disappointing in places, and you sometimes come out from the first hearing of your finished music product wanting to cry a bit.
You actively participate in the recording of the music...

Oh yes. I am one of those composers who always conducts his own music.

You insist on this...

Well, they are very glad to do it usually. It saves them a bit on their budget, rather than have a separate conductor. The days when someone like Muir Mathieson would conduct someone else's scores don't seem to exist very much today.

I suppose there must be some composers who can't do their own conducting. It's a separate skill — a very special skill — conducting film scores, as opposed to conducting. There are some very fine conductors who could pilot a symphony orchestra like nobody's business, but who would be lost doing that sort of job in a film studio. It's a matter of timing and stop-watching, and just something different.

Would you like to compose for a musical film — with singing and dancing?

I would love to. Yes, it's the thing that keeps crossing our minds.

Has anybody made approaches in that direction?

Yes, there have been various approaches. None of them have ever come to anything in the long run. But I really think that we should be turning towards production of our own things, instead of waiting for other people to come along and put up their ideas.

Making your own films...

Quite possibly. Our own films, or our own television films... those are the sorts of things our minds are turning to at the moment. If you wait for people with ideas, all they have are ideas. They usually go to someone else for money anyway. So one might as well put up one's ideas and form one's own company and see what happens. That's what is in our minds at the moment.

Would this be in Britain or the U.S.?

I don't know. We would probably do them wherever we found the locale most interesting, and the production costs lowest.

What about Australia?

Well, that has crossed my mind as well. That's why I was questioning you very closely about the Australian film industry earlier.

Has anything inspired you in Australia that you particularly see film-wise?

Not really. We haven't really got down to the details on what could take place in a film: plot-wise, or how it would work out. The sort of film that has occurred to us is The Umbrellas of Cherbourg, the French film, where it was all pre-recorded. It was virtually a sort of lightweight opera, all filmed on location. So if you start thinking in that direction, your location depends on your story. A place like Australia would be ideal to think of things like that, because of the fine weather, the beautiful scenery that you can see there, and all the facilities that it has as a modern westernised nation for those sorts of things.

Which directors do you prefer working with? Have you had difficulties with any?

Oh, you have difficulties with most directors at times. The one director I didn't have any difficulty with, because he is a musician in an amateur sense, and therefore understood the problems of musicians, was Peter Hall, who is mainly known as a theatre director of course.

This was a film called Perfect Friday with Ursula Andress, Stanley Baker and David Warner. I found him helpful and easy to work with, because he knew what my role was and kept his suggestions and advice to a minimum.

Another person I had a great deal of fun with was Henry Hathaway, who is quite a legendary Hollywood name, and who has made so many of the great big Hollywood epics right from the thirties onwards. That was a film called The Last Safari, and was probably about the worst I have ever made.

It was shot in Africa and recorded in Britain, and was the one film where no piece of music that I did at any point — in spite of the fact he was there all the time listening to every note — met...
with any criticism from him whatsoever. Perhaps it would have been better if it had met with some criticism from him, but it didn’t. I have a feeling that throughout that whole film he was just enjoying himself, rather than trying to make anything cultural. If you see the film you will know what I mean.

Are there any directors you would like to work with, that you haven’t?

I have never really thought much about that. I think Mike Nichols might be one I would like to work with.

Do you work in any different manner to other film composers?

I don’t know. I suppose the flavor of my music, that comes out in my own output, just goes into the music in films as well, but I don’t really know. I can’t think if there is any different approach. The only thing I always try to do, is to play a little bit myself somewhere in any film that I do, rather than just conduct . . . it’s almost a superstition.

A sort of a Hitchcock . . .

Yes, absolutely!

Have there been any significant changes in film compositions over the years, or any that you would like to see?

I feel it’s a shame that in the past 10 or 15 years there have been a sort of decline of the great sort of orchestral composers, the Korngold sort of figure in music. Obviously it was inevitable that there should be a change of styles in music, and the first indications of that were very good with Henry Mancini, who I think was and is a brilliant musician of the film industry.

But I think there have since been a lot of attempts to use people who aren’t really good at writing films, and use them by getting expert orchestrators to cover up their deficiencies and that sort of thing. It’s a shame when the film industry descends to that, because though it might make a fast buck selling albums or hit records or something, it would be a great shame if that were a permanent thing.

I would like to see the skill of orchestration and clever orchestral devices, like the great Hollywood composers were capable of, come back into film music more. Even if I weren’t part of it, I would be very happy to see that happen with someone else doing it.

You have obviously revised your opinion about film composing . . .

Yes, it’s a special skill. It’s a thing that I have had to leave over the past four years, because I have been touring so much with Cleo, which has been a full-time job. So I haven’t been able to entertain the film offers made to me. But I’ve had time to think about it, now that I have been away from it.

I still wouldn’t like to go back to the pressures of doing four or five films a year, because I think that devalues you by having to treat it as a job, rather than as a pleasure, and I think that you tend not to be able to see the wood for the trees.

But I would like to go back to doing one good film a year, depending on the director and the circumstances. I would enjoy that.

I am always conscious that with any film, you can rush into a melee of duelling between producer, director, editor, moneymen and so forth, and that’s the unpleasant side of the film business. Because, quite often the composer, being the last one on the list to add his talents, is the one that gets a lot of those things in the neck.

It’s the old story, that if you have a duff film on your hands, everybody looks to the composer to get it out of the mire, so to speak; to make a hit of the score of it. So the composer is under terrible pressure from all sides at that point. That’s the part I don’t like about film writing.

But if I am given a film where I am left to do exactly what I want with that film score, and then if after that’s finished they throw it out and get someone else to do it . . . which they often have done in the past, both to me and every other film writer worth note. We have all had our scores chucked out, at some point or other.

I did a film for Losey called Boom, for which the score wasn’t accepted, largely after pressures from the moneymen. I was delighted to see the box-office flop of all time, when someone else had done the score.

FILMOGRAPHY

Feature films as composer-music director

- 1960 Saturday Night and Sunday Morning
- 1961 The Criminal
- 1963 The Servant
- 1965 Darling
- 1969 Return from the Ashes
- 1971 Sands of Kalahari
- 1986 The Idol
- 1968 Modesty Blaise
- 1968 Morgan, a Suitable Case for Treatment
- 1967 Faultless
- 1968 Accident
- 1968 The Last Safari
- 1968 Salt and Pepper
- 1969 The Magus
- 1969 The Girl, I Hate You
- 1969 The Last Grenade
- 1970 Perfect Friday
- 1970 The Engagement
- 1971 10 Rillington Place

Short films as composer

- 1959 Short Film
- 1961 One Night Long
- 1962 The Servant
- 1963 Survival
- 1965 The Avengers
- 1966 One Man's Music
- 1967 The New Ark
- 1968 Experiment - Improvisations

Television

- 1959 The Voodoo Factor
- 1961 The World at Three
- 1962 The Avengers
- 1968 Music

Oneřiní Československá Televize (ČST)
INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION ROUND-UP

U.S.

After 167 days of shooting in the Philippines, Francis Ford Coppola is now editing his Vietnam epic Apocalypse Now for release at the end of this year. Louis Malle is in New Orleans making his first American film, Pretty Baby, from a screenplay by production designer Polly Platt, which deals with a child prostitute. The film will be released by Paramount. Also at Paramount, director Joan Darling is making a film with the original title of First Love, starring William Katt. Richard Donner has replaced Guy Hamilton on the Salkinds’ Superman IV, which reunites the stars of the first two films. The story has been filmed at least twice before, by Josef von Sternberg as The Devil is a Woman, and by Julien Duvivier as La femme et la pantin. Claude Lelouch is completing Another Man Another Woman in the U.S., with James Caan and Genevieve Bujold. Francois Truffaut, taking a break during shooting of Steven Spielberg’s Close Encounters of the Third Kind, in which he plays a major role, directed The Man Who Loved Women.

Carl Reiner, who hasn’t directed a feature since the hilarious Where’s Poppa? in 1970, returns with an irreverent comedy, Oh God!, starring George Burns. Michael Ritchie is doing another sporting comedy, Semi-Tough, with Burt Reynolds, Kris Kristofferson and Jill Clayburgh. Meanwhile the indefatigable John Cassavetes is shooting Opening Night for his own company; it stars his regular actors — his wife Gena Rowlands, and his friend Ben Gazzara — and this time he is in it himself. After the lukewarm reception given to Wizards, and the non-release of Coonskin, Ralph Bakshi is toiling on Lord of the Rings — his most ambitious animated feature yet.

FRANCE

Bertrand Tavernier’s Les Enfants Gates will be on a much more modest scale than his last two historical films; it’s a semi-autobiographical story of a film director (Michel Piccoli) who rents a new flat and becomes involved in a tenant’s strike. The title of the new Philippe de Broca film is now titled Julie pot de colle.

Jean-Pierre Mocky is making a comedy, The King of Do-It-Yourself, inspired by the current French fad. Luis Bunuel is filming The Obscure Object of Desire in Spain for producer Serge Silberman. The story has been filmed at least twice before, by Josef von Sternberg as The Devil is a Woman, and by Julien Duvivier as La femme et la pantin. Claude Lelouch is completing Another Man Another Woman in the U.S., with James Caan and Genevieve Bujold. Francois Truffaut, taking a break during shooting of Steven Spielberg’s Close Encounters of the Third Kind, in which he plays a major role, directed The Man Who Loved Women.

ITALY

Lina Wertmuller has been making her first English language film, A Night full of Rain, on locations in Italy and San Francisco for Warners; the stars are Giancarlo Giannini and Cándice Bergen. Ettore Scola is making A Very Special Day which reunited Marcello Mastroianni and Sophia Loren. It’s about the day in 1938 when Hitler visited Rome.

Mario Monicelli has Alberto Sordi, Monica Vitti and Shelley Winters in A Tiny, Tiny Bourgeois Man, about a clerk who avenges his son’s murder. Dino Risi is making The Man from Corleone, a Mafia story, with Marcel Bozzuffi, Andrea Ferreoli and Irene Papas. Producer Alberto Grimaldi locked Bernardo Bertolucci out of the cutting room where he was finishing his 4½-hour cut of the English version of 1900 (the Italian version was 5½ hours). Grimaldi says he will cut the English version down to 3½ hours; legal action is pending.

OTHER COUNTRIES

After making films in the Bengali language all his life, Satyajit Ray is completing his first feature in Hindi, The Chess Players; one of the stars is the late Jeffrey (Billy Fish in Huston’s The Man who would be King). After the disappointing critical response to Heart of Glass, Werner Herzog is hurrying to complete Stroszek.

Stuart Cooper is in Montreal shooting Disappearance with Canadian actors Donald Sutherland, Christopher Plummer and Francine Racette; Bryan Forbes will make International Velvet, a sequel to M.G.M’s 1944 classic National Velvet; it’s hoped that Elizabeth Taylor will continue the role she first played 33 years ago. And in Greece, Theodor Angelopoulos is working on his new film, The Hunting, his first since The Travelling Players.

Below: Tito Brass’ Caligula.
Kevin Wiggins, Melbourne Cameraman for 'A Current Affair' talks about Kodak Ektachrome film:

"I guess it boils down to a personal preference on my part. I like Ektachrome film because it's reliable in so many ways as far as color standards are concerned. I prefer the color that Kodak stock produces"... "I think it gives a truer rendition"... "You can stretch Ektachrome stock a fair way in forced development. I've shot with Ektachrome 7242 film under mercury-vapour street lights, pushing it three stops and getting quite amazing results. Of course, there was some color change but we did have an image on film, and when it comes to the crunch that's what's important"... "In this sort of work it's sometimes necessary to work in strange and very remote locations. I've ridden on camels and flown in balloons and been in many other weird vehicles and there are always a lot of problems and variables involved"... "So it's good to know that there's one constant that can be relied upon in these situations: Kodak color films."

Kodak Ektachrome film gives you the true picture... always.
## Box Office Grosses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Distributor</th>
<th>THIS QUARTER 3.10.76 to 1.1.77</th>
<th>LAST QUARTER</th>
<th>TOTAL $ TO DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SYD.</td>
<td>MLB.</td>
<td>PTH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devil's Playground</td>
<td>RS (12)</td>
<td>95,925</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>121,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caddie</td>
<td>RS (12)</td>
<td>117,585</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>104,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Fraser</td>
<td>RS (2)</td>
<td>28,269</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>41,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic at Hanging Rock</td>
<td>GUO (3) (RS)</td>
<td>13,005</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>54,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Boy</td>
<td>SAFC (6)*</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>54,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don's Party</td>
<td>MCA (4)*</td>
<td>49,355</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad Dog Morgan</td>
<td>GUO (3) (RS)</td>
<td>6,008</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>6,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasm</td>
<td>FW (12) NA</td>
<td>42,319</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>42,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deathcheaters</td>
<td>RS (2) (1)</td>
<td>10,722</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>10,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barney</td>
<td>COL (3) (2)</td>
<td>4,999</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>7,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promised Woman</td>
<td>RS (3)</td>
<td>10,272</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>10,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Wish</td>
<td>SAFC (3)</td>
<td>6,552</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>6,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer of Secrets</td>
<td>GUO (1)</td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>3,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let the Balloon Go</td>
<td>FOX (2)</td>
<td>6,256</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>6,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Too Far away</td>
<td>RS (2) (1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>340,082</td>
<td>344,858</td>
<td>180,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,080,696</td>
<td>2,291,557</td>
<td>1,116,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,420,778</td>
<td>2,636,415</td>
<td>1,397,721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Box office grosses of individual films have been supplied to Cinema Papers by the Australian Film Commission.

1 Not Available
2-Continuing into next period
3-Figure for one of 3 weeks in period only.
(1) Australian theatrical distributor only. RS—Roadshow; GUO—Greater Union Organization Film Distributors. FOX—20th Century Fox; UA—United Artists; COL—Columbia International Corporation; FW—Filmways Australian Distributors; 7K—7 Keys Film Distributors; COC—Columbia Pictures; REG—Regent Film Distributors; CCG—Cinema Centre Group; AFC—Australian Film Commission; SATC—South Australian Film Corporation; MCA—Music Corporation of America; S—Sharmill Films. (2) Figures are drawn from capital city and inner suburban first release hardtops only. (3) Playing period in weeks for given city. (4) New Season.
Proof of Atlab's success

Photographed by Australia's Cinematographer of the Year, Geoff Burton.

Apart from offering you every modern laboratory facility for film or tape, our revolutionary Proof Printing System is a real favourite with producers. Developed at Atlab by our color consultant James Parson, it gives you perfect color correction without you having to screen every frame. We appreciate how valuable your time is. Talk to us about your next production. We'll give you expert advice designed to ensure that the quality you put into your work will be reflected through ours.

GIVING QUALITY SERVICE TO THE MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY.

Atlab Film & Video Laboratory Service
Television Centre, Epping, N.S.W. 2121
Telephone: 85 0224
John Scott’s initial experience as a film editor was gained at ABC Television and at Cinesound Productions in Melbourne between 1962 and 1964.

Over the next three years Scott worked in London with the BBC and for several independent production companies, cutting documentaries, shorts and commercials, before returning to Australia in 1968 to work for Fred Schepisi at the Melbourne based Film House.

Scott returned to London the following year and again worked on commercials and shorts before cutting his first feature, “The Adventures of Barry McKenzie”, for Bruce Beresford.

“Boesman & Lena”, a film by Ross Devonish, based on the Athol Fugard play, took John Scott to South Africa in 1973, and in 1974 he completed a sequel to “The Adventures of Barry McKenzie”.

Scott came back to Melbourne in 1975 and worked on David Baker’s “The Great McCarthy”. This was followed by Bert Deling’s “Pure S” and Philippe Mora’s “Mad Dog”.

In the following interview, conducted by Rod Bishop and Peter Beilby, John Scott talks firstly in general terms about his editing methods and procedures, then specifically about cutting “The Great McCarthy”, “Pure S” and “Mad Dog” (see box).

**PRE-PRODUCTION**

At what stage do you usually become involved in the cutting of a feature?

It varies from film to film. On some films I haven’t been involved until after they have been shot, while on others I have come in as early as two months before shooting.

What are you doing during that period?

I look at the entire post-production budget and talk with the producer about the plan for the post-production schedule. There are lots of details to go over, particularly on how the money will be spent during that time.

What do you discuss with the director at this stage?

I try and get some indication of what sort of editing style he wants in the film and how he thinks it’s going to be cut. A director will probably talk about how he is going to treat and cover scenes, particularly the more difficult ones such as action scenes.

We also look very closely at the script.

At what point do you start consultation with other crew members? Is there pre-production work to do with these people?

Yes, most films have pre-production meetings with key personnel. Naturally, there is a lot that the editor can do to help the cameraman during the shooting of a film. For example, a cameraman might call for one-light work prints from the laboratory — not graded rushes — and the editor will look at the laboratory report each day and check the technical quality of the scenes. It’s the editor who usually sees the film first.

The editor is also involved in discussions with the sound man about what sort of effects and atmospheres he is going to record and what scenes might need to be shot with guide tracks. There are also many organizational things to be worked out between the editor and the sound man on how the material will be collected and stored for handling later on.

You mentioned consultation with the continuity person... how important are the notes on continuity to an editor?

It’s very important. Continuity is the recording of everything that goes on the set during the shoot: which lens was on the camera; whether the camera is static or moving, tracking, or panning. The continuity sheets also tell you what sound was recorded and whether it’s a guide track, a wild track or sync sound. They also tell the editor how much of a scene has been shot to date.

**Continued on P. 341**
Cutting MAD DOG, PURE S and THE GREAT MCCARTHY

Let's talk specifically about three films you have edited: "The Great McCarthy", directed by David Baker; "Pure S", by Bert Deling and "Mad Dog", by Philippe Mora. These films are different in subject matter and treatment and were made on substantially different budgets. How did the budgets effect the way in which you worked?

The Great McCarthy, which cost around $300,000, had a 20-week post-production schedule, including a six or seven week shoot. It was cut in a house in Melbourne and the cutting rooms were set up for that one production. But it was difficult to obtain a theatrette for double head change-overs and we had to go to Sydney at various stages.

Pure S, which had a budget of only $40,000, was cut in Melbourne over a period of six weeks; and we had to cut the film with very limited screening facilities.

"Mad Dog" had a much larger budget. Did it allow you a longer post-production period?

Mad Dog had a 22-week schedule, and the budget was around $475,000. Editing started in a Melbourne warehouse where a cutting room was set up, but after the first rough-cut, we moved to Sydney and rented cutting rooms close to screening facilities.

What were the shooting ratios on these three films?

Pure S was shot on 16mm with a very low shooting ratio. There would have been more than 10,000 ft (3050 m) of 16mm rushes — which is five hours.

By comparison McCarthy turned in around 110,000 ft (33,550m) of rushes, and Mad Dog between 95 and 100,000 ft (30,500m) — about 16 hours. McCarthy would have had a ratio of something like five to one, and Mad Dog was around five to one as well.

Was the "Pure S" shooting ratio unusually low?

It didn't seem to be. If you are limited to that sort of budget you just have to stay within certain limits.

Did the low coverage mean that the editing was more predetermined?

Yes, it was certainly very carefully worked out in the way it was shot, and it was clear how it was going to be cut. We only worked on it for four weeks and had to make decisions very quickly. If you have more money and a bigger budget, you spend more time looking at other ways of doing things.

Did "Pure S" stick closely to the script?

Yes, the narrative never changed. There were no substantial changes in the narrative on The Great McCarthy either.

And "Mad Dog".

Mad Dog went through a lot of changes in the cutting. Philippe tried lots of different ways of beginning and ending the film. He also tried cutting different scenes in different ways. But once again, it was a film which follows its original narrative very closely.

"Mad Dog" has a strong continuous narrative but appears more episodic than "Pure S" or "McCarthy"…

I think it was very much to the script. We often thought of changing the order of some of the sequences, but often the juxtaposition broke the time structure and, therefore, the main character's development. We couldn't shift very much from the original order of the sequences.

The first assembly of Mad Dog was 150 minutes long, and the final cut was around 110 minutes. So there was a lot of material and a lot of different ways of putting it together. The film went through many different stages in the cutting — some scenes were shortened and some lengthened from the original cuts. Quite often they'd even come back to how they were originally cut.

A number of scenes in "Mad Dog" couldn't be used in the final cut because of technical problems in the special effects and make-up departments. Has that been a common occurrence on films you have worked on?

I don't think so. I can remember some shots in Mad Dog which were difficult, but I don't think I have been aware of it in any other films.

There are always things that you can't use because there is some technical fault, but usually the director is aware of it. Often it's the sort of thing you can't shoot again. It might be some action in a wide-shot that's going to be a problem to cover in close-up. Or it could be the reverse — you might have to stay on the wide-shot so as not to reveal make-up problems in close-ups.

At what point did you start assembling the material on McCarthy and "Mad Dog"?

I started rough-cutting the material on McCarthy while the film was being shot, and perhaps one-third of it was rough-cut by the time shooting was completed. On Mad Dog we did basic rough-cuts of some scenes, which Philippe particularly wanted to see on location. But most of the time was spent cataloguing material and preparing it for cutting when the director was available.

One of the arguments often used against rough-cutting on location is that the director is not able to be involved in detailed discussions on how he wants the material to be cut. It's often very difficult for a director to look at rough-cuts and consider what he is going to do while he is planning a scene to be shot the next day.

Would you prefer to leave the assemblage until the film is shot?

I like going ahead and rough-cutting scenes, but I don't mind waiting until the director is available. It depends on the director and on the film. I do really have a set plan. I have found every film that I have cut has demanded different styles and slightly different procedures.

The McKenzie films and "The Great McCarthy" were comedies, while "Pure S" and "Mad Dog" both had elements of comedy in their narratives. Do you enjoy cutting comic sequences?

Of all the material I have ever cut, comedy is the most difficult. When you are working on a comedy for something like five weeks, the jokes become less and less funny. It's very hard to remain objective and keep track of the right pacing.

But that must be a problem with all material, whether it's a dramatic line, or a shock moment. How do you guage the impact the film is going to have on the audience after you have seen it 50 times?

Continued on P. 369
THE CUTTING ROOM

When do you start organizing your cutting room and putting on assistants?

If the shoot is on location I have one assistant who will sync all the sound from the daily rushes and catalog it all, while I go on with the basic rough-cutting.

Then, when the film is finished and the director is ready to start cutting, the cutting room staff increases.

How do you set up your cutting room? What are your requirements?

My requirements for cutting a film are a four-plate flat deck Steenbeck and a Moviola. I prefer to work on a flat deck editing machine, although there are some sequences I like to cut on a Moviola, so I really need to have both machines available.

In addition, I need synchronizers, amplifiers, trim bins, and other miscellaneous equipment.

Is the film actually stored in the cutting rooms?

Yes, the film is always stored on racks in the cutting rooms. On location the cutting room is usually quite small, but when cutting starts in earnest after the shoot, you will probably have three cutting rooms, and one of those will be where all the material is stored. Only the scenes you work on from day to day are stored in the main cutting room.

Can you describe what happens when the first rushes come in?

If the film is being shot on location, at the end of each day the negative is sent off to the laboratory and the quarter inch sound tapes to a transfer facility in the nearest city. The negative is processed and printed overnight, and the sound is transferred to magnetic film. The negative is held in the laboratory and the original quarter inch tapes are usually held at the sound transfer company.

What comes back to location is a work-print off the negative and a magnetic film transfer from the original quarter inch synchronous sound. First the image is looked at by the director and checked for technical problems.

Is this before the director sees it?

Yes. Of course, the laboratory screens the work-print before it comes to the director, so if there are any technical problems they are usually reported by the laboratory at once. But the editor looks again to check that everything is okay.

