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Professionals only argue about two things on the Bolex H16 EBM.

Whether to fit the 400 foot magazine. And what lens to use. The Bolex H16 is a complete filming system offering the ultimate in precision, yet as rugged as a tank. Professionals in all fields, from documentary work to research, recognise it as a basic tool for producing clear, properly exposed film. The top quality optical system is only one of the reasons for its supremacy. Ancillary equipment can be tailored exactly to your requirements — you don’t waste money on gear you don’t need. The motor is electronically regulated. Use film speeds of 10, 18, 24, 25 or 50 fps. (24 and 25 fps are stabilised to sync pulse standards.) Reflex viewfinder. Magnification in the eyepiece is 14 x so you can see what you’re doing. When you’ve decided about the magazine, all you have to argue about is your choice of those superb optics. If you want something more to argue about, take a look at the Bolex RXS, or the Bolex SBM, our spring motor models.

For colour brochures, write to Photimport (Aust) Pty Ltd, 69 Nicholson Street, East Brunswick 3057
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
Fourteen films on India today, a unique insight into one of the world's most ancient civilisations.

The real stars of this series, one of the most ambitious projects in contemporary film making, are the people of India — people like Padma, a dancing teacher from Madras, Rana, a young Muslim student from Old Delhi, Bijan, a Calcutta artist and Jyoti, a twelve-year-old school girl living in an industrial complex on the outskirts of Bombay.

Fourteen films that explore the fascinating biways of agrarian, urban and cultural life in the India of the Seventies are available singly or at a special series price. Running times vary from 14-20 minutes.

In Australia enquiries should be directed to the Marketing and Distribution Branch, Australian Film Commission, 8 West Street, North Sydney. Overseas to the Commission’s representatives: in London, Ray Atkinson, Canberra House, 10-16 Maltravers Street; in New York, James Henry, International Building, 636 Fifth Avenue, or through any Australian Government office.

Produced by Film Australia

ModelMation specialises in puppet/model animation, from fairy-tale characters to monsters from the imagination; and miniatures, from buildings to futuristic space-craft.

For advance information please phone (Melbourne) 359 3274 after hours only.

Victorian Filmmakers — Producers, Writers, Directors, Script Editors, Researchers and Freelance Technicians

The Victorian Film Corporation is currently compiling a register of all film production companies and freelance people currently resident in Victoria. It is hoped that this register, when completed, will prove to be a valuable resource both nationally and internationally.

Please write or telephone Roz Woodman for an application form.

VICTORIAN FILM CORPORATION
c/- Ministry for the Arts
168 Exhibition Street
Melbourne 3000
Telephone: 662 3588
(Temporary address only approximately end July)
FOUR OUT OF FOUR

FILMS FUNDED BY THE CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT BRANCH of the Australian Film Commission scooped the pool at the 1977 Sydney Film Festival Greater Union Awards.

LISTEN TO THE LION
Producer: Robert Hill
Director: Henri Safran

CONFIRMATION
Director: Paul Bugden

PRISONERS
Producer: Tony Green
Director: Mark Styles (with Collective)

(Out of the 12 finalists 8 were assisted by funds now operated by the Creative Development Branch of the Australian Film Commission.)

Funds for Filmmaking, Video and Radio Grants

HOW TO APPLY for assistance from the Creative Development Branch of the Australian Film Commission:

Applications for assessments for the Film Production Fund, Script Development Fund, and Experimental Film and Television Fund will now be assessed throughout the year. There are no longer any closing dates for submission of applications. Applications can be sent in at any time and will be evaluated soon after they are received.

Intending applicants should discuss their proposal with a Project Officer from the Creative Development Branch before submitting an application. This will ensure that applicants are directed to the correct fund and have a full understanding of the criteria and that the appropriate information is provided for a proper evaluation of their project.

Applicants for the Film Production Fund and the Script Development Fund should write to or phone a Project Officer at the Creative Development Branch to arrange an appointment to discuss their project. The people to contact are Curtis Levy — Film Production Fund, Richard Keys — Script Development Fund, Albie Thoms — Experimental Film and Television Fund, and Helen Pross — Public Broadcasting and general film grant inquiries. Project officers will be available for consultation in all States on a regular basis.

Guidelines about the funds and application forms for the Film Production Fund, Script Development Fund, and the Public Broadcasting Fund are available from:

The Chairman
Australian Film Commission
CPO 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

FILM PRODUCTION FUND provides assistance for small-budget projects ranging up to around $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 $7,000 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.

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.
Think of the worst that can happen... then think again.

SUMMERFIELD

NICK TATE  JOHN WATERS  ELIZABETH ALEXANDER
in
SUMMERFIELD
with
MICHELLE JARMAN as Sally

Written by CLIFF GREEN  Music by BRUCE SMEATON
Produced by PATRICIA LOVELL  Directed by KEN HANNAM

HANNA-BARBERA  34-36 ATCHISON STREET, ST. LEONARDO'S, N.S.W.
FOR ANIMATION, CHARACTER DESIGN CONTACT ROBERT SMIT 430-3877
The new Vincent Library Catalogue

$3.60 CAN NOW BUY YOU THE CINEMA EXPERIENCE OF A LIFETIME

The Vincent Library is one of the most important and accessible resources of film for the non-theatrical market. Any group or individual can apply for registration with the Library.

The new Vincent Library Catalogue features a wide range of films, including many new releases. If you are involved in film, this catalogue is indispensible.

Order now by sending $3.60 (includes postage) to Vincent Library, Australian Film Institute, PO Box 165, Carlton South 3053 Victoria.
The Producers of “Caddie” now choose Gevacolor type 680 for their new film “The Irishman”

*Registered trademark AGFA-GEVAERT Antwerp/Leverkusen.

The exacting professional demands a film that will give him quality, freedom and the flexibility he needs to stimulate his creative imagination. He gets all this from Gevacolor Type 680, a high-speed, double-masked original negative film. Gevacolor Type 680 is the choice of “The Irishman” production team, and of discriminating European film makers like Claude Lelouch, director of “Le Chat et la Souris” “Le Bon et les Mechants” and others.

AGFA-GEVAERT Limited.
Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, Adelaide, Perth.

The “Caddie” production team on location.
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Four hours so I could cancel the Paramount agreement and make the deal with Fox; however, Bertolucci has recently advised me that he could not cut the movie to less than four hours and that the audience would not bear the loss of the scenes which possesses the same distribution problems, for us to hope the demand for the following minute version. Therefore, I was compelled to exercise my contractual right to exclude Bertolucci in cutting the movie to three hours fifteen minutes, in order to fulfill my commitment to Paramount, which held a delivery deadline of March 31, 1977.

Bertolucci was responsible for extending the shooting schedule to almost a year, thereby increasing the cost of the movie from the originally budgeted $3,000,000 to $4,000,000. I would not be able to recoup the additional costs that Mr. Bertolucci’s failure to honor his contractual obligations, as critics from all parts of the world who have seen the original version all felt that the picture was too long. This failing has been blamed by the audiences in the countries where the picture has been released: Italy, France, Germany, Switzerland, Greece and Denmark. In these countries, the film has been criticized by the film distributors who have seen Part I and went to see Part II.

There are only two English versions of the film: Part I is the three hours fifteen minutes version which had been delivered to Paramount and the other is the five hours ten minutes original version which can still be shown in Australia in any theatre willing to screen it.

It was, moreover, the only festival in Australia to gain admission to the International Federation of Independent Film Festivals, and Bertolucci was awarded the Golden Palm at the Edinburgh Film Festival and the Rotterdam Film Festival in 1976.

Not at first endorsed by the establishment, it eventually called the lack of purpose and their poor record in helping films find distribution which could be seen only if they were too specialist to clash with the other festivals, there existed an apparent lack of the cooperation. However, eventually changed and the Sydney and Melbourne festivals kept quietly to Perth’s defense when it ran into censorship trouble in two consecutive years. In 1975, Perth successfully appealed against a ban on the Belgian entry, *Ves de Nuis*, which the Western Australian authorities argued was too explicit. The film was eventually allowed to be shown without any cuts.

As well, it must be pointed out that the Borowczyk, the Hooper and the Zeno have all been part of the international film festivals, and are works by important directors. Thus, in surveying the censorship scene of the past 15 months we find the Board of Trade Practices沤 the film’s rule—an inordinately greater film of minor sex scenes. Is this enough to justify continued existence in its present form?

(The Board is Chairman, Stanley Hawes (Film Australia); Deputy Chairwoman, Caroline Scott; Dr Ventrurini, Vice-Chairman; Dr Middelton; David Ditchburn; Dudley McCarthy, and Prof. A. G. Hammer)

DR VENTURINI BOWLED OUT

Members of the new body which will administer the yet again revised Restrictions Trade Practices Act from July 10 were officially sworn in by the Minister for Trade and Customs Affairs, Mr Howard. Surprisingly, Dr Ventrurini Venturini, the most experienced and qualified of the past commissioners in terms of trade practices and commerce, was omitted from the appointments.

Dr Ventrurini, a frequent and trenchant critic of the past Labor government’s commercial activities, has recently complained about the judicial and Commerce. The West Australian suggest a growing awareness of what has happened, though the chances of the organization’s independence from the revival of the festival, in Perth at least, must be counted as slim.

THE DARWIN CINEMAS’ LOSS

The Trade Practices Commission again turned its attention to the film industry in a public hearing of the Commission regarding a clearance application for a takeover of an independent cinema by Greystar Union. Interestingly, the Commission’s resident film critic, Peter de Grigorio, was present in the hearing.

The Commission’s published reasons and a statement of the facts are set out below. They give some insight into the Commission’s thinking on independent cinemas.

This is an application for clearance of the acquisition of an assets. Darwin Cinema’s Pty Ltd (Darwin Cinemas) applies for clearance to acquire the Parap Hardtop Picture Theatre including land, improvements, fixtures and fittings, goodwill and the exclusive right to use the name “Parap Theatre”. Darwin Cinemas also intends to lease for a period of 5 years with an option to renew for a period of 5 years the Parap Hardtop Picture Theatre. The Parap Hardtop Picture Theatre is owned by a company, a common shareholding in the company owning the Parap Theatre. The Commission has not sought for this lease “because the Valuers have advised that the proposed sub-lease is not within the jurisdiction of the Trade Practices Act”.

A.Response Seeking Clearance para 2.

(c) The Commission is not bound to make a decision on the application before the six months from the date of the decision. Accordingly, this decision relates only to the acquisition of the assets of the Parap Hardtop Picture Theatre. The Commission, in exercising its discretion, will consider whether the acquisition is likely to have effects contrary to the public interest. If the Commission is satisfied that the acquisition is likely to have such effects, it may make a recommendation that the acquisition be disallowed.

The Commission is not bound to make a decision on the lease of the Parap Hardtop Picture Theatre. Therefore, this decision relates only to the acquisition of the assets of the Parap Hardtop Picture Theatre. The Commission, in exercising its discretion, will consider whether the acquisition is likely to have effects contrary to the public interest. If the Commission is satisfied that the acquisition is likely to have such effects, it may make a recommendation that the acquisition be disallowed.

A short submission has been lodged by the applicant setting out various aspects relevant to the
6. There are three movie theatres in Darwin these and the Darwin Cinema and the Drive-In Theatre.

The Parap Theatre was remodelled in 1974 at the end to allow the flow of cool air into the theatre. The Parap Theatre if it is to increase its attendances. The manager of the Parap Theatre states that a

9. There is adequate availability of film in Darwin on which to construct theatres and approvals for construction would be easy to obtain from the Darwin Reconstruction Commission. There are no legislative barriers to entry.

10. The Parap Theatre and the Darwin Cinema both screen first release films. Darwin Cinemas is a wholly owned subsidiary of United Artists in Queensland and United Artists in the Commonwealth. United Artists in Queensland, it is likely that films shown at the Darwin Cinemas are from these distributors. Thus it is unlikely that films shown at Darwin Cinemas are from the same distributors as these are booked for all B C & C

11. Other leisure activities which exist in Darwin are horse racing, greyhound racing and cinema.
I left Cousteau and worked with Robert Bresson on Un Condamne A Mort S'est Echappe (The Condemned Man Escaped) as an assistant. After that, I made my first feature, Asceaur Pour L'Echafaud. It was based on a book, a not very good thriller of the same title. It had to do with a man who is stuck in an office elevator for a weekend immediately after having committed a crime. It is a typical, Hitchcock-type suspense story. Was it difficult making the transition from documentary to drama?

The problems were not technical. I could discuss things in detail with cameramen and soundmen and I was quite aware of editing — generally more so than the average director making his first film. Where I did have difficulty was directing actors, because I had no experience. Certainly the weaknesses of my first films are with the acting. But I became more and more interested, and today I would say it is almost my forte; it's what interests me most.

When I started I had to deal with stars like Jeanne Moreau, Brigitte Bardot, Alain Delon and Jean-Paul Belmondo; today I am more interested in working with non-professional or little-known actors and actresses. In all my recent films — Murmur of the Heart, Lacombe Lucien — the central character has been an adolescent; consequently I have used beginners, and I find that very interesting. I find it more rewarding in terms of the result. They don't know any tricks, they are generally more honest with the part, and they bring you something that professional actors don't. For instance, it would have been impossible for me to have a professional actor as the lead in Lacombe Lucien, because I had to have somebody with that kind of a past or background — he had to be a peasant.

There is a scene in the film where the boy has to catch a chicken and kill it. Pierre Blaise, being from a peasant family, told me the scene as described in the script was wrong. We rewrote it and now one of the really impressive moments in Lacombe Lucien is where, all in one shot, Lacombe catches the chicken and kills it. The first take was fantastic; we hadn't rehearsed it and you can detect this in the film because when Pierre chopped off the chicken's head the operator was so taken aback that he jolted the camera a little.

But surely the advantage of using stars, apart from using their names, is that you are fairly aware of their talents...

Yes, but that is what I don't like; you know what the film is going to be too much in advance, I prefer to sit under the camera and just say "go". I love to be surprised; for actors to do something unpredictable. That is what you get from non-professionals, rarely from professionals; they are used to being extremely precise.

If a professional has to light a cigarette, he prepares the pack so that he can look in the eyes of his partner, pull out the cigarette, light it and you can detect this in the film. Pierre Blaise, being from a peasant family, told me the scene as described in the script was wrong. We rewrote it and now one of the really impressive moments in Lacombe Lucien is where, all in one shot, Lacombe catches the chicken and kills it. The first take was fantastic; we hadn't rehearsed it and you can detect this in the film because when Pierre chopped off the chicken's head the operator was so taken aback that he jolted the camera a little.

But surely the advantage of using stars, apart from using their names, is that you are fairly aware of their talents...