Then, during the day, the assistant editor will sync the sound to the image, and in the evening the director, editor and lighting cameraman will look at them.

The purpose of this viewing is usually to check that the scene is working and that nothing additional needs to be shot. At this stage the editor and the director discuss how the scene is going to be cut.

Do you usually set up in close proximity to sound or laboratory facilities?

I don’t think it is critical to be near sound and theatre facilities for the first six weeks. In fact it’s often quite useful to be somewhat a bit more isolated. For example, I think you need somewhere to cut a film where you don’t have any interruptions.

I don’t like to be in a situation where three films are being cut in the same building. I like to be alone with the film.

When location shooting is finished, do you employ more people in the cutting room?

Yes. There is usually only one assistant on location. But the moment you arrive you put on a second assistant. Then, after the first assembly, it might even be necessary to bring in another assistant — a runner — who does most of the chasing around, reordering of material and taking care of day-to-day things.

FIRST ASSEMBLY TO ROUGH-CUT

How do you go about the first assembly?

When you arrive back from location, you will probably have quite a lot of the film in different stages of rough-cut, but all the scenes will be separate. So you first complete rough-cuts on all scenes.

On the first assembly I like to work in such a way that I don’t cut scenes too tight. I like to do a first assembly quickly of the whole film.

How do you check that everything is okay?

I always find it the most useful way to approach the first assembly. In other words I go for a quick cut of the whole film — which might be a very long and very long loose assembly. On a 90-minute film it might be as long as 150 minutes.

Is there any assemblage during the shoot?

Yes, there can be; it is possible to assemble the whole film during the shooting period and perhaps even do a basic first cut. But quite often this isn’t of great benefit, because it may close a lot of options too soon, rather than leave the material for more careful scrutiny after the shoot. I believe you need time to lay out all the material before you start making too many decisions.

Is it ever necessary to cut certain scenes to enable the director to shoot something which follows?

Action scenes will have preliminary cuts done on location to ensure that they are working, especially if they involve a lot of special effects and stunts. By doing a rough-cut you have a chance to reshoot or do a pick-up shot to cover, if you need it.

Then, from that first assembly, you start to see for the first time — with all the material in the correct order from beginning to end, it might be quite loose and rough, but it starts to give some feeling for the pattern of the film from scene to scene; a feeling of the texture of the material, and how different scenes affect other scenes.

From that first assembly you go to the rough-cut, which will be a lot tighter. You will already have made some decisions about what would go and what would stay. There are usually quite a lot of alternatives. For example, a scene might be played out more by the director than he intended, so you might only use half a scene. Usually that is the sort of material to disappear from the first assembly.

So if you had a first assembly of 2½ hours, you would probably come back on the first rough-cut to about two hours running time, although probably there wouldn’t seem to be very much missing.

Then from the first rough-cut you go to another, or maybe even to two more, before you go on to a first fine-cut. It’s difficult for me to call the various stages in the cutting of a film rough-cuts and fine-cuts, because they all progress towards one ultimate fine-cut of a film. In other words, I work it over and over — but working over the whole film evenly. I don’t start at the beginning and fine-cut the first scene — I slowly concentrate the film into its correct time structure.

How closely do you work with the director on the first assembly?

I work with a director scene by scene. Usually each morning I look at the rushes of one scene with the director who decides which are the better takes, and gives me a plan on how to cut it. And then I always like the director to leave me to do the first cut.

Sometimes there are things that I may change. Then at the end of the day he looks at it. The next day the scene will probably undergo another cut. A scene will usually be cut several times before the first assembly.

How long is a first assembly?

The length of a first assembly can vary quite a lot. I’ve had first assemblies of 210 minutes for a 90-minute film. At this stage the cuts are very rough and loose.
FILM SOUNDTRACK AUSTRALIA

Proudly announces the opening of Melbourne’s only Sound Mixing facility capable of handling everything in sound from Stereo feature films to Johnny’s first experiment.

Features:
- 20 tracks of 35mm, 17.5mm or 16mm
- Any combination of gauges running together
- International 3 track master recording
- Transfers to any gauge at any speed from any source
- 50 foot plush mixing theatre
- Anamorphic, arc and xenon projection
- 40 foot Post synchronising and recording theatre Voice overs
- Fully automated rock and roll operation
- Preview screening — non stop double head
- Editing rooms for hire

For rates, bookings and details of cash discounts contact Peter Zerbe.

Film Soundtrack Australia
107 Queensbridge Street, South Melbourne. 62 5677

EDWARD McQUEEN-MASON
Freelance Film Editor
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• ALVIN RIDES AGAIN • END PLAY
• ELIZA FRASER • HIGH ROLL

Sound Editing
• PETERSEN • END PLAY
• DEVIL’S PLAYGROUND

PHONE: MELBOURNE 69 4268 or 232 1378

EDGE NUMBERING SERVICE
PRINTED ONTO ACETATE OR POLYESTER BASE

F STOP PRODUCTIONS P/L
COMPLETE POST PRODUCTION FACILITIES
- EDITING ROOMS AND EQUIPMENT,
  PRODUCTION OFFICE
PHONE MELBOURNE 69 4268

JOHN BARRY GROUP
INTRODUCES TO AUSTRALIA THE
TODD-AO 35
ANAMORPHIC LENS SYSTEM

The “TODD-AO 35 system was recently acquired by Cinema Products Corporation of Los Angeles, and the John Barry Group, who are their sole representatives in Australia, have purchased a range of lenses together with the Exclusive Rental Franchise for Australia, New Zealand and South East Asia.

These high quality anamorphic 35mm lenses were designed by Dr Richard Vetter (of the TODD-AO Corporation), who received an *U.S. and foreign patents pending.

Academy Award in 1973 for their improved anamorphic focusing system — a system which results in the lowest distortion yet achieved by any anamorphic lenses.

TODD-AO 35 anamorphic (scope) lenses are computer designed to the highest standards of the motion picture industry. In addition to unexcelled quality, their optics have the added advantage of maintaining a constant squeeze ratio (2:1) of the image at all focus distances without distortion.

All TODD-AO 35 lenses were designed with the objective of incorporating maximum flexibility without sacrificing picture quality. All lenses may be used interchangeably on standard BNC-R, BNC, Mark II and Arriflex cameras. Other features aimed at reducing production costs include a 200mm macro-telephoto lens capable of focusing from a few inches to infinity, and a zoom lens (10 to 1) with focal lengths ranging from 50mm to 500mm.

LENSES IMMEDIATELY AVAILABLE FOR RENTAL EX STOCK SYDNEY
35mm WIDE ANGLE. 50mm NORMAL ANGLE.
75mm NORMAL ANGLE. 100mm TELEPHOTO.
200mm MACRO-TELEPHOTO. 50-500mm ZOOM.
MOUNTS AVAILABLE
MITCHELL - BNC MARK II, ARRIFLEX.

105 Reserve Road, Artarmon
Sydney, N.S.W. 2064
Telephone: 439 6965
Telex: 24482
Cable: BIRNSAW-SYDNEY
All correspondence: P.O. Box 199
Artarmon, N.S.W. 2064 Australia.
Do you screen the material in the theatre at this stage, or do you just look at it on the editing machine?

I don’t believe in judging the cuts on editing machines, and I don’t believe in deciding which is the best take on an editing machine. I prefer to make these decisions in a theatre on a screen the size it will be seen on.

There are vast differences in timing between a small and large screen. Some scenes will also appear to be more interesting on an editing machine than they really are.

At what point do you start screening a film?

Usually after the first assembly. That’s when you are going to need to be next to the screening facilities and, of course, to sound transfer facilities, because that’s the stage when you are going to start cutting wild-tracks and doing a lot of sound work. But up until that first assembly, it’s not critical to be close to theatre and sound transfer facilities.

What stage is the soundtrack in for the first assembly?

At this stage, the soundtrack is limited to 35mm or 17.5mm sync dialogue rushes only. In other words, the sound which was recorded on location while the camera was running. All sound effects and wild track dialogue is still on tape at this stage. You use guide-track sound in scenes that the sound will be recorded for later. These are scenes with difficult sound locations, or perhaps they are scenes which used special effects equipment which made too much noise to allow dialogue to be recorded. But you will try and get a cut on a scene before you replace the dialogue. It would be uneconomical to re-record all the dialogue for all the takes.

So, the first assembly has a very elementary soundtrack with no overlapping dialogue.

Could you describe the process of refining the material from the first rough-cut onwards?

Well, first you look at the rough cut — even though it’s in 10 reels — in a continuous run in the theatre and get an overall impression of the flow and pacing of the film.

Then having looked at it once in the theatre, you might go through it again, on an editing machine and decide which scene you will start working on. You don’t have to start from the beginning. Usually I go to the most difficult scene and start building that closer to its final form. Some scenes may be put aside for the time being, because often I can’t decide how to cut a scene until I have cut every other scene around it.

So it’s a general process of tightening up each scene…

We are starting to find a pace, but not really starting to fine-cut yet. Not closing off too many options.

How closely do you work to the script at this stage?

Usually, for a first assembly, it’s exactly as in the script. But once I see the first assembly, I might for example, immediately see there is one scene that isn’t working, which I decide not to use.

At what stage is the structure of the film set?

Well, I like to keep it until as late as possible — just to keep the options open. But there is always pressure to reach a fine-cut to allow the sound work to be done. Soundtrack work can’t be done to a rough-cut, because if you change the image, you have to change the sound on all the separate tracks, and that becomes very complicated.

How long is this whole procedure — from when you begin the first assembly until you have fine-cut the film?

I would say normally, on a film that takes seven or eight weeks to shoot I would expect to have a fine-cut within eight weeks on completing shooting. You have to hand over at least two or three reels of a 10-reel film to the dubbing editor within seven weeks.

THE DUBBING EDITOR

So you don’t hand over the whole film to the dubbing editor, but rather reel by reel. Do you complete the reels in order or at random?

Well, ideally I like to hand the first reel of the film to the dubbing editor first, and follow it with a reel of each two or three days — particularly if I am working to a tight schedule and need more time to work on the film.

Between a rough-cut and a fine-cut, you start to work more on sound, and so you might produce a fine-cut with two dialogue tracks and some rough mixes of dialogue and music.

Are there any sound effects in these mixes?

With rough mixes on fine-cut scenes you often need sound effects because the scene might rely on them for part of its mood — whether those sounds be wind, rain, footsteps, or whatever.

How many tracks does the dubbing editor usually make up?

Normally he works on up to 15 tracks.

Does the dubbing editor work on your cutting copies of the image and sound?

The lab makes a black and white copy from the color work-print of the reel, and the dubbing editor works on that. A dupe is also made of the soundtrack, which the editor keeps, and the dubbing editor is given the original.

How do the concepts for the soundtrack usually evolve?

Well probably the director would talk to you about the general concept at pre-production stage, and would outline his ideas: where he wants the effects and where he wants any special effects on dialogue. So from a very early stage you would have an outline, and throughout the cutting of the film you would communicate, or be preparing to communicate with the dubbing editor all these ideas about sound.

By the time you actually hand the first scenes over to the dubbing editor — who has been preparing himself for those scenes and choosing the right sort of sounds — he will first have to organize dialogue tracks and prepare them for mixing in such a way that they can be easily and quickly handled in the mixing theatre.

There is a lot of work to do filling out dialogue tracks, removing off-screens, director’s cues and all sorts of extraneous sounds that are not required in the finished film. And when he has finished the dialogue tracks he will then start to lay the effects tracks.

Is an editor usually involved in the process of selecting the effects that are used?

Well, I find that it’s usually something that’s talked out between the editor, dubbing editor and the director. It’s very difficult for a dubbing editor to lay up the sound effects for the whole film without talking in detail with the editor and the director about what sort of things he is going to do. Most dubbing editors spend a lot of time planning and then choose all the sounds and atmospheres that are dramatically right for the scenes.

And then you check them…

I always like to have dubbing rehearsals before going to the theatre. I look at a reel with all tracks and ensure that everything is working. If something isn’t quite right, I still have time to change it.

What happens to the music during the assemblage and rough cuts?

You will usually have some sort of outline from the composer about where music will occur in the film in pre-production stages. I would also expect the composer to be involved in watching the development of the scenes during the cutting.

So, even though the music hasn’t been recorded, the dubbing editor will probably have a guide track of just one instrument that the composer has prepared, to give an indication of how music runs through the film.

What role does the editor play once the reels are fine-cut?

Well, the mix has to be done, and you should always regard that as being the first time you ever really see the film.

So you work very hard, considering the way the film is being mixed. During a mix you might even decide to change what you have done — you might decide to change a scene or re-cut something completely. Don’t forget it’s usually the first time you are seeing it with all the effects and music. Often the whole pace of a film can change on seeing it. No amount of imagination about how a film is going to look with the music and the sound effects has ever really seemed to me possible. ★
Tom Ryan and John O'Hara

In recent years, specialist film magazines have devoted several or more of their pages to a discussion of television. As Charles Barr noted in March 1970, "the centrality we cannot ignore: we should discuss it even if only to articulate what we don't like about it."

Rather than settle for the oft-repeated dismissiveness of the 'highbrows', the TV columnists (John Pinkney's well-practised vituperative wit in the Melbourne Age notwithstanding), and the educators (nowhere is there more ignorance lavished on the form than in our schools), the medium needs a more calculated and informed criticism.

Above all, in spite of the hostility, rightly or wrongly directed at television, its potential needs to be explored at least in the following ways:

- A new 'language' for television criticism is necessary, replacing the one usually reserved for subversives and politicians.
- Instead of amateur sociologists slapping together exclamations of horror at the 'connection' they have found between actual crime and violence, and the fictionalized or documented form in television, a broader cultural criticism, in which television will become a single aspect, is necessary.
- Instead of critics bemoaning the inordinate proportion of 'police' series on television, what is needed is a thoughtful analysis of the genre, its patterns and variations, distinguishing the parts from the whole.
- Instead of the prevailing condescending which greets the sophistication of particular variety shows or the earthiness of others, what is needed is a study of the kind of performance they entail and the nature of their appeal.

In Britain Sight and Sound and Movie now publish substantial analyses of the structures of television and of particular program types, and Screen too has shown an occasional inclination to include television in its theoretical explorations. The British Film Institute already has a useful series of television monographs relating to the nature of the industry in Britain and the presentation of news, sport and variety entertainment.

In the U.S., Film Comment has a commentary on television, and in 1975, the American Film Institute launched American Film as a "journal of the film and television arts". But in Australia, apart from the occasional piece in the now defunct Lumiere, there has been a dearth of serious material on the subject.

In an attempt to remedy this, Cinema Papers will provide a regular forum for discussion of the television, the industrial and political framework within which it exists, and the direction alternative forms of video might take.

The format of this magazine will be extended to include features on television, interviews and production information on Australian-made television films and documentaries, reviews, interviews and educational discussions.

A detailed analysis of popular television is not an easy task. The sort of research necessary to fulfill such a goal often founders in the face of the ephemeral quality of television programmes, and even the most committed researches of our form have had to live with the problem of how to screen the overabundance of material.

Already in Australia, several significant television programs have passed without winning the critical attention they need and deserve. John C. Murray's article, "Defending the Defenders" in Lumiere (April 1973) goes some way towards outlining "the substantial merits" of the Crawford 'police series'. But this piece simply serves to illuminate the absence of further examinations of these and other series.

The recent Trident Nine network co-production, Luke's Kingdom, was greeted by what one could be forgiven as seeing as a conspiracy of critical silence (in this country, at least). Yet, it is arguably one of the most impressive of those emergent 'continuous dramas' to reach our screens. The ABC series, The Outsiders, has been ignored, Power Without Glory failed to stimulate any probing analysis; Who Do You Think You Are?, an underrated and forgotten 'soap opera', series. But this piece simply serves to illuminate the frequency of the 'soap opera'.

Of course any attempt to talk about television, which does not also give weight to the various imported programs, will distort the perspective. American drama, comedy and variety would seem to provide the staple diet for local television audiences, and some British series also seem to have gained a firm hold.

While it is distressing to see the dominance of foreign material over the local output, it is important that this distress should not color our view of that material. Even while regretting the reluctance of Australian finance to provide the means for productions here, it is also possible to admire some of what has taken its place. The screening of overseas programs which we have not had the opportunity to see — from Paddy Chayefsky's work in the Playhouse '90 series in the 1950s, through Stephen Sondheim's television musical, Evening Primrose in the 1960s, to Ingmar Bergman's or Rainer Werner Fassbinder's television dramas, or the episodes denied us of Mary Hartman, Mary Hartman in the 1970s.

In this issue of Cinema Papers, John O'Hara discusses the BBC production of Days of Hope, which was recently shown on the ABC, and interviews the director of the series, Kenneth Loach. On other pages Patricia Edgar examines the newly established Australian Broadcasting Tribunal and the Inquiry into Self-Regulation in her article entitled 'Network and the Self Regulation Inquiry'. In future issues Cinema Papers will be as much concerned to examine material from abroad as it is to begin work on that which is specifically Australian. By way of an introduction to the former prospect, the two coming issues will feature checklists of directors and writers of American comedy and drama series, compiled over the past decade and occasionally beyond.

Days of Hope, one of the landmarks features of British television for 1975, has come and gone on Australian screens with scarcely a ripple. The series drew almost no critical comment in Australia on its value as television drama, and sparked no discussion at all about the issues it dealt with: conscription, conscientious objection, the right to strike, the power of monopoly and conservative governments to crush protests by the working class, and reformist vs revolutionary paths to power.

The total absence of critical interest in Australia may have been due in part to the timidity of the ABC, which broadcast the four-part series over the Christmas-New Year holiday period. Each of the programs concentrates on a major political event, or at least what the producers see as a crucial event in the formation of the British Labor movement during the period 1916-26. The final deals with conscription in 1916 and the trials of conscientious objectors in the army; the second with the miners' strike in 1921; the third with the coming to power of the first Labor government in 1924; and the last with the General Strike of 1926.

The series created an uproar when it was shown on BBC1 in September 1975. The Daily Telegraph saw the films as evidence that the BBC had been infiltrated by left-wingers. The paper argued that the minority political viewpoints ought not to be put on the BBC in this way. "This is a plea, not for censoring left-wingers, but for ending a situation in which this is the dominant political philosophy put out by a semi-monopolistic state service," the paper commented.

This argument obscures the political implications of the rest of the BBC's programming, and reinforces a directly literal interpretation of what Days of Hope might mean to its audience.

Other arguments took up the representation of various institutions, such as the Church and the army. One letter written to The Listener said: "My dead father and uncles, in their un-frockable Midland rollmadies, challenge from fending photographs with a gaze I find it increasingly difficult to meet. Is there to be no flash of recognition, no murmur of thanks? Is it all to be handed over to those who have made English the dirtiest word in the English language?"

Others clearly felt differently about what they took from the series. One commented:
In my opinion Days of Hope faithfully reflected the atmosphere of the strike committee rooms, and of the factories and the homes where the issues had to work themselves out. If they had been presented from the point of view, above the battle of the smug, self-satisfied professor, they would not have been worth a damn. What other response impossible.

The cut between contrasting political meetings in the first film become fades in similar sequences in the last, to indicate what Loach has referred to as a “measured, thoughtful approach”. He has also said that they ran out of money and could not afford the variety of settings of the earlier films. But one feels also that the relatively abstract interest in arguing political issues has cut out the definition of concrete situations which give force and urgency to the arguments. The overall style of the programs led to further muddy controversy. Were they fact or fiction, and did it matter if they were described as documentaries or drama? Much of the discussion revolved around the historical accuracy of the series. Their writer, Jim Allen, said, “Our business is to write fiction — we don’t make documentaries.”

The films in fact develop a steadily binding ideological argument, although the second two lose touch with the social and cultural context of that argument and the slow growth of real conscientiousness. The change in emphasis from the battle of the smug, self-satisfied professor, to the staunchness and courage which grew during its course; and the surprise and consternation followed by white hot anger, when those who had led up the hill crumpled up so suddenly, and scurried down again. There was nothing in the play which could have exaggerated those experiences."

With both these respondents one feels that the series only confirmed certain expectations; the establishment and the trade unionist have each drawn on the films to strengthen their commitment to particular causes. Those who did not live through the events depicted might well ask whether they are characterized so as to make any other response impossible.

The contrasting sequences of interiors and outside scenes disappear by the last film; we are merged in an underworld of committee rooms and smoky meetings. The sense of picking meaning from the unfolding life of a small community is replaced by a constant level of argument; the variations in lighting and sound give way to more even and accessible interiors; odd glimpses and snatched fragments become explicit and drawn out, and the last film requires a different kind of participation by the audience.

The head of BBC drama, Shaun Sutton, suggested in defence of the BBC, that the bias was only occasional, thereby missing the point of the argument. He remarked that of the last 800 plays televised by the BBC only 10 were political. But this is to refer to politics purely in terms of content.

The reassuring police presence in Softly Softly Task Force and the grand authority of the political patronage in The Pallisers each in their different ways play upon an assumed consensus of order, customs and law. Action takes place within an order that defines the individual and gives him the opportunity to act. We know how to interpret the drama because we are familiar with the presentation.

The interesting tension in Days of Hope is the attempt to present a predictable, though radical, political line while dispensing with many of the forms of narrative history on television. In certain important ways the series attempts to redefine what we usually take for granted as foreground and background in television drama.

From the opening of the first film there is an impression of farm life in a small Yorkshire community, isolated, simple, vulnerable and inevitable. These suggestions become more important than the usual dramatic device of locating the characters in a landscape or explaining their motivations. It is often difficult to make our figures exactly, as the lighting changes; especially when episodes of dialogue are lost and only odd sentences stand out. The viewer extracts meaning from impressions that pass as though there were no need to record them. This technique of calling attention to apparently inconsequential activities and conversations allows an immediate sense of intimacy that is only reinforced by the constant off-camera dialogue. The convention of individual characters speaking clear, successive lines while the camera records their gestures, is done away with. So, too, is the sense that each scene embodies a specific meaning that derives from the shots immediately preceding and following.

The traditional resources of television drama are transformed: no even lighting, as though the world were a stage temporarily lit up; no spot sound effects dubbed in, no background music, no static two-shots, no zooms at all. Instead, Days of Hope consists of a loose collection of episodes linked by outstanding emotional emphases, whose force is usually a cumulative expression of underlying anger and bitterness, carefully controlled.

The films indicate a persistent and moving awareness of the constant struggle by its individual characters to defend themselves against the systematic aggression which is seen to characterize the nation’s political processes.
Keeping a Low Profile

Times have changed. There was a time when a Technicolor 3 strip camera required a 22" geared head. For standard studio cameras a 16" quadrant is considered to be ideal. Now, to accommodate the new low profile cameras we have produced a superb 13" head, the Samcine-Moy Mk III.

The Samcine-Moy Mk III has the same silky movement as larger geared heads, the same feel and the same balanced gun-metal control handles which smooth out long pans and tilts. Like the Mk I, the new head has a built-in balancing slide, an either-way-round adjustable wedge, a dovetail camera attachment, optional off-set control positions, two-speed pan and tilt action (four speeds with the off-set arms), a large "T" level and a levelling high hat, as well as an adjustable pan friction.

If you've got a low profile camera and you want to get a head, get a Samcine-Moy Mk III.

CONTACT PAUL HARRIS
SAMUELSON FILM SERVICE (AUSTRALIA) P/L 25 SIRIUS RD., LANE COVE, NSW 2066
PHONE: (02) 428 5300 — 24 HOURS

SPECTRUM FILMS

Where the shoot ends and the movie begins.

Caddie
The Picture Show Man
Summerfield
Journey Among Women
The Search of Anna
The Irishman
The Mango Tree

141 Penshurst St., Willoughby, Sydney, Australia, 3068. Phone (02) 412 4055
In the last issue of Cinema Papers producer Richard Blackburn commented on the essential role that the state of the Australian film industry. In future issues further contributions will be made by leading figures in the industry’s unions, guilds, societies, associations, and production companies. It is hoped these articles will provide a forum for an exchange of ideas about the industry.