Yes, but that is what I don't like; you know what the film is going to be too much in advance, I prefer to sit under the camera and just say "go". I love to be surprised; for actors to do something unpredictable. That is what you get from non-professionals, rarely from professionals; they are used to being extremely precise.

If a professional has to light a cigarette, he prepares the pack so that he can look in the eyes of his partner, pull out the cigarette, light it and still appear very natural. Actually it is not natural at all; the actor should stop and look at the pack. Professional actors give you a
LOUIS MALLE

vision of reality which is already pre-digested. I like accidents such as when something falls to the floor. It is this element of hazard that is so interesting; because in documentaries there is nothing else. And that is probably why I am now so interested in dealing with non-professional actors and in preserving their moment of chance.

How do you go about casting? Do you have a casting network over France or wherever?

We are having this problem right now, because we are casting a film where the central character is again a 12-year-old girl. I have no intention of using Tatum O'Neal or Jodie Foster — I want somebody fresh. The film is taking place in New Orleans, and while it is not essential, it would be better if the girl was Southern. I am seeing hundreds of girls and it is just a question of time and patience. It takes instinct, luck and courage — it is a terrible decision.

With Lacombe Lucien, for example, after I had already chosen Pierre Blaise, another boy came and I hesitated on him because I felt that this boy had things that Pierre didn't. My God I am so glad I didn't change my mind because Pierre Blaise was a phenomenon; he was extraordinary, and from the first day of shooting we knew he was going to help the film tremendously.

You must also remember how much I like dealing with real people. Pierre Blaise knew more about Lucien than I did. He felt so close to the character that I would listen to him as if he were my technical adviser about the part. He would come all the time with propositions that had a lot to do with the essence of the character, and this is important.

My main problem with Lacombe was that I was dealing with someone I knew very little about. You see I have a completely different background; I come from a bourgeois family and when I make films like Murmur of the Heart, Les Amants or Le Voleur, I am dealing with people who are like my brothers — they are part of myself. In Le Feu Follet, my film about suicide, these people are more or less my family, my background. I identify with them very easily.

I had problems in Lacombe with some people because I should have gone further. Now everybody found the mother of Lucien very good — and she is good — but I had trouble with her because though she came from a peasant family, she had become a stage actress. She tended to compose her performance and when we started shooting I thought she was overdoing her peasant walk.

I remember having a big fight because I told her it looked ridiculous. We had lots of extras who were peasants, so I said: "Look at those people. You think your idea of how they walk is right, but look at them. These people don't walk like that at all, they just walk normally." She was very artificial.

One of the criticisms of "Lacombe" is that while we all sympathize with Lacombe, there is something very wrong in sympathizing with that kind of barbarism...

I think that is what was interesting about the film, because I have noticed very opposite reactions among audiences. Some people identify with Lacombe, but I don't think they do so 100 per cent. As well, some people obviously don't sympathize from beginning to end, they reject the character entirely.

For me, the whole point of the film was merely to present such a character. I don't try to explain him, excuse him or justify him — actually there is not one thing in the film which could lead to the conclusion that I was trying to justify him. I think it has something to do with the fact that you are watching him for two hours.

Somebody once said, "Never try to understand your enemies, because if you do you are in trouble." But I think it is interesting sometimes to look at your enemy. I suppose if there is a revolution, people like you and me would be on one side and people like Lucien would be our enemies. I think that is interesting.

I think the problem with "Lacombe Lucien" is that what he does never seems evil. So while I don't think you should be moralistic, there should be a realization on the part of the audience that here was something evil. For example, if you were to do a film on Hitler and just show what he was like inside his office, and how he treated his secretary and so on, you could do so without any sense touching on the evil of the man...

Yes, but I would say there is a big difference between Hitler and Lacombe Lucien, and that's the point of the film. This is a film about the little man, the little guy; it is a film about somebody who is on the side of the murderers, but is actually a victim. In a sense, he becomes an employee of this Gestapo gang though he doesn't understand what is going on.

The proclerat is so often on the side of the fascists and Marx explains this by pointing out that they are used to being manipulated. They don't have the consciousness or the education to understand what side they should be on. These people are easily influenced by money and power; sometimes just for survival, you could do so without in anyway touching on the evil of the man...

Yes, but I would say there is a big difference between Hitler and Lacombe Lucien, and that's the point of the film. This is a film about the little man, the little guy; it is a film about somebody who is on the side of the murderers, but is actually a victim. In a sense, he becomes an employee of this Gestapo gang though he doesn't understand what is going on.

The proclerat is so often on the side of the fascists and Marx explains this by pointing out that they are used to being manipulated. They don't have the consciousness or the education to understand what side they should be on. These people are easily influenced by money and power; sometimes just for survival, you could do so without in anyway touching on the evil of the man...

That was what happened in Algeria. The Arab Algerians collaborated with the French, yet at the end were the victims. They were abandoned by France — of course — and were left in Algeria with the SLN victors coming in. They had a tough time and were horribly tortured.

That is so typical of how the French population has been used by the exploiters, the fascists. I think the story of Lacombe Lucien fits perfectly. I didn't intend to make a Marxist film, but it is Marxist in approach.

So to answer your question, I think your question is a good one, and I think you imply this in your film "Calcutta", in that you don't present the film as a diatribe against the way in which the Indians are being exploited...
big enough. We were fighting with production problems all the way through and at the end I sort of surrendered.

I had to work too fast, and I had all kinds of problems with the two girls, Jeanne and Brigitte, who were very difficult. It was even difficult to get them to work on the same set on the same day at the same hour; one of the two would be sick or not show at all.

I am also not at ease with scenes where there are thousands of extras. I don’t really mind, but I’m not that interested, and I got bored during the shooting — something that never happened to me before.

I was shocked the other day when a director in Hollywood told me that while he loved the writing and editing periods, he hated the shooting — he found it boring — it is the only thing I find interesting in life.

But I must admit that on Viva Maria I would sometimes wake up in the morning and think, “My God, it is going to be so boring taming those two girls.” My role was more that of a diplomat than a director.

You tend to write a lot of your own screenplays...

Well, I am doing it more and more, though on my latest film I am not writing the script because it is in English, and I don’t think my English is good enough. However, even when I work with another writer I do participate in the writing.

Of my last films, the only one on which I worked with another writer was Lacombe; I worked with novelist Patrick Modiano who had no previous experience in writing scripts. But three of his novels had been taken place during the occupation and he was well informed about this period. He came up with lots of important aspects of the script, like the Jewish tailor and his family. He and I would write independently and then we would put them together and discuss the result. I usually end up writing the final script, however, because I am the one who has to turn the script into a film.

Is your final version the shooting script?

It is the shooting script, except that it doesn’t include any technical details. I am not interested in describing how I am going to shoot the scene; I don’t list the close-ups or dolly shots, because I may probably change everything on the set anyway. I do plan ahead, however, to see how many shots I need and if I am going to need protection; i.e. additional shots that we may use in the editing to help solve problems in the rhythm. As I am often hesitant about rhythm, I organize my shooting so that it is possible to make changes during the editing. This is very important, especially with very long shots, because if something goes wrong with the pace of the shot, there is very little you can do about it.

Also, I am always prepared to change something if I think it would help the actors. For instance, I would scrap a dolly shot if I suspected it was making things difficult for the actors.

Some directors, and I did this when I started making films, have the actors do artificial things just to help the camera. The actors have to move from A to B because it makes it easier for the cameraman to get where he wants. You see this in many films, and even if the audience is not fully conscious of it, they do notice something artificial in the performance and often the actors are blamed, though they are not responsible for it.