In this issue, Tom Stacey argues the case for direct financial assistance to the Australian film industry. A comparative study of film finance in Britain suggests that industry subsidies are necessary to provide economic incentives in the absence of national and international recognition. The Australian Film Commission (AFC) has recommended to the Tariff Board Inquiry that the industry needed a subsidy. The reader will understand my reluctance to believe the worst. The Australian film industry is important: it is part of our culture and provides much needed employment to a variety of people and pleasure to the whole population. In short it is to the detriment of society if it is allowed to fail.

To this end I believe that a cash subsidy should be available to all producers of Australian feature films: this should be a substantial subsidy to increase profitability overall, and it should not be limited to AFC-financed films. Even on AFC-financed films, using the AFC's 20 per cent of gross profit, 25 per cent of cost assumption, 25 per cent of cost would be available. This is a substantial subsidy.

In an industry devoid of statistics one must, therefore, estimate the trading results of specific films often from unconnected items of information.

On January 12, 1977 the Financial Review had an article headed "A Case for Subsidy". Caddie, now in its eleventh month in Sydney, is an excellent film which has earned its success. But in 1972 it became apparent that the producer, in spite of a prolonged and sincere attempt, could not raise private capital to match the costs of the film. AFC investment in it was about 82 per cent of the budget came from government sources. However, the AFC has been willing to give anyone anywhere with the production scale to distribute the film. Clear, from the public favorability and success of the film, the only known information available to the public it seems that Caddie, which cost $349,000, will be returned approximately 30 per cent per annum to its investors - a rate which after tax scarcely keeps pace with inflation.

Tom Stacey is the Executive Officer of the Australian Film Development Corporation from its inception in 1970 until ceased operation in 1975, and its functions were taken over by the newly-formed Australian Film Commission. He is currently the Director of Development and Projects with the Sydney-based production company, Air Programmes International.

Let us look at film production in Australia and what areas are subsidized.

1. The AFC is subsidized.
2. Private film producers are subsidized.
3. Educational film production is subsidized.
4. The Australian Film and TV School is subsidized.
5. The AFC is subsidized.
6. Television commercial producers and television series producers are being or have been subsidized.
7. The ABC is subsidized.

The only sections of the industry not subsidized are documentaries and some film production. Documentary production should be subsidized and I hope someone will put the case for this. I am concerned with feature film production.

A lot has happened in the five years since 1972 when the Tariff Board Inquiry was held. I have based this recommendation for a subsidy on:

1. The ABC is subsidized.
2. Our films are earning money overseas. After deducting agent commissions, the difference in the box office earnings usually involves the introduction of overseas actors, thus adding to the cost of production.
3. The AFC has raised its per cent of net film hire from the 75 per cent of net film hire which is returned to the producer.
4. Australian film features have received inadequate subsidies for some years. They were started by the Australian Film Development Corporation, with additional support from the AFC. There are some interesting aspects about these subsidies, which hinge on the terms of the film investment agreements.
5. They are capital subsidies rather than profit subsidies, with the emphasis on getting the production area. Having regard to the failure of many scripts, which the terms of such AFC investments vary from those which are profitable make unsatisfactory profits having regard to the high risk nature of the business.
6. The ABC is subsidized.
7. subsidies, with the emphasis on getting the production area. Having regard to the failure of many scripts, which the terms of such AFC investments vary from those which are profitable make unsatisfactory profits having regard to the high risk nature of the business.
8. The ABC is subsidized.
9. subsidies, with the emphasis on getting the production area. Having regard to the failure of many scripts, which the terms of such AFC investments vary from those which are profitable make unsatisfactory profits having regard to the high risk nature of the business.
10. The ABC is subsidized.

Australian film features have received inadequate subsidies for some years. They were started by the Australian Film Development Corporation, with additional support from the AFC. There are some interesting aspects about these subsidies, which hinge on the terms of the film investment agreements.

The Australian film industry is important; it is part of our culture and provides much needed employment to a variety of people and pleasure to the whole population. In short it is to the detriment of society if it is allowed to fail.

To this end I believe that a cash subsidy should be available to all producers of Australian feature films: this should be a substantial subsidy to increase profitability overall, and it should not be limited to AFC-financed films. Even on AFC-financed films, using the AFC's 20 per cent of gross profit, 25 per cent of cost assumption, 25 per cent of cost would be available. This is a substantial subsidy.

In an industry devoid of statistics one must, therefore, estimate the trading results of specific films often from unconnected items of information.

On January 12, 1977 the Financial Review had an article headed "A Case for Subsidy". Caddie, now in its eleventh month in Sydney, is an excellent film which has earned its success. But in 1972 it became apparent that the producer, in spite of a prolonged and sincere attempt, could not raise private capital to match the costs of the film. AFC investment in it was about 82 per cent of the budget came from government sources. However, the AFC has been willing to give anyone anywhere with the production scale to distribute the film. Clear, from the public favorability and success of the film, the only known information available to the public it seems that Caddie, which cost $349,000, will be returned approximately 30 per cent per annum to its investors - a rate which after tax scarcely keeps pace with inflation.

Tom Stacey is the Executive Officer of the Australian Film Development Corporation from its inception in 1970 until ceased operation in 1975, and its functions were taken over by the newly-formed Australian Film Commission. He is currently the Director of Development and Projects with the Sydney-based production company, Air Programmes International.

Let us look at film production in Australia and what areas are subsidized.

1. The ABC is subsidized.
2. Private film producers are subsidized.
3. Educational film production is subsidized.
4. The Australian Film and TV School is subsidized.
5. The AFC is subsidized.
6. Television commercial producers and television series producers are being or have been subsidized.
7. The ABC is subsidized.

The only sections of the industry not subsidized are documentaries and some film production. Documentary production should be subsidized and I hope someone will put the case for this. I am concerned with feature film production.

A lot has happened in the five years since 1972 when the Tariff Board Inquiry was held. I have based this recommendation for a subsidy on:

1. The ABC is subsidized.
2. Our films are earning money overseas. After deducting agent commissions, the difference in the box office earnings usually involves the introduction of overseas actors, thus adding to the cost of production.
3. The AFC has raised its per cent of net film hire from the 75 per cent of net film hire which is returned to the producer.
4. Australian film features have received inadequate subsidies for some years. They were started by the Australian Film Development Corporation, with additional support from the AFC. There are some interesting aspects about these subsidies, which hinge on the terms of the film investment agreements.
5. They are capital subsidies rather than profit subsidies, with the emphasis on getting the production area. Having regard to the failure of many scripts, which the terms of such AFC investments vary from those which are profitable make unsatisfactory profits having regard to the high risk nature of the business.
6. The ABC is subsidized.
7. subsidies, with the emphasis on getting the production area. Having regard to the failure of many scripts, which the terms of such AFC investments vary from those which are profitable make unsatisfactory profits having regard to the high risk nature of the business.
8. The ABC is subsidized.
9. subsidies, with the emphasis on getting the production area. Having regard to the failure of many scripts, which the terms of such AFC investments vary from those which are profitable make unsatisfactory profits having regard to the high risk nature of the business.
10. The ABC is subsidized.
Made by professionals for professionals, Sennheiser microphones are designed to meet the exacting requirements of the film, television, broadcasting communications and recording industries.

A whole range of microphones are available from miniature Lavalier types to the latest transistorised condenser microphones and Electret types, offering directional characteristics for every situation.

In addition to the host of accessories such as windshields, stands, goosenecks and booms, there is the famous Sennheiser 'Microport' system, an RF microphone communication unit which offers truly cordless operation.

Like to know more about the huge range of Sennheiser microphones? Come and talk to Cunninghams!
PRODUCTION SURVEY

35mm PRE-PRODUCTION
THE BEAT GOES ON (Working Title)
Production Company...............Docufilm
Distribution Company...............Stills
Producer..................Howard Cassell
Director..............................Terry Bouke
Screenplay/Scriptwriter............Donald Crombie
Associate Producer.................Jenifer Paterson
Makeup................................Barry Mcllroy
Production Manager..............Brian Gertz
Art Director..........................Judy Howes
Sound Recordist......................Bill Penning
Editor..............................Richard Bate
Assistant Editors........................Bud Reilly
Producer Assistant.................Erica Martin
Camera Operator......................John McMillan
Continuity.........Barbara Burleigh
Stunt Coordinator...John G. Tewell
Best Boy.........................John Cummings
COLOR PROCESS: Eastmancolor
Release Date...................December 1977

CROCODILE
Production Company...........Jenifer Paterson Productions
Production Distributor...............Stills
Producer..................John Megone
Director..............................Terry Bouke
Screenplay/Scriptwriter............Terry Bouke
Associate Producer.................Terry Bouke
Executive Producers..................Terry Bouke
Makeup................................Brian Fothering
Still Photography.........................Valentine Taylor
Production Manager...........Richard Bate
Art Director..........................Judy Howes
Technical Adviser......................Peter Arnold
Release Date...................December 1977

35mm IN PRODUCTION

THE GHOSTS OF YERRENDERIE
Production Company................Forest Home Films Pty Ltd
Distribution Company...............Australian Film Commission
Director..............................Donald Crombie
Screenplay/Scriptwriter............Donald Crombie
Associate Producers.............Natalie Miller, Dan Byers
Executive Producers..................John Tsambazis
Director of Photography............John Tsambazis
Sound Recordist...................Michael Norton
Mixer..................................Richard Bate
Continuity..........................Barbara Burleigh
Stunt Coordinator..................Barry Mcllroy
Release Date...................January 1977

THE MANGO TREE
Production Company..................Samphire
Distribution Company...............Pty Ltd
Producer.............................Peter Arnold
Director..............................Terry Glyn
Screenplay/Scriptwriter............Terry Glyn
Associate Producer.................Pete Shiels
Production Manager...........John Tsambazis
Continuity..........................Barbara Burleigh
Production Assistant.............Harry Glynatsis
Camera Operator......................Bob Page
Best Boy.........................John Cummings
Color Process........................Eastmancolor
Release Date...................January 1977

OFF THE DEEP END
Production Company...............Forest Home Films Pty Ltd
Distribution Company...............Pty Ltd
Director.........................Donald Crombie
Screenplay/Scriptwriter............Donald Crombie
Associate Producer.................Ginny Lawton
Executive Producers...............Pete Shiels
Director of Photography............John Tsambazis
Sound Recordist...................Michael Norton
Mixer..................................Richard Bate
Continuity..........................Barbara Burleigh
Release Date...................December 1977

THE IRISHMAN (Working Title)
Production Company...............Forest Home Films Pty Ltd
Producer.............................Ginny Lawton
Director.........................Donald Crombie
Screenplay/Scriptwriter.............Donald Crombie
Associate Producers.............Natalie Miller, Dan Byers
Executive Producers...............Pete Shiels
Production Manager...........John Tsambazis
Continuity..........................Barbara Burleigh
Release Date...................December 1977

THE GHOSTS OF YERRENDERIE
Production Company................Forest Home Films Pty Ltd
Distribution Company...............Australian Film Commission
Director..............................Donald Crombie
Screenplay/Scriptwriter............Donald Crombie
Associate Producers.............Natalie Miller, Dan Byers
Executive Producers..................John Tsambazis
Director of Photography............John Tsambazis
Sound Recordist...................Michael Norton
Mixer..................................Richard Bate
Continuity..........................Barbara Burleigh
Stunt Coordinator..................Barry Mcllroy
Release Date...................January 1977

THE MANGO TREE
Production Company..................Samphire
Distribution Company...............Pty Ltd
Producer.............................Peter Arnold
Director..............................Terry Glyn
Screenplay/Scriptwriter............Terry Glyn
Associate Producer.................Pete Shiels
Production Manager...........John Tsambazis
Continuity..........................Barbara Burleigh
Production Assistant.............Harry Glynatsis
Camera Operator......................Bob Page
Best Boy.........................John Cummings
Color Process........................Eastmancolor
Release Date...................January 1977

OFF THE DEEP END
Production Company...............Forest Home Films Pty Ltd
Distribution Company...............Pty Ltd
Director.........................Donald Crombie
Screenplay/Scriptwriter.............Donald Crombie
Associate Producers.............Natalie Miller, Dan Byers
Executive Producers...............Pete Shiels
Production Manager...........John Tsambazis
Continuity..........................Barbara Burleigh
Release Date...................December 1977

THE IRISHMAN (Working Title)
Production Company...............Forest Home Films Pty Ltd
Producer.............................Ginny Lawton
Director.........................Donald Crombie
Screenplay/Scriptwriter.............Donald Crombie
Associate Producers.............Natalie Miller, Dan Byers
Executive Producers...............Pete Shiels
Production Manager...........John Tsambazis
Continuity..........................Barbara Burleigh
Release Date...................December 1977
PRODUCTION SURVEY

For details of the following 35 films see the previous issue:

The Flame Stone
Barney
Break of Day
Don’t Panty
Ella Fraser
Storm Boy
Summer of Secrets
Summer City
The Picture Show Man
Journey Among Women
Deathdeathers
The FJ Holden
The Getting of Wisdom

16mm PRODUCTION SURVEY

BACKROADS

Director...........Philip Noyce
Screenplay............John Emery
Additional material written by director and cast
Producer.............Zac Martin
Music................Zac Martin
Director of Photography............Phillip Foxley
Editor.............David Foxley
Sound Engineer.............Jude Carrick
Sound Recordist.............Lloyd Carrick
Gauge..........................16mm
Progress..........................First Two - filming completed
Length..................................52 minutes each film
Budget...............$50,000
Color process..............Eastman
Synopsis: This film reveals the bizarre cult of the FJ Holden, film freak and actor, plus cast in the film

THE CORAL LEAVNTH NIGHT PROWERS

Producers.............Ben Cropp, Eva Cropp, Wally Gibbins, Stan Godber, Ian Hart
Director.............Ben Cropp
Production Company.............Peninsular Films
Gauge..........................16mm
Length..........................55 minutes
Budget...............$25,000
Color process..............Eastman
Synopsis: Four one hour TV specials covering Sound Snakes, sharks, trees, rocks, and dangerous night creatures — all filmed mostly under the Barrier Reef

THE FLAME STONE

Director.............Phillip Noyce
Screenplay............John Emery
Additional material written by director and cast
Producer.............Zac Martin
Music................Zac Martin
Director of Photography............Phillip Foxley
Editor.............David Foxley
Sound Engineer.............Jude Carrick
Sound Recordist.............Lloyd Carrick
Gauge..........................16mm
Progress..........................First Two - filming completed
Length..................................52 minutes each film
Budget...............$50,000
Color process..............Eastman
Synopsis: This film reveals the bizarre cult of the FJ Holden, film freak and actor, plus cast in the film

THE LIVING GODDESS

Production Company.............Cinetel Productions
Director.............Frank Heimans
Screenplay/Scriptwriter.............Stephen Wallace
Music................Ralph Schneider
Editor.............Kathy Dargan
Sound Recordist/Mixer.............Chris Maunder
Director of Photography............Paul Foxley
Gauge..........................16mm
Progress..........................First Two— filming completed
Length..................................52 minutes each film
Budget...............$25,000
Color process..............Eastman
Synopsis: This film reveals the bizarre cult of the FJ Holden, film freak and actor, plus cast in the film

THE SUMMER OF SECRETS

Producer.............Elizabeth-Anne Crawley, Garry Maher, Robert Ken Brindley, Joanne Hill, Malcolm Salt
Director.............Stephen Wallace
Production Company.............Cinetel Productions
Gauge..........................16mm
Progress..........................First Two— filming completed
Length..................................52 minutes each film
Budget...............$50,000
Color process..............Eastman
Synopsis: This film reveals the bizarre cult of the FJ Holden, film freak and actor, plus cast in the film

THE FLAME STONE

Director.............Phillip Noyce
Screenplay............John Emery
Additional material written by director and cast
Producer.............Zac Martin
Music................Zac Martin
Director of Photography............Phillip Foxley
Editor.............David Foxley
Sound Engineer.............Jude Carrick
Sound Recordist.............Lloyd Carrick
Gauge..........................16mm
Progress..........................First Two - filming completed
Length..................................52 minutes each film
Budget...............$50,000
Color process..............Eastman
Synopsis: This film reveals the bizarre cult of the FJ Holden, film freak and actor, plus cast in the film

THE SUMMER OF SECRETS

Producer.............Elizabeth-Anne Crawley, Garry Maher, Robert Ken Brindley, Joanne Hill, Malcolm Salt
Director.............Stephen Wallace
Production Company.............Cinetel Productions
Gauge..........................16mm
Progress..........................First Two— filming completed
Length..................................52 minutes each film
Budget...............$50,000
Color process..............Eastman
Synopsis: This film reveals the bizarre cult of the FJ Holden, film freak and actor, plus cast in the film

THE SUMMER OF SECRETS

Producer.............Elizabeth-Anne Crawley, Garry Maher, Robert Ken Brindley, Joanne Hill, Malcolm Salt
Director.............Stephen Wallace
Production Company.............Cinetel Productions
Gauge..........................16mm
Progress..........................First Two— filming completed
Length..................................52 minutes each film
Budget...............$50,000
Color process..............Eastman
Synopsis: This film reveals the bizarre cult of the FJ Holden, film freak and actor, plus cast in the film
**THE MAKING OF ANNA**

**Director**

**Executive Producers**
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**Screenplay/Scriptwriter**
Peter Ryan, Ron Hender, Charlie Tingwell, Graeme Foreman, Brian Bradley, Lee Armstrong, Robert Ryan, Ron Hender, Charlie Tingwell, Graeme Foreman, Brian Bradley.

**Sound Recordist**
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THE KIWI FILM COMPANY PTY. LTD

RICHARD CLARKE, GODFREY PYE and FRED NEALE
SPECIALISING IN...

POLISHING, PROTECTING & PRESERVING YOUR POST PRODUCTION.

THE KIWI FILM COMPANY
83 MILLER STREET, NORTH SYDNEY.
TELEPHONE 9294111

The New Alternative Lab

16mm and 35mm contact
- Optiscope (Techniscope) to Cinemascope
- All optical effects
- 16mm, 35mm and Optiscope
- 16mm to 35mm Blow Up
- 35mm to 16mm Reduction

OPTICOLOR
Cnr 188 Pacific Hwy & Bellevue Ave
Greenwich 2065 NSW
(02) 43 9771
PRODUCTION SURVEY

PRODUCERS, DIRECTORS and PRODUCTION COMPANIES

Include your next project in our production survey listings. Send your production details and stills to:

Production Survey
Cinema Papers
143 Therry St.
Melbourne, 3000

Phone: (03) 329 5983

Deadline for next issue is early May.

Color Process: Eastmancolor negative
Progress: Final editing
Synopsis: A film on varying activities of outback airmen.

Assistant Producer: Ron Hannam
Producer: Malcolm Otton
Synopsis:
Music: Cameron Allan
Director: John Sexton
Production Co-ordinator: Roy Bissell
Editors: Ian Walker, Henry Danger
Electrician: Bruce Gailey
Camera Assistant: Tony Gailey
Production Assistant: Su Doring

THE TEAM
Production Company: Film Australia for The Director of Airforce Recruiting
Producer: Bruce Allen
Assistant Producer: Ron Hannam
Director of Photography: John Hopkins
Editor: Ian Weddell
Sound Recorder: Howard Spry
Mixers: Julian Ellingsworth
Sound Editor: Greg Roper
Camera Assistants: Peter Levy, Andre Roinin
Assistant Editor: Lyne Williams
F111 Aerial Photography: R.C., John Bennett
Camera Assistant: Peter Levy
Production Assistant: Tony Gailey

THE WATER MUST GO SOMEWHERE

Production Company: Film Australia for The Natural Disasters Organisation
Director: Graham Chase
Assistant Producer: Ron Hannam
Director of Photography: Mick Von Bonnemann
Editor: Brian Woods
Production Assistant: Su Dorning
Sound Recorder: Beazley
Mixers: Tony Gailey
Camera Assistant: Ian Plummer
Electrician: Charlie Donald
Length: 15 min
Gauge: 35mm
Color Process: Eastmancolor negative
Synopsis: A recruiting film for the Airforce.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION

Details next issue.

DEPARTMENT OF FILM PRODUCTION TASMANIA

Details next issue.

AUSTRALIAN FILM COMMISSION

Projects given financial support during the period December-February, 1976.

DECEMBER

CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT BRANCH EXPERIMENTAL FILM AND TELEVISION FUND
NSW

Jan Chapman
Show Time $4800
16mm/color/20 min
Robert Chittick
Young Kids of Liverpool $4850
16mm/color/45 min
Laurie Field
Wheel $3820
16mm/color/10 min
Catherine Grenville
Dabs $3000
Christopher Hook
Philip Leslie — Motor Cycle Rider $980
16mm/color/24 min
John Kirk
Community Documentary Newsreel $1000
8mm/v/color/6x10 min
Michael Magoffs
Preview $1880
16mm/B&W/5 min
Milton Reid
Fiesta $1000
16mm/color/15 min
Victoria Roberts
Goodbye Sally Goldstein $3989
16mm/color/7 min
Elizabeth Rust
Definitions/Redeinitions $500
16mm/B&W/45 min
Mark Vicario
12 Jottings and Music $2640
20 min
Tracey Stewart
Freedon $340
8mm/color/30 min
Sandra Richardson
Take It or Leave It $4580
16mm/color/20 min
Suzanne Walker
Pipi Storm $500
16mm/color/B&W/4 min
Timothy Wilczeck
Section 8 $4405
16mm/color/20 min

VIC

Robert J. Burns
Hydrocarbons and Western Port $552
16mm/color/B&W/90 min
Cynthia Connop
Returning $337
16mm/color/45 min
John Dunkley-Smith
Hoddle Street Suite $1735
16mm/B&W/25 min
Chris Goulter
The Soldier $1942
16mm/B&W/11 min
Darren Gunzburg
Kay $1433
16mm/color/7 min
Maureen McCarthy
A Holiday $1767
16mm/B&W/12 min
Raymond Quint
Holiday $1744
16mm/color/30 min
Brian Smyth
Orb of Day $668
16mm/color/10 min
George Stamkoss
Hollywood Hollywood $1848
16mm/color/B&W/20 min
Dusan Stojanovich
Day 1 $2320
16mm/color/15 min
George Viscas
Tramp $897
16mm/B&W/10 min
John Wright
The Artist. Good Evening. Nothing But. $2590
16mm/B&W/Respectively 2 min, 2 min, 3 min, 1 min
Grace Macguigan
Volcano $1000
Super 8mm/color/12 min

S.A.

P.K. Barram
The Tractor $2000
16mm/B&W/5 min
Catherine Kelly
Unitfed $2361
16mm/color/10 min
Simon Lewis
Wild King Kuroy $420
16mm/color/55 min

W.A.