The actors, or interpreters, are essential because they are the ones that go up on the screen. They should be helped and protected. I have an enormous respect for them. It must be very difficult for actors with 25 people on one side of the camera, they on the other, and a big glass eye in between. There is so much anguish when you start a take and they must feel terribly alone.

Given your love of improvisation, how important is the editing stage?

I have a great editor in Suzanne Baron. She is one of the best and has made all my films since Le Feu Follet. That’s when I had a revelation about how much good editing can help a performance. The performance of Maurice Ronet, for example, is 50 per cent Suzanne’s work. It was a very difficult part to play and there were some weaknesses in the performance. So we often took out a sentence or word from one take and cut it into another.

The film was made up of bits and pieces, but it is so brilliantly edited it doesn’t look chopped about — it looks like a long slow movement. However, if you were to look at the film very carefully you would notice there is a cut every three seconds.

Do you structure and restructure your films in the editing?

Well Lacombe Lucien, for example, was a perfect film in the sense that the script, the shooting and the editing were very much in line. We didn’t have to improve Pierre’s performance, because it was perfect; and we had no problems with the script. The only problem was that it was too long; the first cut was 2 hours and 40 minutes long and we had to delete 25 minutes. We ended up cutting out two long scenes, which was a very difficult decision to take.

But overall we didn’t change much in the editing. If I were to shoot the film again I would change very little, which is not true of some others I have made. On my last, Black Moon, we changed everything in the editing several times. It was very experimental and there
were many different ways of putting it together — it was like a musical construction. Absolutely fascinating.

Yet “Black Moon” is considered one of your least successful films...

I have made two films that were big flops — Zazie and Black Moon — and the reason for the latter was because it was too difficult and experimental. I knew in advance Black Moon was not going to be a box-office hit, but I had expected a bigger audience. It does, however, have a certain following and some people are crazy about it. Bergman, for instance, told me that I shouldn’t worry, that he was all for this kind of film that people will think of as a classic in five years time. But I don’t find that very satisfactory, given the importance of film as a medium.

If you are a writer or painter you can say, “Well in 20 years they will be crazy about it. Bergman, for instance, told me that I shouldn’t worry, that he was all for this film — he seemed to have me completely liberated painters. All of a sudden they didn’t have to worry about reproducing the real world because there was a better instrument for it — photography and filmmaking.

The basic point about being a filmmaker or photographer is that you are limited by this stupid instrument of reproduction. I think it was Cocteau who said that he regretted the over-liberated painters. All of a sudden they didn’t have to worry about reproducing the real world because there was a better instrument for it — photography and filmmaking.

My intention while shooting Black Moon was that I wouldn’t use in my dream sequences any distorted lenses or weird angles. Things like that give a baroque-like quality to dreams, but I have a completely the opposite feeling.

To me, dreams are absolutely clear, they are like Flemish paintings in that every detail is impeccably there. The Basic Moon are black and white, are not really into the photography and filmmakers are still stuck with this problem and it has been the hassle of filmmaking ever since its invention.

I spent a month filming my dreams in my house, which was, of course, unreal — though terribly real in another way. I tried to come as close as possible to a sort of reportage, though I also attempted to convey the sense that time is cyclical and that it reproduces itself; as well as giving the feeling that space is closed. Eight, nine or ten times in the film the girl goes up the same stairs; it is like a labyrinth. I gave the feeling of a place being like a womb. It has a lot to do with a different organization of space and time, though it had to be done with subtlety. I really would like to explore more in that direction.

Who are your favorite filmmakers?

I don’t like to answer that question because I change my mind a lot about films and filmmakers. I am not crazy about the auteur theory: I think it has done a lot of wrougt and damage recently. By way of example, had I been very disappointed with Bresson’s last film — which actually isn’t the case — I would then think more about my admiration for his previous work."
Ray Edmondson

Most people have heard of Soldiers of the Cross, even if they know little more about it than that it was made by the Salvation Army. But there are few living today who actually experienced the original presentation in 1900 and can recall its nature and impact. And it is now unlikely that the experience can ever be fully recreated, since two of its key elements — the original music score by Major R. McAnnally and most of the original lantern slides — are no longer with us.

But other components of the Salvation Army's most ambitious "Limelight Lecture" do survive; the original music score by Major R. McAnnally and most of the original lantern slides. So, too, do contemporary descriptions of the presentation — and audience reaction to it — in old issues of The War Cry. And their existence raises the possibility that one might at least glimpse something of the power of a dramatic creation which obviously enthralled audiences of its day, and which had a far-reaching, if indirect, effect on the embryonic Australian film industry.

Soldiers of the Cross was not a film in the modern sense: it was an elaborate audiovisual presentation in which sequences of lantern slides alternated with short film episodes, together forming a narrative which dramatized the lives of the early Christian martyrs in an episodic fashion. A 20 to 30 piece orchestra supplied mood music throughout, over which Commandant Herbert Booth — are no longer with us.

But other components of the Salvation Army's Limelight Department, which created the slides for this and other Salvation Army lectures, became Australia's first film production studio when Booth, in collaboration with department head Major Joseph Perry, began work on Soldiers. It premiered on September 13, 1900 in the Melbourne Town Hall before an audience of 4000; it was re-presented (and rearranged) many times over the next 12 months, particularly in Sydney and large country centres.

Booth's brainchild made history with several Australian firsts to its credit; principally, however, one is struck by the extraordinary vision which understood the power and possibilities of the cinema when few people, even in Europe and the U.S., regarded it as more than a curiosity.

Then, in 1976, the newly-formed Film Committee of the Arts Council of Australia (A.C.T. Division) decided it would try and present the surviving elements of Soldiers of the Cross to the paying public in a manner that would capture some of the theatrical effect of the original presentation.

It wasn't an original idea: in July 1973 the Salvation Army in Melbourne staged a "nostalgia evening" built around the slides and music, which the Film Committee took as its blueprint. But the 1976 version was designed more as a smooth-flowing theatrical presentation which would attempt, with better facilities, to present at least some of the music in synchronization with slides to approximate the effect achieved by Perry and Booth in 1900.

The venue chosen was the Canberra Playhouse, a 312-seat live theatre/cinema with an almost ideal combination of stage and projection facilities. The Canberra Salvation Army joined with the Arts Council in mounting the project and shared the financial responsibility; their part was to assemble an orchestra similar to the original Biorama ensemble of 1900 and to rehearse McAnnally's score. Ken Smith from the NSW Conservatorium of Music — who had conducted a similar orchestra at the Melbourne presentation in 1973 — led the final rehearsals and conducted at both performances.

The Film Committee (principally, on this occasion, Karen Foley, Andrew Pike and myself) were to produce the show. Initially, this involved structuring the program and sorting the surviving slides into what was probably their original order. As it finally evolved, the program followed a kind of TDT format: local radio personality Keith Richards acted as anchorman, stringing successive segments together in a logical sequence. Contemporary film was used to set the atmosphere of Australia at the turn of the century; a singalong introduced audience participation (an important element of the original presentation); historian Ross Cooper, using slides and film, related the history of the Salvation Army's Limelight Department and the genesis and production of Soldiers of the Cross. After interval and further film excerpts, Ken Smith and the orchestra presented segments of the score; and finally, the Perpetua story — the only slide sequence to survive more or less intact — was presented in synchronization with its music. Overall, the purpose was threefold:

- to create the proper period atmosphere within which to present the slides and music;
- to convey some historical data about the production and its importance;
- and to experience, if possible, some of the theatrical and emotional power of the original presentation.