John Birt
Habitate — Stock Dooco $362
16mm/B&W/7 min
Jennifer Boul.
Bus-Ride $1241
16mm/color/5 min
Elizabeth Caucson
The Proposal $3239
16mm/color/2 min
Peter Sorensen
I Don't Know What I'm Going to do With You $1733
16mm/color/10 min

Q U E N S L A N D

John Herbert
Ureal World 360

Leslie Mannison
Meeting $911
Keith Cox
Heart and Soul $281

ADVANCED PRODUCTION FUND
Supplementarys
Ken Cameron
Out of It $3259
John Papadopolous
Jogs Trott $2000
David Gregg
Circus $2000

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT/PRO-PRODUCTION
Graham Gifford
The Airline Nobody Wanted $3000
William Edgar
Moodys $4000
Telemark Productions Pty Ltd
Zero K $2500
Telemark Productions Pty Ltd
The Dean Conspiracy $1700
Esperance Films Ltd
Gina Between Changes $2000
Cimex Productions
Long Weekend $2000

PRODUCTION
Vic Martin Productions Pty Ltd
Blizzards, Sharks and Shipwrecks
Additional funds to complete production $2979.67
Voyager Filmic Pty Ltd
Captain Goodvibes $10,740
Highway Productions
Highway One
Post production and promotional work $16,594
Homestead Pictures
Raw Deal
Distribution advance $5000

LEA
Leisure Time Entertainments/Exhibition Company $100,000

FEBRUARY 1977
CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
Paddington Town Hall Trust — $50,000 conditional guarantee against bank loan. On condition other two bodies involved in the project, Sydney City Council and New South Wales Government, provide an equivalent amount.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT/PRO-PRODUCTION
Mary-Jo Wilson
Some Fell Among Thoms $2000
Robert Talbot
Egan $4000 (second draft script)
Barry Donnelly/Ken Hannam
Carnivore $3000
Frank Sheidles
The Breaker $7000
Peter Maxwell
Touch and Go $7447
Ben Lewin
Dunera Boys $6000

PRODUCTION
SAFC/Aquarius
Off the Deep End $520,000
Royca Smeal Film Productions
Last Run of the Ki $328,000
Quest Films Pty Ltd
Patrick $100,227
Colin Eggleston Productions
Long Weekend $133,791
Independent Artists
The Battle of Broken Hill $300,000

SAFC
TV Theatre Package $97,500
Yorun Gross Film Studio
Doi and the Kangaroo
Additional production funds of $14,750 and distribution loan of $27,698.35
McElroy & McElroy Productions
The Last Wave
Investment structure altered from $207,000 investment to $181.370.

PACKAGE DEVELOPMENT
Myburgh Productions
Muphridge Package $28,000
Anthony Buckley Productions
Buckley/Crombie Package $7,950
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Film Production

1977 could usher in major changes in New Zealand's film industry. Filmmakers are pressing for financial assistance for local film production, and the Government is under pressure to use the money collected in film hire tax for such productions.

The Government has also been urged to set up a fund for local filmmakers, and one parliamentarian suggested a tax on imported television commercials which could be used to fund local films. There are also suggestions for the setting up of a film council which could allocate funds for film production.

Filmmakers are backing their claim for financial assistance by putting three feature films into production.

An Auckland film company, Aardvark Films, plans to produce a feature film called Sleeping Dogs which should be ready for the theatre circuit in September. The film is based on a play by Melbourne author David Rannay and Channel 7 of Sydney. The film's budget is $136,800 of which $56,800 has come from Australian investors and $80,000 from within New Zealand.

Another film, Sleeping Dogs Too, will be made in this country. The others, black and white, were Rewi's Stand, Broken Barrier, Runaway, Don't Let It Get You, and Test Pictures.

Geoff Stevens, who made Test Pictures two years ago, is now preparing to shoot a new film. Solo, a film set in the forests of Tokoroa. The story is a drama of complex relationships between a man who is a professional piece of work, which possibly helped in getting a distribution grant from the Australian Film Commission, thereby assuring sales in Australia.

Geoff says the film is a low-budget commercial feature. By overseas standards it is low, the total budget being $175,000.

Distribution

Last year, the committee of the Wellington and Auckland Film Festivals tried, without success, to get the West German film, The Lost Honour of Katharina Blum, made by the film team of Fassbinder and Schatzki, which won the Silver Bear at the 1976 Berlin Film Festival, shown in New Zealand. The film has been sold to 35 countries, and sold well in overseas markets.

Filmojers was disappointed to learn that the film was going to be screened by the French distribution arm of the BBC, which has decided to screen the film in France. The film was made for the BBC and the French government, and was distributed by the French government.

The film will be shown on TV 1 after it has been released in the cinema.

Exhibition

CIC owner Lang Masters is renewing his efforts to open this country's first drive-in cinema. The campaign began in 1974, and even with strong support from interested groups and the City Council, has so far been unsuccessful.

Under the new Cinematograph Films Act, the exhibition of films at a drive-in cinema is prohibited before a date yet to be fixed. Only the Minister can set the date and give the go-ahead, and since monopoly interests are opposed to the establishment of such cinemas it is unlikely the Government will permit it.

Lang's concept is a cinema which could accommodate 600 people and provide action films aimed at young people who, according to him, is where the market is.

Censorship

On December 8 last year, the new Cinematograph Films Bill was passed and became operational on April 1 this year. This is a great step forward for the New Zealand film industry.

The new Act will allow the censor to take into consideration the artistic merit of a film, together with the type of audience who will view it. Special consideration will be given to festivals and those of film societies.

It is a pity the man who helped draft the Act never lived to see it being implemented. He was Doug McIntosh, the Chief Film Censor, who died on December 26, last year.


What has upset the industry as a whole is the new film censorship and appeal charges. Under the old system it cost the distributor $30 to register an appeal against the censors' decision. If he won the appeal, the money was refunded. It now costs $100 for registration and $100 for appeal and another $100 when the appeal is heard, and win or lose there is no refund — an outlay of $300 with the odds against you.

The distributors say they will now carefully consider what films they take to appeal. It is clear reading between the lines that the new registration charges are designed to muzzle the Films Appeal Board who, if successful, have been reversing the censors' decisions on a somewhat regular basis. The only bright note is that film societies will not be subject to these new charges as they are non-profit-making concerns, but they will pay 25 per cent.

Many people were shocked at one provision in the new Bill, which gives the Minister the power to order a film withdrawn from screening (even after it has been passed by the censor), if he thinks it offends the public's interest, order or decency. Civil rights groups say this is an infringement of human rights, while others call it more political censorship. Whatever the interpretation, a law like this is dangerous and open to abuse.

Commenting on the passing of the new Act, the Minister, Mr D.A. Highet, said New Zealanders were mature enough to adopt a more positive approach to films. He said the censor could become more liberal when dealing with films of quality, artistic and social comment, while at the same time could deal harshly with the rubbish. People who attend the cinema regularly are between the ages of 15 and 25, and there are discriminating filmgoers who have a sensible attitude to today's cinema and reflect the changes in society.

Box-office

Film mania is continuing throughout the country with box-office returns well above average in most cities. If some films failed to measure up to expectations, then others certainly made up for them.

Gumball Rally was sold with saturation television coverage and newspaper advertising, together with a sponsored rally from Auckland to Wellington. The results paid off for Columbia Warners, and this could be their biggest success for the year.

Bugsy Malone, after a hard sell and tough promotion, has started to pay off, and good returns are expected. King Kong, while not having the appeal of the second highest impact of Jaws, is coming big money. Murder by Death failed because no one knew how to sell it.

Logan's Run and The Pink Panther Strikes Back chalked up solid returns, but Victory at Entebbe, in spite of a good advertising campaign, did not rise to the heights expected. The potential was there, but the public wasn't. Mary Poppins, which started on a world-wide run some 18 months ago, has finally reached New Zealand and is a box-office success.
Congratulations to Russell Boyd for winning the British Film Award for Best Cinematography for the film Picnic at Hanging Rock. Colorfilm is proud to have been associated with this production in processing the film.

Colorfilm Australia
35 Missenden Road, Camperdown, N.S.W. 2050
Telephone 516 1066. Telex: AA 24545
## Services & Facilities Guide

### Part 1: Laboratories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services &amp; Facilities</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>New South Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. 35mm COLOR</strong></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Eastman negative to Eastman standards (5247 when available).</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Electronic color analysing.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Ultrasonic negative cleaning.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Rushes (24 hours) — Bell &amp; Howell Model 'C' additive color printing.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Negative breakdown, recording and storing.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Negative matching.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Intermediate positive and negative, reversal intermediate (CRI).</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Release printing — B &amp; H Model 'C'.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. 16mm COLOR</strong></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Negative/positive.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Eastman negative developing to Eastman standards (7247 when available).</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Electronic color analysing.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Ultrasonic negative cleaning.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Rushes (24 hours) — B &amp; W color; Bell &amp; Howell Model 'C' additive color printing; printer edge numbers.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Negative breakdown, recording and storing.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Negative matching.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Intermediate positive and negative, reversal intermediate (CRI).</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 'A' and 'B' roll make-up and printing.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Reversal; developing Eastman 7252, 7256, 7241, 7242; or Developing Gevachrome P600, P605, P615; or Developing Eastman 7252, 7256, 7241, 7242; Printing 7389; or Developing Eastman 7252, 7256, 7241, 7242; Printing 7389; or Developing Eastman 7252, 7256, 7241, 7242; Printing 7389;</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. OPTICAL PRINTING</strong></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 'Oxberry' and like equipment.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Aerial image.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Automatic complex zooming.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Liquid gate.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) 16mm to 35mm blow-up with liquid gate.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. SOUND</strong></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 35mm and/or 16mm magnetic to magnetic.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Magnetic to optical.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Optical to optical.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Electronic printing.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. MAGNATECH 35/16mm</strong></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Sound auto looping recording and duping system</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. 8mm (Standard-Super)</strong></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Duplicating.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Bulk printing and cassetting.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. CLEANING AND POLISHING</strong></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Base polishing.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Scratch eliminations.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Emulsion hardening.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Ultrasonic cleaning.</td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
<td><img src="https://i.imgur.com/1F8G5.png" alt="Star" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Services

- Video & Telecine facilities
- Kinescope recordings
- 16mm to super 8mm reduction printing
- 16mm mixing.
- A & B Hazeltine color analyzing
- Feature film proof printing
- Color consultant
- Quality 16mm Cinema Papers, April — 357
Journey Among Women

“The story of an epic romance set in an isolated British penal colony in the late eighteenth century. Elizabeth Harrington, the elegant daughter of the Judge-Advocate, is caught up in the escape of the colony's most dangerous female prisoners and is taken by them on a desperate trek into the wilderness. To make the film, the cast and crew cut themselves off from the outside world and lived communally in the bush — sleeping in one large tent, cooking on fires, bathing in the freezing river. They formed friendships, fought bitterly, fell apart and came together again.”

CAST
Lillian Crombie, June Pritchard, Martin Phelan, Rose Lilley, Diane Fuller, Nell Campbell, Lisa Peers, Jude Kuring, Kay Self, Tim Elliott, Kenneth Laird, Ralph Cotterell.

CREW
Director ................................ Tom Cowan
Producer ................................ John Weiley
Director of Photography ................. Tom Cowan
Editor ..................................... John Scott
Sound ..................................... Jeff Doring
Screenplay ............................... Dorothy Hewitt, John Weiley, Tom Cowan and cast

Top Left: Helenka Link.
Top Right: The women in convict boat.
Left: Lisa Peers, Diana Fuller, Nell Campbell.
Bottom Left: Robyn Moase.
Below Centre: Jude Kuring, Diana Fuller, Terese Jack.
Below Right: Helenka Link.
The Getting of Wisdom

"The Getting of Wisdom is set in Victoria in the 1890s and concerns Laura's school days at Melbourne's exclusive Presbyterian Ladies College. It is based on Henry Handel Richardson's second novel and recounts her own adolescent experiences. A drama of human relationships charged with emotion and sexuality, it is the only one of Richardson's works to reveal a strong comic streak. A story of obsession and rebellion, The Getting of Wisdom is a closely observed study of the absurdly pompous social values of the time."

CAST
Barry Humphries .................. The Rev. Strachey
John Waters ...................... The Rev. Shepherd
Susannah Fowle ................... Laura
Hilary Ryan ...................... Evelyn
Jan Friedl ....................... Miss Snodgrass

Top Left: John Waters as the Rev. Shepherd.
Top Right: Laura (Susannah Fowle) plays cricket.
Right: Laura is taunted by school friends.

CREW
Director ........................ Bruce Beresford
Producer ........................ Philip Adams
Production Designer .............. John Stoddart
Director of Photography ......... Don McAlpine
Editor ............................. William Anderson
Screenplay ....................... Eleanor Witcombe

d_below_right: The Ladies College: displaying the absurd, pompous values of the time.
d_below: Laura at work.
d_bottom: Director Bruce Beresford 'conducts' a schoolroom scene.
PETER SELLERS
in Blake Edwards' "THE PINK PANTHER STRIKES AGAIN"

ROBERT DE NIRO
GERARD DEPARDIEU
DOMINIQUE SANDA
LAURA BETTI • WERNER BRUHNS
STEFANIA CASINI
STIRLING HAYDEN
ANNA HENKEL • HELLEN SCHWIERS
ALIDA VALLI • ROMOLO VALLI
STEFANIA SANDRELLI
DONALD SUTHERLAND
and
BURT LANCASTER

RICHARD HARRIS
"THE RETURN OF A MAN CALLED HORSE"

FAYE DUNAWAY
WILLIAM HOLDEN
ROBERT DUVALL

FAYE WILLIAM PETER DUNAWAY HOLDEN FINCH

"1900"

ALBERTO GRIMALDI
Production
A film by BERNARDO BERTOLUCCI
"1900"
ROBERT DE NIRO
GERARD DEPARDIEU
DOMINIQUE SANDA
LAURA BETTI • WERNER BRUHNS
STEFANIA CASINI
STIRLING HAYDEN
ANNA HENKEL • HELLEN SCHWIERS
ALIDA VALLI • ROMOLO VALLI
STEFANIA SANDRELLI
DONALD SUTHERLAND
and
BURT LANCASTER

Even more incredible than 
A Man Called Horse.

The all-new adventures of 
The English Lord with the soul 
of an Indian.

RICHARD HARRIS
"THE RETURN OF A MAN CALLED HORSE"
BREAK OF DAY
Beryl Donaldson

Break of Day is a disappointing film—disappointing because the combined talents of Ken Hannam, Cliff Green and Pat Lovell held the promise of a film at least as good as Picnic at Hanging Rock or Sunday Too Far Away.

Set in a small mining town in central western Victoria in the early 1920s, the film centres on Tom Cooper (Andrew McFarlane) a returned Anzac trapped in an unsatisfactory marriage to Beth (Ingrid McFarlane), a newspaper business inherited from his father, and a lie about his war experience. The scene his only outlet seems to be the systematic decimation of local rabbits.

Alice, a painter from Melbourne, views Tom’s gruff awkwardness through the lens of rustic romanticism. For her, he is the strong silent bushman—an embodiment of the ‘true spirit of Anzac’. His daily visits to her isolated hut on the outskirts of the town, culminate in the inevitable affair, which in turn provokes the inevitable town gossip. After a confrontation with a group of Alice’s bohemian friends, Tom returns to resume his position as husband, newspaper proprietor and war hero.

When it comes to films about human relationships, the plots of most can be reduced to a limited stock of themes based on simple and readily observable facts about the human condition. What seems to distinguish the good films from the rest is the way they manage to transform these time-worn cliches into eternal truths, giving us new insight, rather than the depressing sense that we have been through all this before. Unfortunately Break of Day doesn’t seem to make that transformation, and one is often painfully aware of the plot as cliché, rather than classic.

The central character is a man caught in two of life’s recurring dilemmas—one involving the choice between freedom and security, the other the choice between truth and the saving lie. That we are hardly surprised when he opts for the conventional in both cases may, in part, account for the film’s ultimate blindness. Whether due to the acting or to the script, the character is just too wooden to convey any sense of either moral struggle or self-irony which might engage us in his fate.

While this may be an accurate portrait of the small-town moral coward, it is somewhat lacking in dramatic interest. The characters of the women are similarly one-dimensional; and they seem to exist only as embodiments of the choices facing Tom, with Alice representing the freedom and excitement of bohemia. Beth the stifling boredom and predictability of bourgeois life.

Again, this may be as much a function of the acting as the script, as Sara Kestelman’s Alice is often over-drawn and stagy, and Ingrid Mason as Beth seems to be in a perpetually stunned condition, more suggestive of valium than pregnancy.

The film begins with a rather unfortunate attempt to re-create the Gallipoli landing—a sequence as disastrous as was the event itself. It may have been a small campaign, but one rowboat approaching what looks like Portsea beach stretches credibility to the point where one is left wondering why they did not choose some less embarrassing, more literal way of conveying the fact of Tom’s participation in the war if the budget was so tight.

The battle scene cuts to a close-up of a cannon, which turns out to be a war memorial in a small country town. A man on a bike —linked to the battle by virtue of his old army jacket and rifle—is soon coming up the deserted street. This cuts to the sound of gunshots, and prolonged focus on the dead agones of rabbits, all serving to reveal that here is a man much scarred by his war experience.

Somehow it is all a bit heavy-handed, perhaps because the pace is such that one might be, and Beth’s reaction to the soft-boiled egg signals her pregnant state.

On the positive side the sequence has an effective shot of the cracking of a runny egg, and the evocation of the object-laden family home is quite superb, capturing both the oppressiveness of inherited possessions and the sadly ineffectual role-playing of the young couple. However, while much is promised here little is delivered. Although the situation is painstakingly set up and all kinds of undercurrents implied, none of it is ever followed through.

Break of Day is undeniably a beautiful film to watch. As in Picnic at Hanging Rock, Russell Boyd’s cinematography evokes the strangely enigmatic quality of the Australian bush, at once ominous and unexpectedly lyrical.

However, while in Picnic the powerful presence of the bush is integral to the structure of the film; it seems less so here. The endless sweep of the camera through vistas of blue and gold becomes a little tedious—landscape for landscape’s sake. The long sequence in which Tom and Alice are seen exploring the countryside, and the shots of Alice painting merged with shots of the paintings themselves falls particularly into this category. And it all seems a little too familiar, too reminiscent of almost every film made about artists.

The film abounds in pointedly meaningful images and dialogue: the shot of a mother and grandmother holding up a baby as Alice leaves the general store, the erection of the Anzac monument; the rabbit heads floating down the river; the counting of Mr Evans’ (Ben Gabriell) lecture on grammar (“Any man that breaks the rules does so at his own risk”) with the sleazy bar-room speculation about Alice (“Must be pretty broadminded, being an artist”).

However, while there is a constant sense of points being made, there is very little analysis of the issues raised, so that the film seems at once self-conscious and superficial.

Although Break of Day promises more than it actually delivers, it is at least an ambitious failure. The film touches on themes which are obviously central to any analysis of Australian society—the mystification involved in the Anzac legend, the exclusion of women from important areas of life and the stigmatization of independent women as either witches or whores, the mutual contempt of city and country—as well as on universals like generational conflict, the monotony of marriage, and the saving lie. No one could call it a trivial film, but it is unfortunately more ponderous than profound, characterized by stilted acting performances—at least in the major roles—a painfully slow pace, and a singular lack of humor or dramatic impact.

If this was rural life in the 1920s, we need look no further to explain the fact that Australia is one of the world’s most urbanised countries!

DEATHCHEATERS

Roger O. Thornhill

Deathcheaters may well prove to be the dividing line in the career of Australian producer-director Brian Trenchard Smith.

The stunts, chases and acrobatics in Deathcheaters reinforce the impression gained from Man From Hong Kong, that Trenchard Smith is the leading exponent of action-direction cinema currently working in Australia. But the film also reveals that, alongside Tim Burstall, he is a noisy and unsubtle proponent of the Carry On style — a trait he revealed earlier in his lowbrow comedy The Love Epidemic.

The Deathcheaters screenplay is attributed to Michael Cove, but familiar comic action elements make one strongly suspect that Trenchard Smith must have been involved in the rewrites.

The story revolves around a pair of ex-commandos, Steve and Rod (John Hargreaves and Grant Page) who run a stunt agency for film and television work. They find themselves ensnared into an impossible scheme to penetrate a Philippines industrial complex headed by an international gangster, and escape with incriminating plans and papers. The scheme is conceived by Mr Culpepper (Noel Ferrier), an ASIO-type agent who tempts the two friends with a promise of a devil-may-care adventure.

Deathcheaters is full of throwaway gags like, “We’ve come to read the meter”, as Hargreaves and Page burst into the island fortress. But while this sort of line may be standard from Humphrey Bogart, or even Robert Mitchum, it doesn’t quite click when it comes from the mouths of Page and Hargreaves.

To date Brian Trenchard Smith has produced two commercially successful films out of three, and only the vagaries of Australian censorship have prevented him from obtaining a perfect score. (The Man from Hong Kong inexplicably received an ‘R’ rating from the Australian censors, thereby having a large slab of its mature and teenage audience syphoned off.)

Trenchard Smith’s training under Esther Harris making trailers for National Screen Service in Britain clearly taught him the essential elements of audience involvement. He never allows the interest to bog down with scenes of meaningful significance, but pushes through action sequence after action sequence, with only the occasional comic or romance interlude: a car chase along a highway culminates in a spin around a David Jones store and merges skilfully into the scaling of an outside wall of the Sydney Hilton; a montage of stock car activity blends into an attack on a Philippines industrial plant then climaxes in a hang glider getaway — and so on.

Fast insistent action is melded with background details on the mechanics and heroes of stunt work, and Trenchard Smith himself directs a series of documentary-like snippets, including a man incinerating himself, Grant Page surviving an automobile hit and run attempt; and a gunshot at point blank range.

But in Deathcheaters there is more than the miscellany of action filmmaking to plug the gaps between the stunt sequences. Scenes like the one pairing photos of Idi Amin, Napoleon, Hitler and Stalin and Malcolm Fraser on the wall of Culpepper’s office raise a laugh, although the incessant sexist rigmarole of Grant Page and his string of lady friends falls about as flat as the discussions between Syphilis and Gonorrhoea in The Love Epidemic.

In fact stuntman extraordinaire Grant Page has difficulty in raising a laugh at all — as either a Casanova, or canine confidant, Margaret Gerard, as Julia Hall, unfortunately is equally disappointing.

Deathcheaters was shot — for reasons of economy — in 16mm, then blown up to 35mm for release. The quality of the final print is excellent.

But while Trenchard Smith has worked miracles of economy in Deathcheaters — and in doing so offering an object lesson to his filmmaking peers — he has also displayed his flaws.

His next project is apparently a spectacular based on the wreck of the Batavia. In approaching this subject one hopes he will set his course in the direction of an adventure epic in the mould of Mutiny on the Bounty. Captain Blood or Billy Budd. While Trenchard Smith has no flair for comedy, he is however a highly skilled exponent of the action genre.

elements as uncomfortably disparate — and irrelevant — as bedroom farce, ironic social comment, film noir, a knockabout brawl, even a cops’n’robbers chase.

Several particularly incongruous early episodes are sheer Alvin Purple. The best that can be said for them is that they introduce Eliza’s suitors — cynical sea captain Rory McBryde (John Castle) and vulnerable fugitive convict David Bracefell (John Waters). But the price of such devices is serious imbalance. The opening sequence, in which McBryde flees a vengeful husband (Gerard Kennedy), is at such a misleading tangent that latecomers must wonder if they’re in the right cinema.

Further sidetracking into joie sexuelle and sadistic byways delays for far too long Eliza’s arrival at what should be the pivotal episodes. Once the Frasers are on Great Sandy Island (it was later renamed Fraser to commemorate the captain) the film reaches a higher plane.

A lucid and appealing artlessness — one suspects it is close to ad-libbing — infuses scenes in which the natives examine the castaways and commandeer fancied items of clothing.

The clash of cultures, with the primitives for once enjoying the upper hand, is wittily conveyed. There is a marked difference between the humor of the situation in which Sue White does with the same character in his recent novel “A Fringe of Leaves”.

My feeling is that Burstall, in his determination not to enshrine Eliza in stained glass, has immortalized her in comic strip.

Eliza Fraser has a lot going for it, technically. Director of photography Robin Copping makes the most of visual embarrass de richesces in locations like Fraser Island without letting the setting upset the players. He achieves some beguiling evocatory moments while Les Binns’s designs strongly assert the period.

What a pity these attributes are lavished on material that is sometimes unworthy of them.

John Waters as the escaped convict David Bracefell in Tim Burstall’s Eliza Fraser.
THE FOURTH WISH
Basil Gilbert

The Fourth Wish, produced and distributed by the Australian Film Corporation (in association with the Australian production company Galaxy), set up by the film's director, Don Chaffey, writer Michael Craig and lead actor John Meillon, has not been commercially successful. The film only had a short run in Melbourne and Sydney, and when offered to American distributors was dismissed as a "little soft" — perhaps meaning that The Fourth Wish is a tender, emotional film, lacking the direct appeal of sex, sensationalism or violence.

The film's poor box-office performance, however, may have some relief when director Chaffey suggested in a cinema papers interview, a question of faulty distribution tactics: a case of the right film at the wrong time.

Galaxy and the SAFC obviously found that the domestic distribution of an Australian film is not easy, but they must be congratulated for their attempt. Producers like Fred Schepisi (The Devil's Playground) have demonstrated that Australians can now make and successfully distribute their films.

The Fourth Wish deals with a father-son relationship: the husband, Casey (John Meillon) has been abandoned by his wife, Corstane (Robyn Nevin), and bringing up his child has become more a chore than a pleasure. The boy, Sean (Robert Battie) has leukemia, and the inevitability of death gradually strengthens the father-son relationship. Every moment becomes precious, and an attempt is made to live a full life for the remaining moments.

In exploring this theme, The Fourth Wish raises an important social question: why does tragedy, or imminent tragedy, so often give a new dimension to life? Why does it need such a terrifying experience to give life meaning?

While the film offers no solutions, it illustrates that an ordinary person is capable of challenging conventions and changing himself and society for the better.

On the occasion of a falling star, Sean is given three wishes to make. He chooses three that will resolve the resolve and ingenuity of his rather simple, but kind-hearted Irish father: a dog for a pet, a visit to his mother, and a handshaking with the Queen of England.

But there are others. The boy and his father live in a typical suburban rented flat in Adelaide, where dogs are not allowed. Even the charming Benji-type terrier that Casey and Sean pick up from the local dog pound does not melt the heart of the obnoxious landlord.

This opposition, however, brings out hidden resources in Casey. He believes in fighting fire with fire, and if the landlord is going to get the law to have him, his son and dog thrown out, then he will have a bash in the courts and retain the services of a lawyer ("I 'bolly well voted for you") to delay the eviction.

Sean's meeting with his mother is perhaps the most moving sequence in the film. Constance is a alcoholic working in a shabby nightclub and the memory of her son has long faded. But once again Casey, with a Punic misericourse on ethics and respectability, manages to win his new-found moral strength by attempting to stand between the boy and his drunken mother.

Robyn Nevin's very convincing performance, particularly in the scene where she struggles to spruce herself up for her meeting with Sean.

The dramatic tension of The Fourth Wish has some relief when director Chaffey captures the peaceful mood of the family boating, beautifully conveyed in lyrical long-shots. During this quiet moment, the score composed by Tristan Cary and recorded by the University of Adelaide Quintet is evocative, delicately reinforcing the image. In much of The Fourth Wish, however, the score is distracting, especially in the more dramatic scenes.

Stylistically, The Fourth Wish has few surprises. It is hard to reconcile cinematographer Geoff Burton's spectacular and captivating images in Storm Boy with the photography of The Fourth Wish. Of course, the suburbs of Adelaide don't exactly provide the visual scope of Storm Boy's rolling sand dunes and isolated coastal wilderness. Burton, who is sometimes over-theatrical in his lighting of interior sequences (where light-buried hair and multiple shadows give an artificial air, does, however, have a flair for exteriors.

He knows how to use natural sunlight to give a high-key tone to lyrical shots and carefully exploits optical tricks, such as shooting through rain-flooded glass to gain shimmer and texture.

The literary script of The Fourth Wish, by British actor-writer Michael Craig, frequently reveals a slight unease in handling the Australian idiom. But even where the dialogue verges on convoluted pathos ("I don't give a stuff whether you, or her, or the whole AMA says he's going to die... He's my son, and he's not going to die!") John Meillon's broken voice gives the words meaning, and the time-worn lines of his versatile and flexible face speak a language that is much more powerful than words.

THE FOURTH WISH

PROMISED WOMAN
Fiona Mackie

Promised Woman alternatively creates the impression of a film that has captured something essential of the milieu and emotional quality of Greek life in Australia, and a film that is off centre, looking at its subjects from the outside.

This ambivalence between involvement and observation resonates continually in the background. But this may be a positive quality. Certainly it conveys an important life-quality of the Australian Greeks who live under the label and status of 'migrant' and a film that is off centre, looking at its subjects from the outside.

This outcome is assimilationist in its perspective, and were it not for Antigone's emotions in the issue are irrelevant to him. Or as they were to his father when he arranged the deal and handled her own.

Promised Woman does give a strong sense of a woman's position in a traditionally chauvinist society. Antigone is sensitively played as someone who acts out of outrage at her position, but whose actions are muted and controlled by the situation. By the end of the film she has found an independence. In the process, a heaviness has gone from her; a heaviness symbolized at various points in the film in the specter of the 'black Greek widow' (Telis' and Manolis' mother, played by Theo Sevastos).

The role as scripted is perhaps too caricatured, but it has undeniable dramatic impact. It represents the position of many older Greek women in Australia who, having produced children (particularly sons) may traditionally expect some related recognition and power as mother of a family. However, in Australia they lose even that source of independence. Their children learn English, are acculturated, and eventually leave them behind as irrelevant and embarrassing emblems of the past.

Rejected by Telis and increasingly respected and loved by his older brother Manolis (Takis Emmanuell). Antigone finds her feet by, typically, moving from a job with a paternalistic Greek boss to one in an Australian bar; an achievement which to Manolis completes her "fall.

Antigone empathises with Manolis' 20-year separation from Greece. She is haunted by it herself and in a series of flash-backs we learn of the love affair that branded her unworthy of the customary marriage dowry. But as Antigone's memory grapples with her past she becomes more effective in building a new life and stops clinging to the old.

This outcome is assimilationist in its perspective, and were it not for Antigone's progress to independence, would be a flaw in the film.
But a critique of that position is present in the character of Telis, the hard self-made man determined to make good regardless of feelings. His commitment to work and death of life is what many Greeks in Australia abhor. As a Greek woman once said to me, "You could fall dead in the street man determined to make good regardless of here and no one would notice."

There is a sense in Promised Woman of embodied culture, a culture going down, fighting against an extinction threatened by indifference to variety. And for Antigone, attempts to preserve this culture intact present obstacles to her liberation. She manages, however, to find a path that avoids repression while maintaining the spirit of her culture.

The film should bring a sense of solidarity to Greek women who have lived through that experience. But they may find a sense of the warmth and depth that can draw Greeks to each other lacking.

RAW DEAL

Susan Dermody

Perhaps the most regrettable aspect of Raw Deal is its technical competence. Without that there does not seem to be any further excuse for having made the film. Since it was made, with the backing of various bodies — ranging from the ABC and the Victorian government, to the Greater Union Corporation — we are faced with trying to imagine why.

Obviously its long list of investors were satisfied at least that it was going to make them some money. But surely, when they were in the throes of persuading their investors, Russell Hagg and Pat Edgeworth must have put forward some enthusiastic idea about the film. One is that even the lightest of comic treatments of an established form, like all comedy, depends on some at least slightly subversive idea — otherwise, the "comedy" remains irritatingly superficial, going no further in subverting the audience's habitual response to the given form than replacing, say, any hint of serious danger or suspense with a quickly established expectation of rapid relief, usually capped by a gag or punchline, instead. And far from entertaining any slightly subversive ideas, Raw Deal, in spite of its central plot motivation of an imaginary planned revolution, nowhere in Australia of the 1870s, in scrupulous about not challenging any aspect of the Australian ethos, from its political apathy and (well-founded) mistrust of the powers that be, to its blithely unexamined sexism.

The other lesson is that comedy and essentially impeccable action-adventure heroes do not mix with any particular advantage to either. Comedy surely has to have something to do with the fact that human spirit and human matter are often ill-matched, in both quality and quantity. The result is the absurdity that pervades human affairs, and that provides comedy with its surprisingly small number of endlessly productive goldmines of basic situations.

But the only protagonist permitted to show (and never stop showing) the fatal flaw of absurdity in Raw Deal is the Kid, Dick (joke, presumably because he is not yet a man, like the other magnificent four. So that the only comic situations in the film, such as the first sexual encounter (with a whore), and the subsequent visit to the doctor to assay certain suspicions, involve the Kid, while for the men, the only comedy permitted to touch their roles as action-adventure heroes is their shared tolerant amusement at the greenness of the Kid, and their persistent "comical" repartee. ("I wouldn't mind a cool drink right now." "I wouldn't mind a cool blonde.")

Where Hitchcock's light comic treatment of the chase-thriller in North-By-Northwest contrates to quite a profound level of the film (and the form), subverting audience expectations to the point of trapping audience sympathy in quite morally ambiguous situations (while the chase-thriller normally affirms orthodoxy morality in an unambiguous manner), Raw Deal's light comic treatment of the action-adventure only succeeds in cheapening the action and the adventure. Comedy is a far more serious matter than green kids and repartee-based dialogue — as the Hitchcock example makes clear.

It is probably already becoming obvious that Raw Deal is a kind of inverted Magnificent Seven in some respects. The seven men who appear dramatically on the horizon in the opening shot turn out to be a contingent of Tyrones, the Irish who would-be revolutionaries who want to save Australia for the Pope. They represent the force that will have to be put down, not by desperadoes tempted by sudden idealism to defend a threatened community, but by desperadoes tempted by $10,000 (dollars, as "a fistful of dollars", not pounds, as in colonial Australia), to become unofficial mercenaries for the 'threatened' ruling class.

And just to ring one more niche change on the old theme, there will be only five desperadoes, not seven.

The far from magnificent seven Tyrones are quite quickly put down in their attempt to force a small settlement to join their revolution — or at least to contribute to its funds. The potentially interesting notion of a fictional revolution is also quite quickly put down — "Same business, under new management", is how a settler sums it up and it seems that he speaks the viewpoint of the film.
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THE AUSTRALIAN FILM AND TELEVISION SCHOOL

VIDEO COURSES – 1977

The Australian Film and Television School, through its Open Program, is now offering two different video training programs—Video One and Video Two. They are held regularly at the School’s premises at North Ryde.

VIDEO ONE

For: Education, Industrial training, Community Access etc. The emphasis is on the basic skills necessary to produce short informational/educational tapes.

Equipment: Mostly ¾ inch J-standard black & white.

Workshops:
3-day basic portapak & editing
3-day basic studio operations
3-day basic single camera video
3-day advanced editing
2-day general production
5-day introduction to colour

VIDEO TWO

For: Professional film production. These are conversion courses for the film industry, and are an introduction to the production possibilities of non-broadcast video, and to broadcast television.

Equipment: ¾ inch and 1 inch colour

Workshops:
2-day portapak & editing
3-day studio operations

NIGHT COURSES

Video One: Will commence in April
Video Two: Planned to commence in March – a 10-week course, 1 night per week.

Dates and fees on application to:
Program Management Supervisor
Open Program
The Australian Film & Television School
PO Box 126
North Ryde NSW 2113
Phone: 887 1666

ORIGINALLY BANNED!

The notorious American Underground Classic "PINK FLAMINGOS" has now been passed by the Australian Censorship Board for RESTRICTED EXHIBITION.

It's not "Mary Poppins" It's not "The Poseidon Adventure" It's not "Last Tango" IT IS DISGUSTING POOR TASTE.

RE-ISSUE OF ONE OF BRITAIN’S FINEST FILM ACHIEVEMENTS

"It's sickest movie ever made." — Interview
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THESE HIGHLY EXPLOITABLE MOVIES HAVE BROKEN ALL RECORDS IN ADELAIDE, CURRENTLY IN RELEASE IN MELBOURNE. For bookings, contact — Peter Lang or Andrew Shepherd at Roma Cinema,

"SEX OFFENSES THAT WOULD SHOCK THE MARQUIS DE SADE!"
—Rex Reed, N.Y. Daily News
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RAW DEAL

There is never any suggestion of a chance that the five outlaws will find an illegal revolution more tempting than the blood-money, or that the audience will place any sympathy with the thick Irish micks and their essentially non-political 'revolution!' All seven Tyrones fall from their horses with bloody patches suddenly torn in their shirts by the gunfire of Palmer (Gerard Kennedy) and Ben (Gus Mercurio) who, knowing nothing of each other, spontaneously take a joint stand against the Tyrones because they are too tired to be housed around any further.

The Government, economically represented by one Sir Charles (John Cousins) and Sir Frederick (Michael Carman), learns of their handiwork and decides to send them and a few friends against the 600-man Tyrone stronghold in the desert. ("But it will be six against six hundred! Don't worry, we're going to surround them.") They also decide to do away with all evidence of the operation afterwards, down to the last mercenary.

Meanwhile, Palmer selects his men. There is the expected assortment of types, and to eliminate any chance of confusion, the typing extends to costume and accent as well.

Palmer is never without his cowboy hat, sheepskin jacket (even while sweltering in the desert), and low-key, pragmatic 'north country' accent. Ben is a slightly dapper American salesman of presumably black market fire-arms, always recognizable in his bowler hat and pin-striped suit. Alex (Rod Mullinar), whose persona is apparently on loan from Tom Jones, has to be persuaded to join the expedition by having his current married woman turn dangerously into a widow, and therefore a threat, when he shoots her husband in a duel. His iconography is, apart from his boyishly ruffled hair and rowe moustache, a pink cravat and ruffled shirt.

Then there is Ned, saved from the gallows for the expedition in the inevitable jail-break scene. His type is the good-natured working-class man of few words. His cell-mate at the time of the break-out is Dick (Christopher Pate), so, thankfully, we have the requisite Kid, this one in a sort of Dickensian outfit plus top-hat. Perhaps he is meant to vaguely remind us of Oliver Twist and London music-hall comedy, in spite of his mainly American accent.

Dick, of course, must win his place among the men in a bout of drinking, whoring and smiling winningly. And that is topped off by his mainly American accent.

Finally they reach the Tyrone stronghold, complete with black plumage. He really proves his worth when it is discovered that they have to return to the scene of the jail-breakout to steal the dynamite they need, because he has been an inmate there so frequently that he knows where all the keys are kept, etc.

There is this one small nicety in Pat Edgworth's scripting: the first visit to the stockade to release Ned was composed of what seemed to be almost separate small vignettes - a homosocial officer eying his men one by one in inspection, the testing of the gallows and so on — brought together with the details of the break-out under one continuous jaunty piece of music.

In the second visit, the information contained in each vignette becomes 'functional' in the plan for the theft. And not just 'functional': the gallows testing device is used and reused in increasingly inventive ways to eliminate police opposition to the raid, until it begins to seem like a deus ex machina in the gods' plan for the heroes.

It's not a startling piece of invention; nor even a piece of invention at all. But it's a nicely accomplished and appropriate construction, very much in step at this point with the timing, economy and spirit of the theft itself.

Unfortunately, that's about the last nice thing I can say. From here the story is routine. They push forward into the Tyrone's desert by night, and by day they keep the explosives cool by burying them in their coffins during the heat of the desert.

The heat is enough to produce mirages, but not enough to make anyone take off a sheepskin jacket or pin-striped suit. That is, it's not enough to make a man cast off his type. Then the mirages materialize into seven Tyrones, and the bullet-proof heroes are forced to repeat the earlier scene of gunning them from their horses.

Finally they reach the Tyrone stronghold, which turns out to be for the audience) disappointingly small and undefended looking. The climactic scene, if anyone had been looking forward to it, begins to waver and evaporate like a mirage at this point. Ned gets caught and is tortured, and since he naturally remains strong and silent, he is to be submitted to the ultimate torture — the desert sun when it rises next morning. We never find out what interesting property of the desert sun will be able to make him talk, while being useless against Palmer's sheepskin jacket, because the attack is launched before dawn, and by sunrise, no Tyrone survives.

Finally, there is the trap. Palmer and his men ride right into it when they go to force the second half of their blood-money from Sir Charles. When they crash the upper-class dance party, armed and dirty, to negotiate with Sir Charles, Sir Frederick surrounds the house with troopers. Alex, Ned and Dick are mown down, but when Palmer and Ben come on the scene, they repeat their side-by-side stand of the opening sequence, and in turn mow down the troopers plus the two ruling-class villains. Dick revives from what proves to be a mere flesh-wound on the forehead, and the final gag-line is that Palmer thinks he may join Ben in his planned retirement to a quiet little Arizona town he has heard of, called Tombstone.

Retelling the plot like this may seem a fairly drastic measure and a threat to the readability of this review, but the failure of the film is very much the failure of the story to contain anything worth thinking about.

But the opening title of the film, "Australia has never known revolution... Perhaps this is why...", seems to me rather sadly ironic, but in terms of the film itself, rather than the details of the story. Where are the revolutionary works of film or literature in Australia? Where are the works that contain a revolutionary idea? The fact of a film like Raw Deal in Australia, in 1977, may go quite a way towards explaining why Australia has never known revolution and is in no present danger of finding out.
**SUMMER OF SECRETS**

By Sandra Hall

With *Summer of Secrets*, Jim Sharman has composed an essay on memory — its illusions, distortions and disappointments. He has made an ambitious film which fails because the ideas run out and the plotting is not strong enough to make up for that.

It's a film which hints at more than it ever delivers, and is one more example of the fact that while the industry is rich in fine technicians, minds skilled at putting stories together are as rare as unicorns.

The script contains preoccupations familiar from other Sharman productions for both screen and stage — nostalgia, science fiction, the atmosphere of the old Hollywood B-pictures. They are all here, crying out to be shaped into something stylish, mysterious and enjoyably frightening, but the synthesis never takes place because the script has no momentum and makes no attempt to get inside its characters.

Having set them up as the sort of stereotypes who have been loved and hated in a thousand genre pictures, it fails to animate them to any purpose. They run about a lot, but they don't really get anywhere.

The film was shot at Wattamola, not far from Sydney, yet made to look, by Russell Boyd's photography, as remote and romantic as Fraser Island (one of the expert touches that helps to make the lapses so irritating).

A boy and a girl have arrived by boat at a beach house where the boy spent family holidays as a child. The house is rather like an on-shore Marie Celeste, with everything dusty but untouched — from the beds to the family photograph albums and the dress that some relative wore to the local dances. But this bit of eccentricity is accepted without either comment or explanation and adds up to nothing more than an opportunity for Kym (Nell Campbell) to camp it up in fancy dress.

The real mystery is along the beach in a house occupied by a doctor (Arthur Dignam) and his assistant, Bob (Rufus Collins), who are doing unspecified things with complicated machines and laboratory animals. There is a lot of talk about memory and the brain, and the doctor keeps taking time off to put on a white tuxedo and sit and watch old films of Rachel (Kate Fitzpatrick) doing Apache dances in a South American nightclub.

His black assistant fiercely disapproves this custom, but operates the projector anyway, and also spies on their young neighbors. Kym, in fact, is kidnapped by him and is being re-decorated by the doctor to look more like Rachel, when the boy (Andrew Sharp) comes to her rescue.

The doctor confides in them about his past, about his unquenchable love for Rachel, and his hopes about restoring her to life. Then when the scene is set for her reawakening, it is evident that a great deal of time and trouble has gone into the art direction, but that the playing has been left to fend for itself, along with any subtleties of plot.

Rufus Collins brings a lot of verve to his part, but Arthur Dignam, in danger of being type-cast in lugubrious roles like this, wanders gloomily about in need of direction.

Andrew Sharp is inept and Nell Campbell, after the early scenes are done, is never encouraged to look anything but sullen. Kate Fitzpatrick is interesting as the glamorous Rachel, but not much more than that. There is no need for her to be.

The film has been put together on the sketchiest conception of what its characters are like — something that might not have mattered had Sharman's theme been more complex.

But he is saying only that memory distorts, that it can be cruel and that one ought not to trust it too much. He has dressed up the notion with some visually appealing touches, but has failed to make it work as drama.

We are treated to seemingly endless scenes of Dignam and the films — scenes so unnecessary that I suspect they are there only because Sharman liked the tattily authentic way they turned out.

*Summer of Secrets* is a film which betrays again and again a love of illustration — a tendency to do things because they looked good, whether or not they meant anything.

---


---
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I do not favor the subsidy method proposed by the Tariff Board under which 50 per cent of the AFC’s contribution need not be refunded and, therefore, becomes a subsidy. This subsidy would be restricted to those producers fortunate enough to get AFC funds. Any subsidy contingent on AFC involvement must be a selective subsidy. The same objection must apply to any variation in AFC investment funds which have a similar effect. Of the films produced in Britain over the past few years, less than 5 per cent had funds from the National Film Finance Corporation. All other finance came from private sources.

British films are subsidized by the British Film Fund (Eady Money) and it must follow that partly as a result of being provided with an additional 50 per cent of repatriated funds, virtually all Australian feature films are subsidized by the Australian Film Commission (AFC). Money (and it must follow that partly as a result of being provided with an additional 50 per cent of repatriated funds, virtually all Australian feature films are subsidized by the Australian Film Commission (AFC).

For example, while inexperienced have different emphasis each time, they had seen. It was very interesting, because by looking at their experience in the cutting room, and how does it affect the cutting of each of these films? The evidence supporting the rate for Sections 137 and 138 must surely have changed, after all television came to the U.S. in the 1948, and the structure of the American film industry was changed that same year by U.S. anti-trust legislation. There is the only practical and reasonable solution to the financial difficulties of our feature film industry.

John Scott
Continued from P. 340

I wish I knew the answer. I have always thought that the first impression of the rushes is the truest. You have to develop a certain attitude to the material and know what’s good and bad, what works and doesn’t work. I think you carry that right through, it’s always that original impression that you have to keep remembering.

Do you find that actors are aware of the problems associated with cutting together a performance?

Sometimes, Dennis Hopper was an interesting example. As an actor, he offered a lot of editing alternatives. You could see it in the rushes. For example, in a single reaction shot he would often give two or three reactions with a different emphasis each time, knowing the editor could use any one of the three. I think he is aware of how a film is put together.

Do inexperienced actors often present cutting problems?

I don’t think so. I think the actors who appeared in Pure S, for example, while inexperienced have a very believable look about them. A lot of the acting was very careful about the film and how it was going to be made. They talked about it all the time and although I wasn’t there when the film was being shot, I certainly got that feeling from working with Bert Deling during the editing.

What about the mixture of ‘character’ actors on “McCarthy”?

A number of them brought their own particular acting style and sense of timing to the film.

I can remember a lot of scenes in McCarthy which are very different performances of some of the actors. For example, the scene with Max Gillies was cut very much around his performance. It could have been cut more towards the other people. The scenes with Arthur Porritt and Barry Humphries were also cut around their performances. And on McKenzie, both Crocker’s and Humphries’ performances were also cut very much for their particular acting styles.

To what extent did you discuss the cutting of each of these films beforehand with the directors?

Bruce Beresford talked to me during pre-production about how he wanted the film to be cut. So did David Baker. We went over the script of The Great McCarthy in great detail. Philippe Mora also talked about how he wanted Mad Dog to be cut and how he saw the editing, right from the pre-production stage.

What do you discuss at that stage and how does it affect the shooting?

At that stage, I get to know the director and learn how he wants to cut his film — what sort of editing style he is looking for. Quite often the editor will also have suggestions for ways to cover certain scenes — particularly action scenes.

Have the directors you worked with ever involved themselves in the actual cutting of a film?

Bruce Beresford is a highly experienced film editor and on McCarthy he did preliminary cuts on some scenes while I worked on others. It is a situation I always encourage with a director.