Concluded on P. 94

Below: Several scenes of ultimate calamity and destruction, like the one below, were straightforward reproductions of paintings.
At 37, Paul Cox is becoming one of the most impressive filmmakers working in Australia. Cox, who came from the Netherlands in 1963 with an international reputation as a photographer, began his career in films with a series of shorts. His first three dramatic narrative films, "Skin Deep" (1968), "The Journey" (1972) and "Illuminations" (1976), were considerably shorter than the customary feature film, but they exhibited an admirable ability to work with images to construct a world in which the details of his mise-en-scene provided the keys to his characters and their situation.

The films, made on small budgets, deserve broader audiences than they have been able to win. But their tendency to abstraction, to a private metaphysics, work against them. Their meaning remains largely elusive, submerged within the flow of images and the consciousness of their creator. However, Cox’s concern to reach beyond the surface, to seek into these inner urges which drive individuals together, then apart again, is clear. The course which his films chart is one in which contact is fleeting, in which his characters rarely have the capacity to recognize the possibilities for fulfillment which lie open to them — if only they could see. “Skin Deep” and “The Journey” are full of meetings and separations, while “Illuminations” submerges its characters’ blindness to their condition in its assertion of a spiritual world which lies outside the realm of the senses.

It is possible to argue that Cox’s films are more akin to the European cinema of his youth than to their Australian environment. “Skin Deep”, for example, structured around a never-ending movement and a belief in the transience of things, has much in common with the films of Jacques Demy (e.g. “Lola”, “Les Demoiselles de Rochefort”, “Model Shop”), though the tone is ultimately much darker, less able to rejoice in the delight of the moment when it is cast in the shadow of its impermanence.

The point is not that there is any conscious or direct connection between Cox’s work and that of his counterparts in Europe: the bond is rather a question of sensibility, of those factors which work together to construct a way of seeing the world.

Cox’s two most recent films, “We Are All Alone My Dear” (1976) and “Inside Looking Out” (1977), which were screened at festivals this year, provide evidence of the personal nature of his work. The former, ostensibly a documentary about an old people’s home in Prahran, is a moving account of people who have lost the desire for, and the means of, communication. Like “Inside Looking Out”, “We Are All Alone My Dear” takes as its starting point, characters who have reached a point of departure — for their lives and from each other. The home has already lost sight of the reason for its creation — the construction of a community, a place where people can find solace in their togetherness. The emptiness of the corridors whose design automatically provides meeting-points, serves to suggest instead that such a function has long been abandoned.

One sequence in particular encapsulates the way in which Cox sees the world of these people, and, by implication, of all of us. As the film’s narrator and star, Jean Campbell, walks with a friend through a park near the home in which they live, the images bind together past, present and future. A young couple romp happily, oblivious to the world around them; the old women pause to rest before moving on, their path taking them past a couple of gardeners raking fading autumn leaves. Mahler’s ‘Song of the Earth’, with its distress at an impending isolation, underlines the bleak view of existence which the sequences contain.

For Robert (Tony Llewellyn-Jones) and Elizabeth (Briony Behets) in “Inside Looking Out”, the happiness of their relationship is a thing of the past. They are constantly framed behind the windows of the home that has become their prison or placed within the images of a world turned sour; the single factor that keeps them together being their daughter, Dani (Dani Eddy). The letters which resound with the music of their romance (“We must not waste something that is so precious”) seemingly mock their condition and movingly conjure up a sense of waste. The irony of the “New World”, the supermarket which they visit, is that it...
provides a location for their bickering and a reflection of a plastic dream world, feeding a way of life to its customers which is quite out of tune with the realities of their lives.

With "Inside Looking Out", Cox seems to allow his cast room to move — the first time he has done so — the value of the strategy being validated by the excellent performances from Tony Llewellyn-Jones (perhaps the most impressive actor working in Australia at the moment) and Briony Behets. The consistent tone of their exchanges and the hesitating awkwardness of their movements as they search for a direction immediately makes their frustration and anguish assert that their problem is one which reaches far beyond the walls of their home.

The film's use of overlapping sound, cross-cutting and repeated images (of different characters doing the same thing) suggests the interconnectedness of the lives of all the characters. And it is through the periphery characters that we perhaps gain the clearest perspective on Robert and Elizabeth's inability to relate; Dani in her hideaway loft surrounded by images of domesticity (and her drawing, "This is my family"); Juliet, the baby-sitter, exploring her own sexuality via the crumbling relationship which she does not understand; Alex (Norman Kaye) and Marianne (Elke Neidhardt) living out a marriage contract devoid of anything but the rituals of living together.

When, in the closing sequence, Elizabeth finds solace in the naked embrace of her daughter, her celebration of her role as mother is far from a happy ending. Hers is a retreat from reality, every bit as impotent as that of Freud's child who seeks a return to the apparent safety of the womb. The images bind Dani's fate with that of her mother, their physical similarities underlining that cycle which is to remain unbroken.

The following interview was recorded in the week before the premiere of "Inside Looking Out" at the Melbourne Film Festival. Tom Ryan

You came to Australia as a photographer with an international reputation and a financially rewarding career. Why did you turn to filmmaking?

It all happened rather quickly. I think I was probably doing too well — the challenge had been taken out of it. That is partly the reason. I always say to people that if you want to do something seriously, do it as a hobby. Filmmaking was my hobby, photography my living. I enjoyed that hobby very much and found that most of my money was being used for it. And I got more and more sucked into filmmaking.

But since you have been working in films, you have, apparently by choice, been an outsider; you haven't worked within the mainstream industry...

It is partly by choice, but I haven't been that conscious of it. You will probably ask me about commercial filmmaking, whether I would like to make commercial films. The only answer I have for that is, I don't want to waste my time.

You want to communicate your views through film to as many people as possible, yet up until "Inside Looking Out", your films have been largely inaccessible to the popular audience. Isn't that a self-defeating process?

Investigate the question first. If you say film costs a lot of money, does that then mean you have to disregard any inner-strength or inner-self motivation? That is what the question really implies, doesn't it? So does the fact that things cost money mean you have to do the so-called "right" things and not follow your own integrity or ideas? I don't think so. The only answer I can give is I would like to investigate that question, because its existence as a question means many people keep on doing the wrong things.

But the people who invest in your films are obviously going to want their money back. And if they don't get it, then next time either will you? One can't depend forever on subsidies...

You are going off the track. If you keep on insisting that you just do something for the love of it, or for your strong belief in what you have to say, that sort of inner motivation must at some stage shine through. And, ironically, people regard it then as something commercial.

But isn't that somewhat naive?

No, it's not. I believe the world has a conscience, so whatever you do, somehow, at some stage, it must start to make sense.

Does "Inside Looking Out" — a most accessible film which is obviously going to get public response — mean that you have had to compromise your position to make that sort of a film?

I have thought about this a lot. I think it would be conceited to say, "yes, I have compromised." What do I have to compromise about? I am
just starting to make films in spite of the fact that I have been doing it for 12 years. I have learned a lot by just doing my own thing, as I am not the sort of person who can learn a great deal from others. I have to teach myself. Of course, nobody can claim to be an originator either, but I do make a conscious attempt at innovation.

You have talked about a personal cinema with some embarrassment as to whether it applies to you. But can you see how your background might have in some way ‘scripted’ the sorts of films you have made and the sort of personal flavor you have brought to them?

Yes. It would be lovely to say that my youth or my background has not affected me; that I have not been conditioned by anyone; and that I have always done my own thing. But it would be wrong. A certain element of conditioning comes into everybody’s life, and it is perhaps essential that this happens.

We have now conditioned a generation of people who have only been given a verbal language with which to express thought. We have never given them an ability to express feeling. I have always been taught to say the wrong thing in the right way, because that’s what language does to you.

Speech is, in many ways, inadequate, and that is why I find film so fascinating. Because it is a freer language and it offers the opportunity to express feeling. Perhaps that desire has given my films some sort of personal flavor.

Film is such an abused medium, and if it has the ability to give expression to feeling, then one should at least make an attempt to seek that out.

I believe film primarily is a visual experience. Certain things you see, you can at times share with somebody else. For example, when people have those horrifying travel conversations, and they talk about, say, an island they have visited. By talking about it, they have already isolated themselves from the rest of the conversation and from other people. You see the same smile on their faces, the same expressions come out. They have some secret to share. They show you that there is very much attached to a vision.

Sound is important too. It is vital to have an idea of sound before you start making a film. Why start to compose sound after you have done the film? Why not compose the soundtrack first? I was very conscious of the sound for Inside Looking Out, though not the particular notes. I knew exactly how it should be, and because of my relationship with Norman Kaye,* and the way in which we tend to feel the same things through music, he was able to create what I wanted. He is a very musical man, though much underrated. We managed to cooperate well.

So the sound becomes part of the whole structure of the film and it integrates. It has a thematic and emotive function. It helps to make people move with whatever you feel.

You seem to place a great emphasis on details that surround a particular incident from your personal experience, and often that incident can provide the motivation for a particular film. If that is true, are there any particular incidents that set you in motion for “Inside Looking Out”? It’s very personal. A lot of things that happened in Inside Looking Out are things that involve me and even my friends. I think Illuminations is a better example of the importance of little incidents. Five or six years ago I had a dream about somebody in a coffin which had a little hole in it. And somebody’s eye was looking through the hole at the people following. I realized it was in the coffin, but that I was alive and could see all the people who had somehow been part of my life. It wasn’t just the people I knew at that time, but also people who had come back from my past — the man who used to repair my bicycle when I was six, he was there.

It was an amazing procession and it led to Illuminations. But when I made the film I took all that out. I found the very vision of lying in the coffin so heavy and grotesque that I couldn’t use it.

In Inside Looking Out, the motivating incidents have disappeared as well. I cannot remember them — at least I don’t really want to.

Many people have been critical of the dialogue used in your films. It is that banal, too obviously structured, and that it is not right for the characters who speak it...

I think it goes back to the part of our conversation where we talked about having no language to express feelings. We express thought through a certain code system such as, “G’day, how are you?” You must speak in slogans and codes because that is regarded as good dialogue.

My films are, I suppose, pretty obscure and I use few words. It’s true that they don’t always work. In The Journey, for instance, you couldn’t possibly have had a heavier speech at the end. But I thought most of the film would be completely lost if it didn’t have the dialogue spitting out the message.

I think the criticism is really more to do with something like, for example, when Juliet, the babysitter in “Inside Looking Out”, says, “We all have our private madnesses.” That is obviously a significant statement and it comes awkwardly from her mouth. You appear to impose a certain dialogue on the character that doesn’t really fit.

I don’t think so. Inside Looking Out is the first time I have used a lot of dialogue, and, as you know, the script was originally written with Susan Holly-Jones who contributed a lot. Tony Llewellyn-Jones and Bernard Eddy also contributed greatly to the shooting script.

The rest has all been improvised. I find the awkwardness of Juliet’s line quite good: it fits her character, it fits the situation. She is with the man she is sexually attracted to; she is prying on his unhappy marriage and gets a lot of kicks out of it. But as she really doesn’t know how to handle that in an adult sort of fashion, there is a awkwardness about her delivery. I don’t mind that at all.

I know it is a long-standing criticism of my films. But you can’t...
Robert (Tony Llewellyn-Jones) seduces the sleeping babysitter, Juliet (Juliet Bacskai). Inside Looking Out.

really talk about dialogue in all the other films, because it is hardly there. I have always avoided it. I have a great respect for the silent films which told very clear stories without ever resorting to dialogue.

Is it because you are more concerned then with a certain kind of abstraction in the dialogue...

While talking at times, I say something absurd, just to break through the codes. It breaks down the whole nonsense game and gives us a chance to relax and touch.

Images are the most unshakeable arguments. In fact there are no arguments about them. I often become so frustrated about words and how to use them that I have, at times, overstated things on purpose.

Many people found "Illuminations", at least in its later stages, totally inaccessible. What response do you have to that criticism of the film?

Let me put it this way: if I couldn't believe in another dimension, in a greater possibility for this particular existence, I really would cease to exist. You know we go through so much rubbish and humbug before we reach 'home' and as Hesse says, "We have no one to guard us."

What we see in "Inside Looking Out" are characters who have become victims of that rubbish, and cannot find a way out...

Everyone looking at the film must somehow be looking at him or herself. That is the idea. Look at yourselves, investigate your lives, your motivations. The purpose of our lives lies in very small things, but if we can't find the time or the answers, we must be careful not to ruin other people's lives. People do this constantly.

Do you see any hope for the characters in the film, for Robert or Elizabeth?

Yes, if they learn to investigate their existence and situation properly and not use any little thing as an excuse. Elizabeth uses her daughter as an excuse; Robert, his work; and both use the comfort of their friends as an escape, and their little daughter communicates better with her pet rabbit than with her parents.

We look for something warm, a little corner to sneak away into. We all need shelter and warmth, but it mustn't become an escape. One must be aware of the process that one is going through.

Some people would argue that your films, and the personal aspect of them, is an escape, that you are ignoring the political implications of what is there in the films but not explored. For example, in "We're All Alone My Dear", the film about the old people's home, you could have gone one step further and damned the authorities who had created that institution and allowed it to be the way it was. But you didn't...

Firstly, who am I to condemn the people who set up this home? I don't know enough about it. It could have been done in sheer goodwill or in complete ignorance. Basically, the individual can never be blamed for a situation as such. To expose a situation like that you have to hurt a lot of individuals, and sometimes that is necessary. But I cannot see the point of involving myself politically at that level. Not that I am chickening out, because to make films about the human condition is the most difficult thing to do.

At that sort of level, I think my films are extremely political, but not in an overt way. They do not fight for a particular dogma or a point of view, but they are concerned with what's between or inside characters. They are political in a personal way.
Ian C. Griggs

Some time ago Joan Long first mentioned to me the possibility of The Picture Show Man going into production. At that stage, I had already carried out research into outback N.S.W. cinemas in a fruitless endeavor to locate a more or less complete sound-on-disc projection plant. Occasionally I would come across a Western Electric set-up, with Universal base still attached; and at several cinemas even the control boxes were connected and operating, motors and gear boxes intact; in fact, everything but the 16 inch turntables and arms.

However, often I would arrive at some distant, long-closed cinema, only to find that priceless machines or other items of cinematic historical interest had been taken to the local dump or sold off as scrap metal a matter of, in many cases, only weeks before. Nevertheless, perseverance paid off with the discovery of the Barraba Empire in January 1975.