David Baker’s production background had been television and he didn’t think he had been involved in a lot of detailed work in the cutting room, so working with him was different.

Philippe Mora did have a lot of experience in the cutting room, and began preliminary cuts on some scenes while I was cutting others.

If you have ever worked on a film where someone other than the director has seen the cut and entered into the decision-making process, you could see how certain scenes were working.

The Adventures of Barry McKenzie was also shown several times before it was completed to get an audience reaction. That did influence the cutting.

Do you think it’s a good idea?

Yes, I think it’s good idea if it’s a small audience. And it’s a good idea if you can talk to them individually after the screening. I have found whenever I’ve looked at a rough-cut or even a fine-cut with a small audience, it always makes me look at the film differently. I am aware that there are other people around me and I start to think well, what are they thinking? I try to see the film in the way they see it, instead of just looking at what I am interested in.

Do composers usually involve themselves during the cutting of a film?

The Great McCarthy was composed by Bruce Smeaton. Bruce came into the cutting room and looked at the first assembly of the whole film. He was very involved in watching the progress and, therefore, came to understand it and experimented with the music early on. He wrote many different things and would try them out in the cutting room against the image. He experimented all the time, finding out which way the music should go.

That was a very interesting experience for me, and now I think it’s very necessary to do that. Bruce also arranged different guide-tracks — piano pieces for example — that he could fully orchestrate later on. It was also interesting to see the different results and the effect that different kinds of music had against a scene. It can make a big difference.

On Mad Dog, Patrick Flynn was also involved while the film was being cut. He saw rough-cuts and composed pieces as we went along.

Experimenting with music during the cutting of the film is a fascinating area, but one which Australians haven’t really entered into yet.

John Scott
Filmography
1966-67 Children Thinking (Director: Edward Goldwyn)
1971 Loving Memory (Director: Tony Scott)
1975 Squeakers Mate (Director: David Baker)
1979 Boys and Men (Director: Ross Devonish)
1975 Barry McKenzie Holds His Own (Director: Bruce Beresford)
1975 The Great McCarthy (Director: David Baker)
1975 Pure Shit (Director: Bert Deling)
1976 Mad Dog (Director: Philippe Mora)
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Creators of Life: A History of Animation

by Donald Heraldson

DRAKE 1975

Recommended price: $19.95

J. H. Reid

"Creators of Life", although claiming to be a complete history of film animation, really provides a brief history of film animation in the U.S.: a section on the actual mechanics of producing animated life in the biggest and most famous professional studios (chiefly Disney's) of the U.S.; chapters on John Bray, Paul Terry, Max Fleischer, Walt Disney, and cartoonist Richard Williams; an appendix on making your own animated film, Academy Awards for animated films; and a small bibliography. There is no index — a baffling omission in a book that the publisher claims to be a "complete history".

The book has been cheaply produced. It is obvious that the author labored under the misapprehension that many of the illustrations were to be printed in color. The fact that they are in a murky black-and-white makes some of his captions meaningless and ridiculous.

All in all, it is difficult to recommend this book over others in the field. The many books on Disney, particularly "The Art of Walt Disney" by Christopher Finch and "Disney's Films" by Leonard Maltin, and the new books by Joe Adamson, and Max Fleischer, by Leslie Cabarga, leave "Creators of Life" for dead so far as history and anecdote are concerned.

A big book like "The Great Movie Cartoon Parade", with its generous format and dazzling splashes of color, is so much more expensive that it should be a bribe sent to anyone who wants to know very little about it she... actually left (her) living-room and went out and talked to a few of the people involved in it". The result is Supertoy (Sun Book, MacMillan, 1975). This is the book that every 'living-room' student of television was going to write one day but never did. Subtitled "20 Years of Australian Television", it ranges across most aspects of the industry, alternating easily between past and present, always keeping them in perspective.

It's not a glossy glance at the toy's synthetic facade, but a careful exploration of the machinations behind the tube. It links the chapter by chapter, focusing on the way the "thing" hasn't been done before. It isn't petty or bitchy or one-sided, it isn't arrogant or patronizing, and it's highly entertaining. It should be standard fare for anyone interested in Australian television and will, for some time to come, provide the starting point for future work whether at the school or Ph.D. level.

The book is divided into three main sections: The Supertoy (5 chapters), Programmes (5 chapters), The Politics of Change (2 chapters) — a division which tends to belittle the author's skill at keeping all three things well focused, or at least in the picture, all of the time.

The chapter on the ABC ('The House of Compromise') is an example of integrating the elements of personalities, program finances and governments into a plausible critique. Rather than a catalogue of facts, figures and instances, the chapter presents an overview of the relationship that exists between government policy, especially financial arrangements, the internal balance of power, and the programs made by the ABC.

It is suggested that the lack of money under Liberal governments had led to such short-termism that the ABC was led to believe that staff morale was low and operations reduced to snail's pace. Changes in the general climate after 1972, and especially in finance and in the membership of the ABC, meant that the "philosophic aims of the commission were aligned with those of its more conservative program makers as they had never been before, so the enemy was no longer conservatism but bureaucracy." The fresh breezes that blew new vigor and new programs through the ABC brought a new spirit of self-awareness and self-criticism for which it was to pay dearly when the Liberal Party returned to power. The "burst of self-analysis... served simply to render it vulnerable... and the fact that it was examining its own shortcomings was unfailingly turned against it in the climate of conservatism that brought the Fraser government to power."

The changes in broadcasting in the few months since the book was completed often present ironies. In 1974 Ken Watts, hardheaded, outspoken senior ABC executive, was at the wheel of the ABC. In 1975, John Bray is at the head of the ABC, the "interviewing" of the Third Programme's offshoot, the 'Open Forum', the success of " поньи Jack... theAustralian audience... something that the ABC (and the Labor government) badly wanted. Two years later, with Ken Watts still at the wheel of the ABC, the change was merely to give its masters in Canberra a little less tolerance to work with."

About seven pages — a lot in a book of only 190 pages — are devoted to Number 96 and what are seen as related matters. Mercifully, none of them is concerned with establishing the significance of the program, coming at a time when parochial television was finding a vogue in Australia, with new, "double-edged" influence on television drama. First, local writers were given a boost by Number 96 and the beyv of the ABC. Second, the newly-found confidence of the commercial channels in "inter-personal" drama at peak time. Number 96 had itself used (consumed?) 75 writers in its first two years.

There is room for some argument about the quality of the boost gained by writers working on a treadmill. There is also room for more argument and more supporting evidence for the second proposition that Number 96 indirectly led to the demise of the three Crawford police dramas. This thesis, broadly, is this: Number 96 gave many writers their first opportunity to "deal with the suspense of character rather than action."

This style was transferred to the action-based cop shows and received internal acclaim as evidenced by a Dingwall script for Division 4 winning an Angie award. The loyal cop-show audience, however, was firmly attached to other characters; it became alienated and changed loyalties.

The only evidence for this really are the opinions of someone who was script editor for the ABC executive Crawford at the time and a channel executive. In the end it's not really clear whether the writer thinks it was the adventurous scripts trying to break out of the old strait-jacket formats or the tired formats themselves that brought the police shows down.

It would be interesting to know how the failure of Bluey (son of Homicide) could be fitted to this thesis. It might also be interesting to research it fully just to see how well executive assessment fits with reality.

There is only one substantial reason for not buying this book: it is about the worst quality publication imaginable, printed on cheap paper, not well bound and with frequent printing errors. And at $7.95 it is not cheap for a paperback.
creatures to be beautified and placed on pedestals. Men are there to support the pedestals and provide the action.

In "Hollywood Costume Design", Chierichetti gives an alphabetical listing of the major designers and their films. Comparing the filmographies of the two books, however, one finds many discrepancies; Leese credits certain films to designers which Chierichetti omits, and vice-versa.

Although neither author has compiled a definitive work, both books, in their own way offer an excellent point of departure for further study on this neglected subject.

BOOKS OF THE QUARTER

Animation
"Creator of Life", a History of Animation by Donald Heraldson. New York, 1975. $19.95
"Visual Scripting" by John Halas. London, 1976. $29.95

Annuals
"International Film Guide" edited by Peter Cowie. London, 1976. $7.95
"Screen World" edited by John Willis. New York, 1976. $10.95

Directors
"Color" by Carlos Clarens. London, 1976. $8.95
"Directing the Film: Film Directors on Their Art" by Eric Sherman. Boston, 1976. $19.95
"Film Directors Guide: Western Europe" by James Robert Parish. Metuchen, 1976. $16.50
"The John Ford Movie Mystery" by Andrew Sarris. London, 1976. $9.95
"Hollywood Directors" by Richard Koszarski. New York, 1976. $5.95
"The Mexican Dilemma: Interviews with 13 Directors" by Beatriz Reyes Nevares. Albuquerque, 1976. $9.95
"Ken Russell" by Thomas R. Atkins. New York, 1976. $4.95
"King Vidor" by John Baxter. New York, 1976. $4.95
"Frederick Wiseman" by Thomas R. Atkins. New York, 1976. $4.95

Women
"Women in Television" by Anita Klever. Philadelphia, 1976. $10.95
"Women in Television News" by Judith S. Gelfman. New York, 1976. $15.95

History
"Great Movie Spectaculars" by Edward Edelson. New York, 1976. $7.95
"Light and Shadows: A History of Motion Pictures" by Thomas C. Bohn and Richard Stronggren. Port Washington, 1975. $19.95
"A Short History of the Movies" by Gerald Mast. Indianapolis, 1976. $11.95
"The Talking Clowns from Laurel and Hardy to the Marx Brothers" by Frank Manchel. New York, 1976. $10.95
"The Westerns: A Picture Quiz Book" by John Czechi. New York, 1976. $4.95
"Who Was That Masked Man? The Story of the Lone Ranger" by David Rothel. New York, 1976. $21.95

Costume Design
"Cecil Beaton: Stage and Film Designs" by Charles Spencer. London, 1975. $25.95
"Costume Design in the Movies" by Elizabeth Leese. Bembridge, 1976. $21.95
"Hollywood Costume Design" by David Chierichetti.

Theory
"Cinema and Society" by Paul Monaco. New York, 1976. $17.95
"The Devil Finds Work" by James Baldwin. New York, 1976. $9.95
"The Major Film Theories" by J. Dudley Andrew. New York, 1976. $5.45
"Understanding the Film" by Ron Johnson & Jan Bone. Skokie, 1976. $9.95
" Videology and Utopia: Explorations in a New Medium" by Alfred Wollner, Guy Milliard and Alex Gant. London, 1976. $14.95
"The World in a Frame: What We See in Films" by Leo Braudy. Garden City, 1976. $10.95
"America in the Movies" by Michael Wood. New York, 1976. $4.95
"There must be a Lone Ranger" by Jenni Calder. London, 1976. $3.05

Actors and Actresses
"Character People" by Ken D. Jones, Arthur F. McClure. Cranbury, 1976. $19.95
"James Dean" by John Howlett. London, 1976. $9.95
"The Secret Word is Groucho" by Groucho Marx. New York, 1976. $19.95
"Rita Hayworth" by Gerald Peary. New York, 1976. $3.95
"William Holden" by Will Holtzman. New York, 1976. $3.95
"Carole Lombard" by Leonard Maltin. New York, 1976. $3.95
"Larry: The Life of Carole Lombard" by Larry Swindell. New York, 1975. $12.95
"Lucy: The Man Behind the Cape" by Robert Cremer. Chicago, 1976. $14.95
"The Films of Norma Shearer" by Jack Jacobs & Myron Braum. New York, 1976. $3.95
"The Films of Lana Turner" by Lou Valentinano. Secaucus, 1976. $19.95
"Third Time Lucky" by Yolande Donlan. New York, 1976. $10.95

miscellaneous
"Down the Yellow Brick Road. The Making of The Wizard Of Oz" by Doug Mcclendon. New York, 1977. $7.95
"Encyclopedia of Mystery and Detection" by Chris Steadbrunner & Otto Penzler. London, 1976. $25.95
"The Films of the Fifty's" by Douglas Brode. Secaucus, 1976. $21.00
"The Girl in the Haary Paw: King Kong at Myrk, Movie and Monster" by Ronald Greenspan and Harry Goldblatt. New York, 1976. $9.95
"Horror Films" by R. H. W. Dillard. New York, 1976. $4.95
"Into Film" by Laurence Goldstein and Jay Kaufman. New York, 1976. $15.50
"Stop the Presses! The Newspaperman in American Films" by Alex Barris. New York, 1976. $24.95
"Science Fiction Film" by Thomas R. Atkins. New York, 1976. $4.95
"Soundtrack: The Music of the Movies" by Mark Evans. New York, 1975. $9.95

STATE THEATRE
May 29~June 13 1977

- Over 40 sessions of the most important new features and shorts from around the world.
- Salute to German Cinema — Wednesday, June 8: 5.30 p.m. Chinese Roulette, a film by Rainer Werner Fassbinder;
- 7.30 p.m. The Coup de Grace, by Volker Schlondorff;
- 9.30 p.m. The Wild Duck, by Hans W. Geissendorfer.
- Evening of New Canadian Cinema — Wednesday, June 1: 5.30 p.m. The Supreme Kid, by Peter Bryant;
- 7.30 p.m. Hot Water, Cold Water, by Andre Forcier;
- 9.30 p.m. Partners, by Don Owen.
- Greater Union Award for Australian Short Films. Finalists screened publicly May 29.
- Film Forum 1977 — Every week day between 2-5 p.m. An opportunity for Australian Film people to meet and talk to overseas guests and each other. No admission charge.
- Ron West plays the mighty Wurlitzer between sessions.
- Open Night, May 29, 7.30 p.m. An evening of animation in the cinema, including Bruno Bozetto’s feature Allegro Non Troppo, and many clips of favorite cartoon characters from Felix to Fritz.

Enquiries: Sydney Film Festival
Box 4934, G. 0. P. Sydney, NSW 2001.
Telephone (02) 660 3909
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Well, I suppose you might say that. There is a sense in which I am trying to record the present in a way which reveals the ambivalence, doing now what historians would usually do later on.

And you think irony is the method for doing this . . .

Irony is an excellent weapon for slicing paradoxes apart, and it's entertaining too. Human ambivalence is a paradox — it's about something being different from the way it seems, about two apparently contradictory things being contained in the one idea, in the one person.

The essential film technique for bringing over the irony is juxtaposition. Placing the contradictions immediately side by side, so they become more obvious than in everyday life. You are thus heightening the audience's perception.

There were people on both sides of the argument who liked 'Dig a Million Make a Million' . . .

Yes. That demonstrates what I have been saying. I was surprised when the mining companies concerned said they liked the film — they bought prints. Yet left-wing opponents of the companies also liked the film — saw it as a blow against overseas investment and so on. So there you are . . . society is ambivalent, man is ambivalent, audiences are ambivalent.

Rather like the sequence in Petersen that showed police brutality. Tim Burstall was worried that it would be banned. Within a few weeks the police had ordered prints of that sequence to be hauled off to hand the drunks.

Well, in many of my films I have come at things obliquely, so people can opt for their own reaction. The main exception is Beyond the Black Stump, where I just let my hair down. That film is explicit. There is only one kind of reaction possible. You like the film if you agree with its strong line. You don't like it if you don't.

Did that create problems for you at the BBC?

On the contrary, they loved it. Although there was an astonishing debate in the House of Lords where an Australian-born peer called me "the long-haired layabout from King's Cross". But the British liked it, probably for the wrong reasons in that it confirmed their worst suspicions about Australia.

Some people also found it illuminating. It explained a lot about the Australian sense of failure and defeat and the perennial chip on the shoulder, which a lot of the British said they hadn't understood until that time.

What about the Russell Braddon film "Epitaph to a Friendship"? Didn't that achieve the effect of getting both sides upset at the same time?

It was an attempt to get rid of something inside me. The Braddon film was a kind of crisis point. I really had to decide whether I'd become an Englishman, or whether I'd turn into one of those classic Australian expatriates in Britain, or whether I would just be an Australian who happened to be living for a while in Britain. There was also this 'new nationalism' thing under Gough Whitlam and things going on.

In Russell Braddon, who had been living in Britain since 1949, I saw one kind of person I could become: the professional expatriate. For me personally the film was a kind of burying of that British-Australian ambivalence. It's set in a graveyard and ends in a graveyard. It was also very different in that someone else had to hold the centre stage. The whole notion of that sequence is that you take someone and let them do their own thing. And I also felt I had to be very honest with Russ.

What about the Anzac Day ceremonies. Whose concept was that?

Russ is not a visual man. We got very close together and he told me that he had no visual ideas whatsoever, but he had some strong verbal ideas. We talked for a couple of days and I worked up a list of possible things we could film.

The great virtue of working with Braddon was that as a professional writer he could see what I was doing with him, and to him. Finally the film, I think, reveals what some have called a mild paranoia.

In a documentary, the director has a special responsibility to his actors, because they are real people. I don't mean you should be timid, but you need to be sure that the way you are presenting them is the way you really think they are.

There was one film where the editing was delayed for two months and I sat there with material which virtually gave me the power to destroy the career of a man. I had to decide what to do. I don't say you go soft. But the decision you make has to be one that you can defend in terms of all you know about the person. Otherwise I think you abuse the privilege of getting a real person on film or tape.

How do you make those sort of decisions? What sort of standards do you apply?

Good press criticism helps a lot. It creates in the filmmaker's mind the sense that there is a challenge out there and he isn't going just to walk away with it because he is clever or smart. There are very few good critics in Australia; good critics who really take time and trouble to analyse a film and argue logically towards their conclusions. What we have here too often are people who just take a salary for saying whether they like a film or not. They give their piece some punch, only by camouflaging it in racy words.

What were the pressures working for the BBC?

You inevitably make big compromises working for organizations like the BBC, but you also benefit. You have terrific resources and generally a lot of cerebral back-up. But it's inevitable that you are influenced by the anxieties and fears and policies of the organization even before you start the film. So you can find yourself in a self-censorship situation. That happens in any institution.

Did you find that the BBC had a tendency to 'eat' people up?

That's probably an exaggeration. The 1960s was a great period for the individualist, but that had passed by the time I got there. People like Peter Watkins, Ken Russell, Tony Palmer — they had all had their fights and then left. Since then the BBC has become a much tighter ship — economically. There is now more emphasis on good production managing, there is less room for wayward auteurs. You play the auteur at a certain risk.

Why did you leave the BBC?

At the beginning of 1975 I had a choice. I had a creative fellowship from the Australian Arts Council. I had this desire to get off the institutional "treadmill" — I had never made a film independently. I had always been on staff or on contract to an organization.

I also suspected, knowing Australia, that the sort of film work which was then building up might not last long. I really felt I would like to have a go at catching it and becoming part of it.

Has your BBC experience helped the Australians?

Well, I have been setting it up for a year, on and off. The Australian Film Commission gave us pre-production assistance. We had backing from the Australian government, but we still needed to find 50 per cent of the budget. We finally got the balance from French television and the BBC. There is an interesting aspect to the deal. We are making the film in three languages at once: English, French and Welsh.

I find it interesting that a lot of your films have something to do with skeletons. "The Talgarl Skull" was the first . . .

Well, you can go out into the desert and look at the fireplaces on the ground where people actually sat 20,000 years ago. The landscape around is virtually unchanged. I can't escape the feeling that gives me a constant tension. I want to do something with this. It's the exact opposite of our recent European Australia.

What gets me is the contrast. You are out there, looking at things thousands of years old, the real history of the continent. And out there with you is a station overseer who has been on his job maybe five years, and professors and geologists, and you can't escape feeling how ephemeral, how superficial the European presence is, compared with, say, a 30,000-year-old skeleton extruding from the sand. The Europeans seem irrelevant to the landscape.

"Black Stump" was criticised in Britain because of its lack of attention to the Aboriginal people . . .

Aboriginals only appear for a few minutes in the film — in re-enactment for the Queen at the Bicentennial. I had never made a film about the Tasmanians. That film is important. Aboriginals only appear for a few minutes in the film because the nineteenth century myth of what white Australians did in settling this country involved no recognition of Aboriginals except as a charade.

Women were the same — they were ignored in the myth. There was one four second shot of a woman in Black Stump — four seconds in 55 minutes. That was about the place accorded her in the traditional canon of the Australian character.

Are you trying to answer your critics in the next film on the Tasmanian Aboriginals?

I was stirred by Clive James in The Listener who suggested that in Black Stump we should have had a shot of Tasmania from a helicopter and a voice reading out the names of all the dead Aboriginal people. I think the story is so big and mind-bending that it deserves a whole film.
OBITUARY: BOB EVANS

Sydney filmmaker Bob Evans, the founder of the Australian surf film industry, died in Florida last October. He was 48.

Bob, who produced, directed and filmed some 14 surfing features, was a surfer in mind and spirit — a pioneer of the modern Australian surfboard riding scene. In 1956, a team of American surfers time to Australia. They brought novel, shorter surfboards with fins. Bob bought one of the boards, rode it at Manly Point on a 3.5 metre (12 ft.) day, and decided it was the board of the future.

A few years later Bob teamed up with American surfer Bud Browne who had filmed the surf action in Hawaii. They screened Bud's Hawaiian Surf and Big Surf to an audience of 600 people at the Queenscliffe surf club. The audience was 'stoked' for the first time and with it a new type of film production and distribution began in Australia.

Bob bought a 16mm camera on hire purchase, and, buying one roll at a time, he began making Australia's first surfing feature, Surf Trek to Hawaii. The film was made on a shoestring budget, and Bob everything — production as well as distribution.

Bob turned out a film a year for 14 years. He promoted and exhibited his films, making just enough out of each one to live for a while, rake together a few sponsors and start on his next film. And of his 14 features the last, Drown, received any financial assistance — that was from the Australian Film Development Corporation.

He was a filmmaker in the most basic, yet total sense. He was reflecting the raw, energetic, action qualities of the man who made them. His films, Surf Trek to Hawaii, Surfing Highlights of Hawaii, The Young Wave Hunters, The Long Way Around, High on a Cool Wave, The Navigator, To Ride a White Horse, Family Free and Drown, made international surf stars out of Nat Young, Midget Farrelly and many others. Bob became their father figure taking them on adventures round the world, capturing the big days, the spectacular action qualities of the man who made them. His films.

Bob always had an audience with this sort of action. He not only gave them hot surf action, but brought to the screen raw talented kids who later became surf film stars. Behind the camera, talents like Albert Falzon got their first chance to shoot films. Bob attempted to have a film distributed in the conventional sense only once. To Ride a White Horse, in 1967, was a compilation of all his best surf action. Blown up to 35mm it went into cinemas with traditional distribution, but it was financially unsuccessful for the producer. Bob had learnt that a one-man show keeps all the box-office dollars.

Apart from his filmmaking, Bob started Australia’s first surfing magazine, Surfing World, and was responsible for bringing Tom Curren and Stomp to our shores. He was a man of fantastic independence, willing to share his knowledge. For many of us who wanted to get into filmmaking full-time he had the initial solution.

An articulate, colourful surfer and swimming magazine and his own words best summarize the spirit of the man who many of us admired.

"I like writing and I love making surf films. I like getting the public giving their opinion on something I have created. I am not out to get rich, but only to have fun. I think I've been involved in making an epic. I am too impatient. I think I will always make surf films that are as "now as possible.""
**MELBOURNE FILMMAKERS’ CO-OPERATIVE**

**Fundraising Crisis**

The Melbourne Filmakers’ Co-operative is at the crossroads. The co-op’s grant for 1976-77 from Film Australia Co-operative, which supports Australian film production, has been reduced from $50,000 to $30,000. This has presented a considerable challenge to the co-op, which was already facing financial difficulties due to the decline in film production and distribution in Australia.