This theatre was originally Clifton's Hall, and at the rear was the open-air division with its separate projection box. The cinema opened in 1921, with two new Kalee machines, one with the last of the Indomitable No. 6, and the other with the first of the Indomitable No. 7 heads. These rare machines, which have now been reassembled, are complete, original, and operating, and are in The Picture Show Man. At the time of installation they sold at 178 pounds ($356) each. They are complete on the heavy four-part cast iron stands, with one single and one double blued-metal lamphouse, and with the now scarce bevel-gear and shaft-drive take-up magazines.

With the introduction of sound, the proprietors had decided on a locally made system, the Markophone, developed in Sydney by Messrs D. Lyton Williams and S. Laws. This design appeared in January 1930, some six months after Raycophone and 12 months after Western Electric's first Australian installations. It sold at 1450 pounds ($2900) for both sound-on-film and sound-on-disc (S.O.D) and by July 1930 seven installations had been completed.

The one installed at the Barraba was the ninth to be made. Unfortunately, figures on how many were eventually sold are not available, but I believe the Barraba plant is the only one left intact. Under the stage, thrown in among all manner of junk, were, as well as the Kalee machines, two complete Markophone turntable pedestals, with tone-arm brackets, guard rails, motor platforms, gear-boxes, shaft drives, sound-on-film heads and even the speedo dials with flexible cables to the gear box which enabled the operator to keep check of the motor speed. In fact, there were four sound-heads, the other two being used in the open-air cinema which opened after sound-on-disc had been phased out. From all this material I managed to set up, together with part of an early Western Electric sound-on-disc attachment, a reasonable replica of an operating sound-on-disc machine, with Simplex front-shutter head, Western Electric Motor Speed Control Box, W.E. 46B amplifier and so on; this is seen towards the end of the film, featuring in the humorous loss-of-synchronization segment.

Also included in the film is the beautiful 1921 Powers No 6B projector, which has been sent down by Ron West, of Cooroy, Queensland, from his private collection. This machine is "destroyed" in a frantic, nitrate fire sequence.

If the search for the above equipment had seemed difficult, the search for a limelight projector in 1976 looked impossible. This was even despite having come across, in my travels and interviews with many elderly gentlemen who had travelling shows in the early days, occasional references, descriptions of first-hand experiences, photos, etc. Even when Film Australia made The Pictures that Moved in 1968, certain parts of a limelight plant had to be fabricated, and they had no luck in getting a projector with all its ancient trappings.

However, constant contact with the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences at Broadway, Sydney, finally bore fruit when I was told by curator Geoff Davies: "Oh, yes, we have two of those. Mind you, I've never seen them, but they're on the catalogue so they must be here somewhere."

Several days later I was taken to the inner sanctum of the Museum — the Grand Store at Alexandria. There were two limelight projectors, an Edison Projecting Kinetoscope, of 1897, and an Edison Exhibition Model B, of about 1910. Both machines were complete and operable.

There were also a large iron oxygen tank encased in a wicker basket, an oxygen retort, four separate limelight burners, and eight original wood-cored, round holed spools. There was, however, no ether saturator or lime blocks.

Consequently, a most formidable device has been fabricated at Tamworth from photographs of typical other saturators, and arrangements...
were made to use compressed calcium carbonate to act as lime blocks. The local gas-cylinder agent was also engaged for advice and the provision of gas and rubber tubing.

The number of smaller parts which have gone to make each of the projectors complete and operating have been lent by various private collectors in Sydney and further afield, but to locate the items in the first place meant following up every rumor or vague lead I had been given over the past three years.

One of the rumors concerned a sound-on-disc plant sitting in a cowshed at Liverpool. Though such a lead may sound dubious I found the Western Electric sound-on-disc attachment which was used in the film in a chicken shed at Hoxton Park.

The rare 16 inch film soundtrack discs, which are also seen in the film, were given to me about five years ago while all the 1920s glass advertising slides were found in a tin box under the stage at Crookwell, N.S.W. The footage, of which part is used in the final scenes, is an early sound short found in an old trunk at an auction at Windsor, N.S.W.

Other items came from a retired exhibitor in southern N.S.W. who later told me that I was the first person to call on him to discuss his career or see his long boarded-up cinema. Being an incurable hoarder, he had kept every daybill, poster, glass slide and nearly every trailer since he opened the hard-top in 1922. After interviewing him, we went to the cinema, but never quite got inside the auditorium. Through growths of ferns and shrubs, we came across a ladder leading up into a tree — this was the access to the projection box. Among the stench of rotting nitrate film I found two Kalee projectors and an ancient Magna-Coustian sound system, together with hundreds of cans and reels of film, old records, papers, carbon stumps and vast quantities of bric-a-brac of doubtful value. He had no idea of the danger of fire from the jellied and sticky nitrate film and I persuaded him to destroy everything that could not be saved. That footage we did save (nearly half of which is silent) I shall later itemize and salvage.

LIST OF PROJECTORS USED

Twin Kalee Indomitable, silent, power operated, with carbon arcs.

Powers 6B, hand-cranked, silent.

Edison Projecting Kinetoscope, with limelight, silent.

Edison Exhibition Model B, with limelight, silent.

Simplex, with carbon arcs; Western Electric sound-on-disc attachment.

Assistance acknowledged from: Tim Burns, Ron West, Graham Swan, Bill Dunne, Bob Lucas, David Davison, Noel Gasky, Harold Burraston, Johnny Wilson, Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, and others too numerous to mention, who over the years have given me leads and rumors to follow up.

The twin silent Kalee Indomitable projectors on location.
One interesting series I made at the ABC was a trilogy on children entitled The Other Side of Innocence. It was inspired by the theories of the child-psychologist, John Gabriel, who believed twentieth century living and the nuclear family were short-circuiting the child’s play experience. And if a child hasn’t learnt to play he hasn’t learnt to love himself, and if hasn’t learnt to love himself he has limited his chance of becoming a rounded human being. It was a pretty interesting premise on which to do three programs.

We spent six months shooting kids in all sorts of situations and that was a highly rewarding experience.

The film was mostly cinema verite...

Yes, except for John’s pieces to camera. We also contrasted the heavy structured sports machine of the Greater Public schools with the unstructured routine of some quite enterprising schools, trying to contrast structured play with unstructured and free play.

While at ABC I also made The Soldier, a documentary about a national serviceman who volunteered for Vietnam. We followed him from training camp up to his first patrol in Vietnam, which was a pretty hairy experience. There were Viet Cong all over the place, but luckily we didn’t strike any.

I was opposed to the war, and was faced with a dilemma of deciding what I would do in case of attack: do I pick up a rifle and defend myself or do I call out “Hey don’t shoot, I am on your side”?

Was your attitude, which no doubt contradicted with the servicemen’s, reflected in the film in any way?

I tried very hard to be objective and not to influence the young soldier but I think I probably did influence him.

It was a very satisfying film in some ways because we managed to shoot what I think is one of the best sequences I have done in documentary—the soldier’s engagement party. It was the classic Australian engagement party with real people and real emotions. At that stage his family, and his fiance’s family, accepted us completely.

One of the nice things about the ABC was that they allowed you a reasonable time in which to make a film. So I had the luxury of being able to go up to the soldier’s house and chat in the kitchen with his mother and father and the rest of the family.

The only way you can make a successful cinema verite film is to be fully involved with people. The danger though is that through your involvement you lose your editorial distance, and you sometimes sacrifice a sense of irony because you are inevitably on their side.

Why did you leave the ABC?

There were several reasons, but mainly because I thought I had gone about as far as I could go. I had been there some 10 years, and felt that if I stayed any longer I would become a lifetime ABC employee. I had found a niche for myself there and in a funny way I felt a bit pampered—I wanted to make it outside. But as soon as I quit, the ABC offered me a commission to make They Don’t Clap Losers.