The co-op has decided to hold a fundraising event to offset the loss of the reduced grant. The event will be held on May 15th at the Princes Hill High School. The co-op is seeking support from the local community to ensure its survival.

**Cinema Papers**

Film critic from *Cinema Papers* provides an insightful analysis of the current state of the Australian film industry. The critic notes the decline in film production and distribution and discusses the need for a more robust support system for filmmakers.

**The Melbourne Filmakers’ Co-operative**

The Melbourne Filmakers’ Co-operative is a community-based organization that screens Australian and international films to promote awareness of Australian cinema. The co-op faces significant challenges due to the financial constraints imposed by the reduced grant from Film Australia Co-operative.

**ASSOCIATION FOR A NATIONAL FILM AND TELEVISION ARCHIVE**

New Zealand has established a national film and television archive, the first of its kind in the country. The archive aims to preserve and promote the history of New Zealand cinema and television. The establishment of the archive is a significant milestone in New Zealand’s cultural heritage.

**Metro**

Metro has invested in a new 35mm film projection system to improve the quality of film screenings. This investment will enhance the viewing experience for patrons and contribute to the sustainability of the cinema.

**Metro Film Museum**

The Metro Film Museum has launched a new exhibition exploring the history of cinema in Australia. The exhibition features rare film prints and photographs, providing a glimpse into the development of Australian cinema.
The aim of the first of these meetings was to establish priorities and lines of communication between the departments who are either involved in film archival work or, like the TV networks, urgently require its upgrading to service their needs.

After this first meeting, a steering committee was formed to advise a new plan of action. From this point on, at least one of the prime movers behind the meetings, the National Film Library, hopes to see the establishment of a national film archive some time this year.

Three of these four government bodies appear to favor the immediate establishment of a national film archive, the National Film Library’s aim to retain the existing facility in Canberra.

Though the Australian Film Commission’s impending report on national film archives is expected to favor Sydney for the archive, the eventual headquarters, the Australian location debate could possibly be further complicated by Sydney vs Melbourne considerations.

The National Film Library’s disparate action in New Zealand since 1910, when producers and exhibitors began depositing film, including the American Pat O’Neill Atom Bomb footage at Bikini Atoll to explore the awesome energy of the atomic bomb, is now completing its report for the Federal Government.

These original Video One and Two courses were quickly followed by Video Three and Four. Video Three, a six-week daytime course in Sydney in October 1975, was a master class in television production and editing and preview facilities, expert advice on the preparation of budgets etc., local exhibition, print sales, widest distribution of independent films (including possible U.K. exhibition).

Video Four, covering the complete Circle of Kon Ichikawa’s Tokyo Olympiad — and the British naval drama — In Which We Serve, produced and directed by Carol Drinkwater, was the first of several courses of international significance.

Women’s Course

One of the highlights of the Open Program’s 1977 calendar is a course designed to provide the opportunity for the study and development of the craft of film and television journalism. The course, which began in March, covers film and video production of short one- to two-week films.

An awareness of the value of film archives existed in New Zealand since 1910, when producers and exhibitors began depositing film at the Dominion Museum. Since then no significant moves were made until the 1970s, when the National Film Library embarked on its occasional program of acquisition and cataloging.

Since the introduction of television, a relationship has existed between the National Archives and the Broadcasting Council on the preservation of television programs and the National Film Library has to have its own self-appointed preservation responsibility, which includes the copying and storage of random items (e.g., some of the Dominion Museum footage) for which nobody else has taken the initiative.

None of these bodies has been able to offer a regular archival viewing or supply facility. It is this lack, together with the overall lack of archival co-operation between the responsible organizations, that has resulted in calls for the setting up of a central authority.

In Australia, the active working party, co-ordinated by the Australian Film Commission, has now compiled a report for the National Film Library. This report and its outcome will be watched closely by those hoping for the establishment of a national film archive in New Zealand. Undoubtedly the New Zealanders’ rate of progress will be watched with equal scrutiny, perhaps even envy, from Australia.

AUSTRALIAN FILM AND TELEVISION SCHOOL

OPEN PROGRAM

Changes in the school’s video training program this year have resulted in more options being offered, including the possibility of night study and of more specialized training.

Video One began as a five-day daytime course in Sydney in October 1975. It covered basic principles, techniques of stock video equipment, including portapak, studio operations and editing. The course was soon running fortnightly and spread to other state capitals and regional centers.

A Video Two course evolved as a conversion course to video for film industry professionals and included more advanced techniques.

Those original Video One and Two courses are still being offered this year. There will also be shorter three-day, weekend and evening courses covering the different fields of portapak, studio operations and editing in separate courses. These more advanced options include portable U-Matic cassette color studio operations, advanced editing and general production.

The Open Program will continue in 1978 with 8mm and 16mm film, animation, computer editing, post-synchronization, production and lighting.

WOMEN’S COURSE

The more advanced options courses covering the different fields of the prime movers behind the meetings, the National Film Library, hopes to see the establishment of a national film archive some time this year.

There will also be a separate course in Sydney in October 1975. It covered film and video production of short one- to two-week films.

An awareness of the value of film archives existed in New Zealand since 1910, when producers and exhibitors began depositing film, including the American Pat O’Neill Atom Bomb footage at Bikini Atoll to explore the awesome energy of the atomic bomb, is now completing its report for the Federal Government.

These original Video One and Two courses were quickly followed by Video Three and Four. Video Three, a six-week daytime course in Sydney in October 1975, was a master class in television production and editing.

Women’s Course

One of the highlights of the Open Program’s 1977 calendar is a course designed to provide the opportunity for the study and development of the craft of film and television journalism. The course, which began in March, covers film and video production of short one- to two-week films.

America’s leading film schools and organizations preference for a self-determined national film archive in Sydney, and the National Library’s aim to retain the existing facility in Canberra.

Though the Australian Film Commission’s impending report on national film archives is expected to favor Sydney for the archive, the eventual headquarters, the Australian location debate could possibly be further complicated by Sydney vs Melbourne considerations.
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Women’s Course

One of the highlights of the Open Program’s 1977 calendar is a course designed to provide the opportunity for the study and development of the craft of film and television journalism. The course, which began in March, covers film and video production of short one- to two-week films.

An awareness of the value of film archives existed in New Zealand since 1910, when producers and exhibitors began depositing film, including the American Pat O’Neill Atom Bomb footage at Bikini Atoll to explore the awesome energy of the atomic bomb, is now completing its report for the Federal Government.

These original Video One and Two courses were quickly followed by Video Three and Four. Video Three, a six-week daytime course in Sydney in October 1975, was a master class in television production and editing.
New Zealand Report Continued from P. 355

Curt Eastwood’s The Enforcer took some people by surprise. Though not a great film, it opened to packed houses and set a new record at an Auckland City theatre. It is too early to discuss box office returns from Taxi Driver, Drivin’ and The Eagle Has Landed, but reports indicate they will be good.

The cinema boom comes at a time when increased revenue is being eroded by high overheads, but small independent theatre owners are happy.

Last year Kerridge-Odeon, with very little publicity, went out on a simultaneous release with Picnic At Hanging Rock. The film was received with interest and the returns were good, but not startling.

But many people who saw the film liked it and were talking about it. The reviews were good: one critic’s comment was “most favorable”, and another said: “Australian film comes of age.”

Self-Regulation Inquiry

Continued from P. 303

Self-regulation has been exalted by the commercial operators as a deterrent to government regulation. The first question to be asked is why is self-regulation by a private bureaucracy preferable to regulation by a government bureaucracy? There is no evidence whatsoever that in the critical areas discussed self-regulation would achieve better television.

The issues surrounding the controversial ‘family viewing’ period in the U.S. indicate some of the problems.

Richard Wiley, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, described his agency’s role in the decision on ‘family viewing’ — the time when violent and sexual content is restricted. He said that the decision had its roots in the Surgeon-General’s study in 1970-72 of television and violence, which supported the argument that television violence leads to aggressiveness in children.

Congress demanded FCC action on the issue and the agency asked the industry to consider self-regulatory action.

Wiley emphasized that the ‘family viewing’ reform was adopted voluntarily without any threat of government regulation. He cited this decision as evidence that research on the social effects of television can influence both government and industry.

Wiley paints a cosy picture, but the record shows that independent stations later negotiated their own deadlines for compliance with ‘family viewing’ through the office of the FCC chairman.

But quite apart from the manipulation of the code as an instrument of control is whether the code has really been a criticism of television.

If the architects of ‘family time’ had achieved their goals we could expect that attacks by citizens groups and the press, the seminars and speeches denouncing programs would have waned. In fact, demands for reform have escalated. The American Medical Association, the Parents Teachers’ Association of America and the National Citizens’ Committee for Broadcasting have embarked on national campaigns to curb television violence.

This is not an example of the effectiveness of self-regulation.

Janet Stickland, the third member of the tribunal, has been overseas on a fact-finding mission looking into self-regulation in Britain, New Zealand. There is valuable nitrate material slowly decomposing in an old steel and concrete army bunker because the Government does not consider the establishment of a film archive important. Besides there is no money available for preservation of these films by copying onto safety film.

Other films which were copied years ago and those left to the country by collectors are held somewhere at the National Film Library in Wellington. But the staff has no idea what they have. Recently, vital records associated with films were destroyed because the staff knew nothing about film transportation.

We can be thankful for the Federation of Film Societies who have now listed most archive material in the National Film Library. The federation, which has been talking about the setting up of a responsible body to look after archive material, will be joined in this by the Archives and Records Association of New Zealand, who in 1977, will be mounting a major operation for the preservation of films and television programs.

Self-regulation is no overall policy governing preservation; most of New Zealand’s heritage has disappeared and there are no safeguards to ensure that today’s films will survive.

Film Archives

Film Archives do not exist as such in New Zealand, U.S., Canada and Japan. Ms Strickland described herself as a political neutrality at the time of her appointment. Her timidity would be revealing. Does a political neutrality spend time visiting media activist groups and critics on such a fact-finding tour, or simply institutionalized regulatory agencies? I don’t know the answer, but it’s a very pertinent question and perhaps someone should ask her sometime.

While I believe that the implementation of self-regulation, as the Australian broadcasting industry understands it, would perpetuate worst aspects of the status quo, I do not restrict a referendum to the question of the effectiveness of the ABCB. It does not work if the licensing authority regulates the industry. These functions must be separated if audience interests are to be served.

Most of the recommendations in the Green Report are intended to set the board’s submission — are sound. The inquiry, in spite of the controversy which surrounded it, resulted in a document which is the best analysis of the system we have available. It is not a fait accompli.

Congress demanded self-regulation and the FCC action on the issue and the agency asked the industry to consider self-regulation.

Wiley emphasised that the ‘family viewing’ reform was adopted voluntarily without any threat of government regulation. He cited this decision as evidence that research on the social effects of television can influence both government and industry.

Wiley paints a cosy picture, but the record shows that independent stations later negotiated their own deadlines for compliance with ‘family viewing’ through the office of the FCC chairman.

But quite apart from the manipulation of the code as an instrument of control is whether the code has really been a criticism of television.

If the architects of ‘family time’ had achieved their goals we could expect that attacks by citizens groups and the press, the seminars and speeches denouncing programs would have waned. In fact, demands for reform have escalated. The American Medical Association, the Parents Teachers’ Association of America and the National Citizens’ Committee for Broadcasting have embarked on national campaigns to curb television violence. This is not an example of the effectiveness of self-regulation.

Janet Stickland, the third member of the tribunal, has been overseas on a fact-finding mission looking into self-regulation in Britain, Germany 1974), Picnic (Australia 1972), Xala (Senegal 1974), Des Foster, the director of the Federation of Australian Radio Broadcasters, has produced a Contract which could be entered into at the time of licensing.

On the basis of these hearings the renewal period. If the architects of ‘family viewing’ had achieved their goals there might be a plan to present one hour per day of material designed for children aged between 5 and 10, that this material will cost $5 per hour and that it will be promoted in a particular way.

The architects of self-regulation would be adequately circulated to interested groups and individuals, and hearings would be held to consider the adequacy of the planned contract. On the basis of these hearings the renewal authority could have direct say over the contract and perhaps modifications be made in the Performance Contract. Renewal of the licence would be under the broadcasting to fulfil the Performance Contract. Subsequent licence renewal would be contingent on the adequate performance of the previous contract and adequate presentation of a Performance Contract for the next licensing period. This is one view and I am sure other submissions will put forward useful ideas.

The bright glare of public scrutiny will bear down on the members of the tribunal during the next three months. As a result of the Government’s extraordinary and blatantly partisan behavior, the tribunal has very little credibility at the present time.

In Network, Howard Beale said to his listeners:

“We deal in illusion, man! None of it’s true! But you pretend to sit there — all day after day, night after night, all ages, colors, creeds. We are all you know. You are beginning to believe this illusion we are spinning here. You are beginning to think the tube is reality and your own lives are unreal. You do whatever the tube tells you. You dress like the tube, you eat like the tube, you raise your children like the tube. This is mass madness, you maniacs! In God’s name, you people are the real thing! We are the illusion! So turn that goddamn set! Turn it off right now. Turn it off and leave it off.”

That remains an option but not a useful or desirable one. The object is to improve television.

The Senate Committee transcript reports Mr Gygling as saying:

“I am a salesman primarily and a marketer, and if I cannot make myself and my things positively then I cannot do anything.”

Given the problems affecting the Australian television industry, Mr Gygling will have to do a lot of convincing if he is to try and sell to the Australian public the brand of self-regulation the industry is seeking.

Meanwhile I wonder which station will buy the television rights to Network when it becomes available.
How are you treating it?

As a story of the search to rediscover the Aboriginal. It will cover the genocide, but also try to take us further. It will be about the present, not just the past; about the people and the culture, not just the history. The main theme is the confrontation between the colonizers and the colonized, and the way in which the colonizers have tried to deny the existence of the colonized.

The film is something that has been made deliberately. The stories we tell about the past are not just stories of the past. They are stories of the present. They are stories of the way we want to see the world. The film is about something that is going on now.

What role does a documentary play in this respect?

To show it, film it, push it right in the faces of people and make them uncomfortable if necessary. Not as whimsy — as one television documentary series has been doing — but to go to at least a dozen places around Australia and say: “In there are three hundred and sixty thousand massacred Aboriginals ... if you dig around you will find the bones.”

That’s one way, the other is to unearth our European story, not missing out the bootlicking, godfearing, monarch-worshipping, status-seeking response to being told. To show it, film it, push it right in the faces of people and make them uncomfortable if necessary.

That’s also an exercise in perception. That’s also an exercise in memory. That’s also an exercise in understanding. That’s also an exercise in looking at ourselves in the mirror.

Who do you see as your major influences?

Well that’s two questions really. In terms of filmmakers the influences are really traditional. Renoir is the greatest filmmaker that I have ever experienced; Pontecorvo — Rossi — I think The Context is a staggering film; Cassavetes, for his love of people and his commitment to an absolutely free will of the actor and the emotional and total disinterest in the technical part; and Altman because he doesn’t give a fuck — he is going to do it absolutely personally, and he will do it as long as he can, and then he will walk away.

Most of my thinking inputs are also traditional. I am a child of my time, and tend to be polarized. You have these ley rationalists, like Burroughs, who I really attracted to, and Baba Ram Das has been an amazingly strong influence on me.

But the greatest influence on my life and who I am and the way I think, and has stopped me seeing myself as someone who not only thinks, but also as someone who feels and cares, and who can talk about his emotions and feel them and be unashamed of them, is the woman that I live with. She is the person who has turned me from being a compulsive, rational, achieving, cold, alienated male, like most men, into someone who is trying not to be that — which is the major chore in my life. Filmmaking is second.

Do you think it was deliberate?

What has been deliberate in this country is the effort to forget our own history. It hasn’t just been forgotten. It has been deliberately hidden from people. You can go to several sites in Tasmania where the Aboriginals were taken and where in place after place, they died. The buildings have been destroyed, levelled, ploughed over.

To rediscover these concentration camps of our recent past you have to go in for painstaking detective work. There is an absence of a sense of history in this country that is deliberate.

To show it, film it, push it right in the faces of people and make them uncomfortable if necessary. Not as whimsy — as one television documentary series has been doing — but to go to at least a dozen places around Australia and say: “In there are three hundred and sixty thousand massacred Aboriginals ... if you dig around you will find the bones.”

That’s one way, the other is to unearth our European story, not missing out the bootlicking, godfearing, monarch-worshipping, status-seeking response to being told.

We are getting situations where the distributors don’t bring certain films into this country because they know they won’t get through, and other films that come in are having certain parts of them removed. We are being isolated from types of influences which are readily accessible in other western capitalist countries. So the rest of the world moves on, while we tend to wallow in this comfortable 1950s kind of space.

What are your current projects?

I have just written a script with Rod Bishop about the way the press functions in this community. We have chosen three examples of the press: a traditional big-city newspaper; a collective like the one that used to put out the Digger; and a traditional union newspaper. I have also achieved, collaborate, and community newspaper. It’s also a really interesting film for me, because it’s autobiographical — it’s about the changes in the way that men and women relate — which has been the major input to my life over the past couple of years. It’s also about the media in Australia, which has been an ongoing obsession since God knows when. Rod Bishop will direct it, and I’ll produce it.

I will probably do that as soon as I finish the script that I am working on at the moment, which is a comedy about going mad in Australia — about the society that causes you to go mad and about the role of the family.

One of the things that interests me most is the role of maternity in this community. It’s also about cultural oppression, about how you take away people’s minds, and you re-program them with the mind processes of the colonizing nation, and you don’t have to worry any more about radical politics. It’s also a comedy about the awakening of political consciousness in one person.

I am writing it with a guy called Jay Bland, from Adelaide, and a lot of this stuff comes out of his life.

After that I hope to write a road movie with a crack lick, set in Byron Bay in Sydney, about a character who is trying to make it in the rock and roll industry. It’s about travelling, moving in Australia, and about living just outside the law, and how if you live just outside the law and keep on moving, you are caught.
PIERO TOSI

Continued from P. 323.

It must be terrible for a costume designer to see an old, possibly deteriorated copy of his films...

Ah, such as when I saw Il Gattopardo... I was horrified thinking of all the work we put into the colors for the ball... and in the end all you could see was the black of the men’s evening tails, but all the colors were a mess. Then, later when I saw it again after seven years, it seemed rather beautiful. But at the time it was a disappointment.

We took a whole day to show Guiseppe Rotunno, the cameraman, what a candlelit ballroom of that period should look like. All the rooms of the Palazzo Ganci were lit with candelabras. Chandeliers were everywhere... there was an incredible magic about it. A golden aura rested on every object, the characters, on the rehearsals of the entrance of the families: an emotional day full of beauty and magic. It was a real Proustian day. Then, the reality of film which is a magic. It was a real Proustian day.

It’s true that Visconti was very demanding, but he was so in the positive sense, because if something has in fact to be a certain thing, you can’t use something else instead, especially if it’s in the foreground. Louis Jovert said, when he did Moliere: ‘A lace handkerchief can’t be made of paper’ and this holds for film.

As regards costumes, it’s certainly one of my requirements. For a costume to be alive and credible, it must be real — there’s no getting around it. It has to be in keeping with the person wearing it, in the psychological sense. A costume shouldn’t just cover or decorate an actor, it must help him create a character — or a situation. So it has to be made properly, it can’t be something improvised or decorative alone, as in a cabaret.

“L’Innocente”, the last film by Visconti, is set in a period when fashion was transitory, the 1890s...

Yes, right at the end of the ‘culisson’ of the 1800s, and there were the last traces of the fashion that had lasted from the 1700s until the end of the 1800s. Then a year later, it disappeared altogether. The fashion becomes softer, fuller. The line, even though it is one of transition, is a very beautiful one which became an extremely simple, essential line.

It’s a difficult one, however, because it required a particular long physique, an extremely lean figure, dry, with vertical lines. When I did the research for Proust I found pictures of that line of extraordinary elegance and beauty. And all this was swept away within the space of a few years. Between 1888 and 1890 everything went.

And when the fashion changes, so do physical characteristics. Take the example of the ideal woman of the 1950s — let’s say Marilyn Monroe, Sophia Loren or Brigitte Bardot who were the ideal physical types of that era. Well today you can’t find a figure that you could reconstruct like that. Today a woman wears a shoe of at least size 39 or 40 or even more. When I began working 27 years ago, the largest size worn by a woman was 38. A woman with a shoe size of 38 was considered a monster.

So the physique of an actor should also correspond to the ideal of the year in which the film is set...

Oh yes, but that’s tremendously difficult. In fact, if you can’t find this, then you can’t achieve a credible result.

Do you prefer to make costumes for any particular era?

No, it is the story which has to inspire me — a world which I have to like. I start there. If you can like the characters, that the story is set in the 1800s or the 1900s is relatively unimportant.

What usually happens to the costumes after the film is finished?

They are returned to the wardrobe to be used in other films — crowd scenes, or the background. At least that’s what is done, in Italy. Hardly ever abroad.

However, you don’t use costumes from your previous films. You always create new ones...

Unfortunately, yes. I always happen to deal with films where I can’t because the era or the place is different. However, others use them. The costumes of Il Gattopardo are to be seen in Traviata in Monaco, Britain, France and Italy. *
Questions on notice

Dear Sir,

The daily viciousness that has characterized Canberra parliamentary politics since Malcolm Fraser became leader of the Liberal Party has manifested itself in a number of odd, and increasingly interesting, ways. Most concrete is the new sense of sniping that has developed. As a result, all sorts of pockets of government and administrative activity, and expenditure, are now being poked into.

They include such things as the expense of maintaining the Governor-General in a lifestyle to which he has undoubtedly become nicely accustomed, the overtime paid to Fraser's staff, the retirement benefits of former Private Ministers, costs and numbers of overseas junkets and so on. Film fans have not been left out.

For that group, the most intriguing matters relate to a series of questions placed on the House of Representatives Notice Paper by Ralph Jacobi, a South Australian M.P.

Amid a mixed bag of matters relating to the big spending arts organizations (Australian Ballet, etc) are the following topics:

- What funds have been granted by the Australian government to the Australian Film Institute, based in Melbourne, during the past five years, and for what purposes these funds have been granted?
- Is it a fact that employees, agents and persons otherwise connected with the Australian Film Institute have used their official status to invest in shares in film companies, or otherwise benefit from those companies?
- Have funds been granted to the Australian Film Institute in order to fund the production of films that are not commercially viable?
- Have the funds been used to underwrite the risk of losing money on particular films?
- Have the funds been used to take over the business of the Motion Picture Distributors' Association?

Jacobi's questions do at least come from a member of the party responsible for the massive increases in spending on film which led to the expansion (and still expanding) activities of film-funding bodies. Not so. Mr David Jull, a newly-elected South Australian M.P., who wrote to the editor of Cinema Papers last week, seems to have some information for which he would like confirmation on the public record. Mr Jull has asked the following question:

"Is the Film and Television School producing the finished product: and is this film being funded entirely by the school from its normal appropriation?"

One would have thought it would be easier to get the information requested here by a letter, particularly as Parliament would not be sitting for a couple of months now and the answer, if it is forthcoming, would have wait until Hansard starts re-appearing.

It would be easy for M.P.s to turn arts funding bodies into benefactors once more. The Liberal Party made a successful exercise out of such activity during 1975. Once the ball starts rolling, the new M.P.s would see all the moneys have been lent by the Government, directly or indirectly for film assistance from the Government, either for the production of five films which are beneficially owned by those directors, (c) the actors, (d) the distributors and (e) the exhibitors.

Questions like these take the public servants in an enormous amount of their time to ferret out the information, especially when the answers involve getting information from interdepartmental and independent organizations like the AFI and AFC.

Jacobi, too, may have made a tactical mistake if he is really serious about getting answers. (Sometimes an M.P. may only place the question on the Notice Paper for its embarrassment value of shaming the under-served.) He has lumped all the questions together under one number (1694) and gathering the information to answer all of its parts would probably take six months. Then, of course, the Minister to whom it is addressed need not provide the answer if he decides against giving out the information.

At present the whole purpose of the exercise remains obscure. Jacobi has not been known as either an advocate or an antagonist of the Australian Film Institute. The only reason he has emphasized on some muckraking on the basis of information he has acquired, or whether the answer is needed or not to form an opinion. He just wants to know on behalf of the constituents, if, of course, a matter of conjecture. Whether he will prove to be on the side of the angels remains to be seen.

In the meantime, the questions remain on the Notice Paper and will lie dormant until an answer is provided or until the estimates debates come up next week. It has provided the only opportunity for hard-nosed probing of government expenditure.

Astonished

Dear Sir,

I was astonished to read, in Cinema Papers issue 16, Scott Murray's contemptuous, one paragraph dismissal of Lina Wertmuller's brilliant film, "Mamma Roma." Any film by a former assistant to Fellini deserves less showy treatment. I consider it to be one of the best films I have seen this year. I am not the only one—Time magazine devoted a whole page to the film and director.

It is both funny and moving, with a superb performance by Sandra Ferras. I am not the only one—Time magazine devoted a whole page to the film and director.

As for giving the atrocities of World War II a laugh. Have any real changes occurred at all? It is true to say that the Trade Practices Act did have a certain scare value in the early days. But the PPO has long since employed top legal advice and is convinced that any attempt to pass the law in its present form would make the film worth seeing more than it does now. It is both funny and moving, with a superb performance by Sandra Ferras. If I am not the only one—Time magazine devoted a whole page to the film and director.

And yet Lina Wertmuller's film, "Mamma Roma," is the first film to take on board the implications of the Trade Practices Act. The film is both funny and moving, with a superb performance by Sandra Ferras. If I am not the only one—Time magazine devoted a whole page to the film and director.

Dear Sir,

I read with interest the reply of Wes Loney, chairman of the Motion Picture Distributors' Association, and the reply to Mr. Loney's comments by Ransom Stoddard. I agree with Mr. Stoddard when he summens the word. "Why have any changes occurred at all?" It is true to say that the Trade Practices Act did have a certain scare value in the early days. But the PPO has long since employed top legal advice and is convinced that any attempt to pass the law in its present form would make the film worth seeing more than it does now. It is both funny and moving, with a superb performance by Sandra Ferras. If I am not the only one—Time magazine devoted a whole page to the film and director.

Canberra

Warning

Dear Sir,

I read with interest the reply of Wes Loney, chairman of the Motion Picture Distributors' Association, and the reply to Mr. Loney's comments by Ransom Stoddard. I agree with Mr. Stoddard when he summens the word. "Why have any changes occurred at all?" It is true to say that the Trade Practices Act did have a certain scare value in the early days. But the PPO has long since employed top legal advice and is convinced that any attempt to pass the law in its present form would make the film worth seeing more than it does now. It is both funny and moving, with a superb performance by Sandra Ferras. If I am not the only one—Time magazine devoted a whole page to the film and director.

Canberra

Letters

Dear Sir,

At the 1975 Tertiary Screen Education Association seminar in Melbourne some people who were engaged in teaching and/or research concerning the Australian film industry decided to publish a newsletter. I was an occasional news-letter.

Information being circulated concerns people, films, news of current research, books and theses in preparation, and anything else that people want others to know about.

There are now more than 40 names on the informal mailing list, including academics, writers, journalists, students, film producers and others. The newsletter is being cut off from the supply of films of any one director. Particularly so since this year will see an extreme shortage of top-grossing viable studio product. I would warn any independent exhibitor operating outside the mainstream of release that these times are not opportune to rock the boat. Refer to the Trade Practices case of Top Feature Films which is now before the Queensland Supreme Court, whereby the applicant sought injunction to restrain distributor from terminating its dealers franchise. In judgement, the distributor was awarded a sum of money with evidence showing that the respondent was grossly dissatisfied with the applicant's performance as a dealer.

I would warn any independent exhibitor operating outside the mainstream of release that these times are not opportune to rock the boat. Refer to the Trade Practices case of Top Feature Films which is now before the Queensland Supreme Court, whereby the applicant sought injunction to restrain distributor from terminating its dealers franchise. In judgement, the distributor was awarded a sum of money with evidence showing that the respondent was grossly dissatisfied with the applicant's performance as a dealer.

Philipp W. Doyle
Kogarah

The author is the managing director of MECCA theatres.

BLOODWOOD
LIVERY STABLES

Proprietor: Heath Harris

Suppliers of horses, livestock, horse-drawn vehicles, etc.

Specializing in: stuntwork and stunt coordination—films, television, advertising, film festivals.

Lease holders, hirey horses.

Just a few of our credits over the past few years:

The Stomper

Solo

Bain Hall

Leases less than 100,000

Deadheaters

Harness Fever

McCloud Down Under

Bloodwood Stud, P.O. Box 309, Mona Vale, NSW 203

Kids and animals can eat into production budgets and schedules. With Bloodwood Livery Stables you only have to worry about the kids.
GUIDE TO THE FILM PRODUCER

Continued from P. 325

2.1. THE Production Company covenants with the Investors as follows:

(2.2) THE Investors hereby grant to the Production Company the exclusive rights in the script and manuscript. The Investors will have (subject to any rights that may be vested in APRA Limited or any other person) an option to sell, assign, licence, hire, distribute, exhibit, televise and otherwise deal with the Film. The Investors will have (subject to any rights that may be vested in APRA Limited or any other person) an option to sell, assign, licence, hire, distribute, exhibit, televise and otherwise deal with the Film.

(c) “Completion date” refers to the date of screening of the first answer provided to the Investors pursuant to the requirements of paragraph 5.11 hereof.

(d) Details of the progress of the production during the preceding seven or fourteen days respectively including daily earning statements, weekly expenditure statements and all other such statements (if any) that the AFC may at any time reasonably require in order to effect the following insurances upon competitive terms; (i) If the controlling shareholding in the Production Company is altered in any way as a result of a change in the beneficial ownership of the Investors, the AFC shall have the right but not the obligation to require the Investors to sell the Film to the AFC at the then prevailing market price. If the AFC elects to purchase the Film from the Investors, the AFC shall have the right but not the obligation to require the Investors to sell the Film to the AFC at the then prevailing market price. If the AFC elects to purchase the Film from the Investors, the AFC shall have the right but not the obligation to require the Investors to sell the Film to the AFC at the then prevailing market price.

(e) Details of the progress of the production during the preceding seven or fourteen days respectively including daily earning statements, weekly expenditure statements and all other such statements (if any) that the AFC may at any time reasonably require in order to effect the following insurances upon competitive terms; (i) If the controlling shareholding in the Production Company is altered in any way as a result of a change in the beneficial ownership of the Investors, the AFC shall have the right but not the obligation to require the Investors to sell the Film to the AFC at the then prevailing market price. If the AFC elects to purchase the Film from the Investors, the AFC shall have the right but not the obligation to require the Investors to sell the Film to the AFC at the then prevailing market price.

(f) “Investors” includes each and all persons who, prior to completion of the Film or the marketing thereof, made a subscription to the Production Company for a beneficial interest in the Copyright of the Film. The Investors shall have the whole of their rights mentioned in 2.1(b) hereof until the Completion date.

(g) “Copyright” means the copyright subsisting in each part of the world as from the Completion date. The Copyright shall be registered in the names of the AFC and the Investors. The Copyright includes all rights under the Copyright Act. or any other Federal State or Local Government law or ordinance.

(h) “Completion date” refers to the date of screening of the first answer provided to the Investors pursuant to the requirements of paragraph 5.11 hereof.

(i) If the controlling shareholding in the Production Company is altered in any way as a result of a change in the beneficial ownership of the Investors, the AFC shall have the right but not the obligation to require the Investors to sell the Film to the AFC at the then prevailing market price. If the AFC elects to purchase the Film from the Investors, the AFC shall have the right but not the obligation to require the Investors to sell the Film to the AFC at the then prevailing market price.

(j) “Marking” includes all or any of the following procedures: assigning, licensing, assigni
7.2. ALL insurances shall be in the full insurable value thereof as accepted by the parties hereto. All insurances shall be taken out in such office or in any other place as shall be specified by the parties hereto. All insurances shall be kept in full force and effect for the period for which the same shall be required, and all other claims excluding them from both partial and total losses shall be met by the continuation of the insurance policies or the renewal thereof in accordance with the provisions of this Clause 12.1 hereof.

7.4. THE Production Company covenants with the Investors as follows:

(a) It shall make timely payments of all sums required to be paid by the Production Company under the terms of this Deed and the proceeds of all sales made by the Production Company in respect of the Film shall be deposited in an account maintained by the Production Company in the name of and to the credit of the Investors, and when the proceeds of such sales have been, or become due and payable, the same shall be immediately paid to the Investors in accordance with Clauses 12.1, 12.3 and 12.4 hereof.

(b) The parties hereto agree that in determining the extent to which the Investors are entitled to participate in the proceeds of any ancillary benefits, the sums to be allotted shall not be included in the actual expenditure and such circumstances shall be deducted from any ancillary benefits.

(c) If it appears to the AFC that the Budget will be exceeded by $33,000 the AFC may require the Production Company to reduce expenditure on certain aspects of the production. In the event that the AFC or any other party holds that the Budget is exceeded and further moneys are required to complete the production, the AFC shall forthwith distribute any moneys received by it in respect of the proceeds received or receivable from such disposition.

9. OWNERSHIP OF THE FILM

9.1. Upon completion of the Film, the Investors shall be entitled to own all right, title and interest in the Film and all ancillary benefits thereof, and such ownership shall be held by the Investors in accordance with the relative interests of the Investors as set forth in Clause 13.4 hereof. In the event that the Investors do not wish to own the Film, the AFC shall make such sales or dispositions as the Investors may request.

9.2. Each party in Australia, by payment into such account and bank as that party may nominate as its or his agent for the Investors pursuant to Clause 17.1 hereof, shall be bound by any determination of the Arbitrator on whether the joint performance of the Investment Company for the Investors has been adequate in all respects.

11.9. UNTIL such time or times as the Investors take over the control of marketing and distribution of the Film, the AFC shall have a vote in proportion to its respective equity held by such Investor. If the Investors fail to resolve the dispute any determination of the Arbitrator shall be binding upon all parties hereto in accordance with Clause 13.4 hereof. In the event that the Investors do not wish to own the Film, the AFC shall make such sales or dispositions as the Investors may request.
Tax and Film
Continued from P. 315.

Section 51 goes on expressly to provide that expenditure on purchasing 'trading stock' (defined as including 'anything produced, manufactured, acquired or purchased for the purpose of manufacture sale or expenditure on purchasing 'trading stock' (defined as 'exchange' ) shall not be treated as a capital outgoing. Special provisions of the Act require trading stock to be valued at the end of each financial year, and the excess (to the extent that the total acquisition cost, in the first year) the excess or deficiency is treated as assessable income or an allowable deduction. Though under Section 51 capital outgoings are not allowable deductions, other provisions of the Act do allow the taxpayer a capital outlay in connection with which a profit therefrom would be included in his assessable income, but in fact makes a loss therefrom, i.e., loss is an allowable deduction. However, the Commissioner may disallow the deduction unless the taxpayer, prior to or at the time of lodging his first tax return after acquiring any property or paying any pre-sale costs, gives the Commissioner notice of his profit-making intentions. As far as the purposes of this Section cannot be calculated until the property is sold or the scheme is complete.

Section 52 is the counterpart of the provisions already mentioned that categorize portions of certain kinds of capital outgoings as income. The costs of producing all the other items that form the property in a film appear clearly to be capital outgoings, at least if the producer becomes the first owner of the property, (if production costs are incurred by a person who does not become the first owner of the property, e.g. by hiring the film to another person, but merely possesses it for another person in order to earn assessable income, it would seem that those costs would be regarded as of revenue nature, but of course the cost to the other person might then be capitalized.)

There may be some difficulties in drawing the line between creating and acquiring the legal or equitable right in a film, but merely produces it for another person in order to create a deduction only under Division 10B; though it is just possible that in his individual circumstances an investor might be able to demonstrate to the Commissioner that he has purchased for trading purposes, or as part of a profit-making scheme, thus indirectly creating a deduction only under Division 10B without proving an early box-office flop. Receipt of income over a period would, however, be inconsistent with a scheme.

TAXATION OF FILM PROCEEDS

Filing is certainly an income-type receipt. The possible difficulties of determining the source of film income have been alluded to above. For example, if any income does not having incurred income taxes are levied by foreign countries on income earned in those countries by an Australian film maker, the income tax paid to its employees (which may be particularly significant when overseas actors are employed), the repayment the producer will incur an income tax liability without necessarily having the funds to meet it.

CONCLUSION

This article does not purport to cover all aspects of Industry. Apart from the substantial tax savings the tax deductions as to production costs and distribution costs are likely to be considerable. The overall effect of this would be to provide that all investment in film production is an allowable deduction. For example, even if the net cost of such a scheme, as well as being deductible on the one hand, the tax benefit will be offset against assessable income in various ways. Under the depreciation provisions, the acquisition cost of any kinds of plant and equipment used by the taxpayer for the purpose of producing assessable income may be written off progressively as allowable deductions at various rates per annum, however cinematograph films are expressly excluded from these provisions. The depreciation is not calculated until the property is sold or the scheme is completed.

Obviously, producers should be cautious about committing themselves to repay loan finance 'off the top' of the film proceeds, because if those proceeds are included in assessable income, the tax benefit will be offset against assessable income without necessarily having the funds to meet it.

CONCLUSION

The above analysis assumes the simple case of a producer of a film and so holds some or all of the property in the film as trustee for the investors. Who can claim the deductions in the more complicated, but more common case where a producer is not a beneficial owner of the film, but holds some or all of the property in the film as trustee for the investors? The answer to that is that it is possible that the producer will lodge a trustee tax return, but will only be assessable as a trustee in relation to the income from Australian sources. However, a producer may enter into a scheme for the purpose of producing a profit. Against such income, the trustee may claim the respective allowable deductions.

Note, however, that though the capital costs of producing the film will have been incurred by the producer as a whole, he may not be able to claim all the tax deductions which may have been made in respect of the book purchases made on the property. Thus reducing the book value that the Australian film maker, the income tax paid to its employees (which may be particularly significant when overseas actors are employed), the repayment the producer will incur an income tax liability without necessarily having the funds to meet it.

CONCLUSION

This article does not purport to cover all aspects of the Income Tax Law that may affect the film industry. Apart from the substantial tax savings that the tax deductions provide, the tax benefits are likely to be considerable. The overall effect of this would be to provide that all investment in film production is an allowable deduction, as if it were funded from the sale of or hire of films assessable income. The net cost of such a scheme would clearly be much higher, taking into account the time not unproductively spent by producers and lawyers unravelling the complexities of the present law.
Film Censorship Listings
Continued from P. 331

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

DECEMBER 1976

FILMS REGISTERED WITHOUT ELIMINATIONS
For General Exhibition (G)
Acrabisia: Knigths, Hong Kong (2800.00 m)
Barney: Waddington-Watkins, Australia (2311.00 m)
Bee's Nests, South Africa (2490.00 m)
Drill Away, Air (16 mm), Australia (225.00 m)
International Bedouin Invitation: Exhibition Match, Hong Kong (2743.00 m)
Learned Bride Three Fools Bridge and Gold Film Co., Hong Kong (2389.00 m)
Oly N. Zucca, Everyone Will Live, T. Yialoupolou, Greece (2500.00 m)
Pr завод, C. C. T. Buoninsegni, Cangaroo Prod., Italy (2900.00 m)
Roi etia, Billo Jo Buoninsegni, Cangaroo Prod., Italy (2900.00 m)
Silver Streak, T. E. L. W. U.S. (2500.00 m)
The Enforcer, J. Ruben, U.S. (2551.00 m)

FILMS REGISTERED WITH ELIMINATIONS
For Restricted Exhibition (R)
Gimag, C. Proctor, Greece (3000.00 m)
Kiriakopoulos Bros, Greece (2500.00 m)
Thisia Mais Ginekas (The Sacrifice of a Woman), Proedrina, Greece (2500.00 m)
L'Eredeita Dello Zio Buonanima, Italy (2500.00 m)
Shinbone Alley, T. Burstall, Australia (3451.00 m)

FILMS REFUSED REGISTRATION
Sex Machine (Full length English dubbed version), S. Clemenoni, Italy (2880.00 m)

FILMS APPROVED FOR REGISTRATION AFTER REVIEW
Sex Machine (Full length English dubbed version), S. Clemenoni, Italy (2880.00 m)

FILMS NOT APPROVED FOR REGISTRATION AFTER REVIEW
The Story of Joanna (a), G. Diamante, U.S. (2191.10 m)

FILMS NOT APPROVED FOR REGISTRATION
The Erotic Adventures of Zorro (a), Previously listed in Film Censorship Bulletin No. 8/76.

NOTICE
The company decided to withdraw the film from further release throughout Queensland; and

Love Camp 7 was shown to the board privately prior to any theatrical release being set for the film in Queensland. We were subsequently advised that, although the board would not officially ban the film, they would go ahead and do so if we attempted to release it in Queensland.

Heath said the board requested viewings of two films — Prostitution Italian Style and Jury Godiva Rides — that had been in distribution in Australia for nearly five years (including a considerable number of releases in Queensland).

Des Draydon
Continued from P. 330

Since its introduction the Queensland Board of Review has banned some 35 films. In a report presented to Parliament this year, a list of the films banned up to June 30, 1976 appeared:

As previously reported in Cinema Papers exhibitors and distributors in Queensland have, in the main, reacted strongly against the double standards imposed by the presence of an additional censorship authority in Queensland, in addition to the federal body in Sydney.

At the 1976 annual Exhibitors' Conference in Surfer's Paradise the then managing director of Birch, Carroll and Coyle in Brisbane, Mr. Terry Jackman, described Queensland's film censorship laws as "the most horrendous and far reaching legislation of all time".

He said his company had spent $2000 on legal advice in an attempt to challenge the laws after the Government had banned the film The Story of O. The company withdrew when two Q.C.s advised it there was no chance of success under the Act.

Representatives of the board are reluctant to discuss its workings. Errol Heath, managing director of Regent Trading, made some interesting points in a subsequent article. He wrote:

"The Erotic Adventures of Zorro was banned after having been screened for a period of six weeks and one day."

"The Erotic Dreams of Casanova was released, and after having screened for two weeks the film was subsequently viewed by the Film Board. We were advised that the film could continue to be shown in hard-top theatres, but if we attempted to show the film at any drive-ins it would then be banned immediately from further release throughout Queensland; and

"Love Camp 7 was shown to the board privately prior to any theatrical release being set for the film in Queensland. We were subsequently advised that, although the board would not officially ban the film, they would go ahead and do so if we attempted to release it in Queensland."

Heath said the board requested viewings of two films — Prostitution Italian Style and Jury Godiva Rides — that had been in distribution in Australia for nearly five years (including a considerable number of releases in Queensland).
FUNDS FOR FILMMAKING, VIDEO AND RADIO GRANTS
formerly administered by the Film, Radio and Television Board of the Australia Council
are now operated by the

CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
AUSTRALIAN FILM COMMISSION

FILM PRODUCTION FUND provides assistance for projects up to a level of $35,000. Only experienced filmmakers are eligible to apply to this fund. Projects should be innovative and should have the potential to further the applicant's development as a filmmaker. This fund is open to all filmmakers, whether employed in government/commercial production or independents.

SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT FUND provides assistance to experienced and promising writers and directors who wish to devote their full time to develop a film or television script over a specific period of time at an approved rate of payment.

EXPERIMENTAL FILM AND TELEVISION FUND provides assistance up to $7000 to filmmakers with lots of promise but limited experience. The fund favours projects which are innovative in form, content or technique and supports experimental work.

Applications for the next assessment for the
FILM PRODUCTION FUND
SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT FUND
EXPERIMENTAL FILM AND TELEVISION FUND
close on 27th May, 1977 — Application forms for the Film Production Fund and the Script Development Fund are available from:
The Chairman
Australian Film Commission
GPO Box 3984
Sydney NSW 2001
Application forms for the Experimental Film and Television Fund are available from:
Executive Director
Australian Film Institute
PO Box 165
Carlton South VIC 3053

FOR INFORMATION: Telephone a Project Officer at the Creative Development Branch of the Australian Film Commission: Sydney 922 6855. Information sheets about the funds are available from the Australian Film Commission.
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BOUND VOLUMES
ORDER VOLUME 3 NOW!
(numbers 9-12) 1976-1977
Handsome: bound in black with gold embossed lettering. Each volume contains 400 lavishly illustrated pages of:
• Exclusive interviews with producers, directors, actors and technicians.
• Valuable historical material on Australian film production.
• Film and book reviews.
• Production surveys and reports from the sets of local and international production.
• Box Office reports and guides to film producers and investors.

STRICTLY LIMITED EDITION
ORDER NOW!
TO PLACE AN ORDER FILL IN THE FORM BELOW

EASY BINDER
Cinema Papers is pleased to announce that a loose binder is now available in black with gold embossed lettering. Individual numbers can be added to the binder independently — or detached if desired. This new binder will accommodate 12 copies (3 years).

TO PLACE AN ORDER FILL IN THE FORM BELOW

BINDING SERVICE
Cinema Papers will now arrange to have your copies of numbers 1-4 and numbers 5-8 bound in volumes.

TO PLACE AN ORDER FILL IN THE FORM BELOW

ORDER FORM
BOUND VOLUMES
Please send me □ copies of Volume 3 (numbers 9-12) at $21 per volume. Enclosed cheque/postal order for $______. (add 50¢ per volume outside Australia)

EASY BINDER
Please send me □ copies of Cinema Papers’ easy binder at $10 per copy. Enclosed cheque/postal order for $______. (add 50¢ per volume outside Australia)

BINDING SERVICE
Please have the enclosed copies bound in black with gold embossed lettering at $13 per volume. Enclosed cheque/postal order for $______. (add 50¢ per volume outside Australia)

NAME
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Postcode

TO PLACE AN ORDER FILL IN THE FORM BELOW

Total amount enclosed $______

Cinema Papers Pty. Ltd. 143 Therry Street, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia
‘Dreams hung in fragments at the far end of the room . . .’ wrote Scott Fitzgerald in ‘The Last Tycoon’, his novel about Hollywood in the thirties.

When in December 1940 Fitzgerald died of a heart attack induced by years of over-indulgence in alcohol and drugs, he was writing not for the movie industry but about it — a Hollywood novel which, although never finished, was to be described by Edmund Wilson as ‘far and away the best, and the only one which takes us inside.’ It was witty, affectionate, devoid of bitterness.

Now, with Hollywood in the throes of a love affair with its own past, Fitzgerald’s unfinished masterpiece has been brought to the screen.

Kazan says he has tried to make an elegiac, deliberately adagio film reflecting the novel’s tempo. He wants the viewer to catch the throw-away detail — the Arab-robed extras playing tag on the back lot, the Heinz ketchup on the silver-laden executive dining table.

Since its US release in December the Eastern intelligentsia have almost unanimously hailed the film as among Kazan’s best work, with a superb central performance by De Niro.

The suspicion remains however that Hollywood lured an American folk hero to his doom, destroying with drink and dollars the greatest writer of his generation. That’s not the sort of legend they like.

THE LAST TYCOON by F. SCOTT FITZGERALD is available as a Penguin paperback at a recommended retail price of $1.95.
Australia's favourite premium beer.

CARLTON

Crown Lager

ANOTHER CARLTON PRODUCT