Did “Losers” come to you as a completed script?

No. At the time I was considering leaving the ABC, I was having talks with John Cameron about changing from the feature department to the drama department. John and I talked about doing a program which was urban, contemporary and not about the North Shore, i.e. something that was a change of pace for them. I thought about it for a while and came up with the idea of

Losers.

I wanted to do a story set in the city, so I thrashed around a while and finally conceived the idea of a “born-loser”. I had very little trouble writing the script, which surprised me, as it is about a working-class man and I am certainly not working class—I am one of the great Australian middle-class. But I think I understood his Irish Catholic background, because that’s my background, too. We did it with a very small crew, and I found it an interesting experience.

What was your next job after “Don’t Clap Losers”?

I didn’t have one till The Picture Show Man. I started to explore the commercial world and I decided that if I was to survive as a freelance, I would have to find work for myself, as a writer and a director, in jobs other than features. I knew then that I couldn’t make a living as a free-lance director.

I thought I would survive making documentaries, thinking it would be a long time before I got to make a feature. I also made commercials and wrote television plays, including an episode of The Outsiders, the ABC/German-Filmproduktion co-production. I was unhappy with their treatment of what I thought was a reasonable script.

I did a lot of things to survive during the next few years, including a bit of tutoring at the Film School. I then got a grant to write a story set against the Broken Hill background. But that was a disaster, because someone else had the same idea.

What commercials have you done?

The ones I enjoy most are the Shell commercials: the two guys on the perpetual odyssey around Australia. They are a fantasy world, but the trick in them is to make the fantasy look real. And in a funny way, they are establishing a new myth in Australia, a new legend — Cousin Charlie is like the search for the Golden Boomerang. They are a lot of fun to set up, you work with good crews and there is plenty of time for the shooting.

How do you see working on commercials for say three or four months, then going into a feature situation; can you take much with you?

I take a lot with me. This gets back to the expertise of your craft. It’s like being a writer: if you want to be good you have to know about grammar, about syntax. You have to know the rules before you can break them.

Some directors whose work I
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have seen never seem to know the rules and that's why they make a great fuss about not caring about them. You have to know what you are doing all the time and I think you can only take intuition so far.

Commercials are interesting, because you know very clearly what the client wants. This inevitably improves your directing, because it makes you consider very carefully what you will put into the frame.

If you're doing a 30 seconder or a 60 seconder each frame has to show exactly what you want, otherwise the commercial won't be a success. As a result, you get used to this kind of thinking and you ask yourself: "What does this scene need and what's it going to say?" It's exactly the same premise.

I think so. Joan had always wanted it to be entertaining and I encouraged her in that direction. It is hard to find a parallel, though when I first read the script it almost had the feeling of, say, The Sting, without being quite as witty.

It is a difficult tight-rope to walk on The Picture Show Man, because the people in it have to be real on the one hand, while on the other hand you don't want to miss the sense of escapist fun. So, you have to play it straight. The actors, for instance, must never laugh at their jokes, unless it was inherent in the scene. The laughs must come from the audience, not the actors.

Did you always have John Meillon in mind for the part of Pop?

John was always the first choice, though there was the usual business of finding an alternative if he was not available. It was the same with John Ewart who played Freddie, though at one stage we did consider John Ewart playing Pop.

The story seems well suited to John Meillon and, in particular, to his way of playing up to an audience...

What was the chief virtue of "The Picture Show Man"?

A good sense of fun: it has a nice fresh feeling. Joan never considered it the most important script ever written or the most important Australian film ever made; she always meant it to be a piece of entertainment of the type nobody has made here before — good natured and good humored.

Were you involved in any of the rewrites?

I came into it after Joan had written the first draft. We talked about it, then she wrote a second draft. At that stage, we had the usual director/writer relationship in which I made comments about the scripts, which she was free to accept. She made some changes, as well as others of her own. It was a progressive, growing thing.

Did the script alter direction during the various drafts? For example, did the sense of fun become more predominant?

I think the script came to John at the right time of his life. John is a great actor; he knows a lot about the traditions of the theatre and cinema. He has been acting for a long time and there is a bit of W. C. Fields in John, just as there is in John. His public image is one of a good-natured ocker actor, but he is much more than that. He is in fact a very serious actor. But he doesn't like to talk about his technique, though he has more than most actors will ever have. John is very good at disguising it.

Some people have considered the performance overly theatrical...

I don't agree, though I did want John to play Pop as a theatrical person. We don't say much about Pop's background, but I imagine he would have been an actor/manager and probably played in touring companies.

The confrontation between Pop and Palmer, which seems intended as the main structural device around which the story is set, doesn't develop much in the film. Was it intended to carry the structure through the film?

Yes, but the fact that Rod Taylor plays Palmer makes the part of Palmer look bigger than it was written. It's no secret that Joan didn't have Rod Taylor in mind when she wrote the script. It was just a gamble and good luck that we got Rod. You may or may not like him, but you can't deny he has a charismatic presence on the screen. There is a bigness about him that you can't ignore, and if you feel there is an imbalance in the film this is probably the reason.

It has also been suggested that Rod Taylor looks embarrassed in
some scenes and that it has somewhat diffused his role as the evil competitor...

Palmer is not written as an all-black character; we did not want to make him a villain, but a man who is aware of technological changes; Palmer is the businessman who sees films as a way of making a fast buck. And that's the way Rod always played him — a smiling but aggressive Yankee salesman who never loses his cool. Palmer is never really mean, he is just smarter than Pop — but then most people are smarter than Pop.

The other notable aspect of John Meillon's performance is the pathos he brings to the role. Was that always in the script or was that developed with Meillon?

There is a lot of John in that part. Pop was theatrical and always role-playing. He plays the roles of the hard father, the courteous lover and attempts at that of the snappy businessman.

Pop is a man who knows his weaknesses, but doesn't know how to correct them, and, therefore, changes his act with every new person he meets. For example, the confrontation at the end with Larry — when he realizes that his son really is going to rebel — Pop immediately changes his act, accepts the rebellion and tries to outsmart him, though he can never really outsmart anybody.

One of the most impressive features of "The Picture Show Man" is your technical direction. How crucial a part of making films is the need for technical competence?

It may not be the most crucial part, but it is certainly very important. I think every director has to be technically competent. I have no patience with directors who say, "I don't care what side the shot is taken from, I don't care whether it cuts or not, I want that shot". You have to be two persons when shooting on location: one who is working on a particular shot and one who is suspended above the set with a foot on the set, the other in the editing room. You must think about how you will put it together, otherwise you are not a director — though we all make mistakes as any continuity girl will tell you.

Appropriately you had a fine cut of "Don't Change the Clock" one week after shooting finished. I also noticed that you were doing a rough cut of "The Picture Show Man" as you went along. Does this make much difference to the way you develop a story?

I think it helps enormously. It gives you a growing sense of involvement with the film: the characters grow more forcefully within you, and it's a good check on what you're doing. If you see a scene cut together quickly you can tell if it's right for feeling, right for pitch, etc.

I am not keen about showing the actors the cut, though I am keen on them seeing the rushes. I think this notion of not showing actors what they are doing is all bullshit. I think the Australian director must accept the fact that he is not God. For instance, I think I would have been mad not to allow John Meillon, John Ewart, Harold Hopkins or Rod Taylor to make suggestions about their characters.

Actors tend to work more frequently at their jobs than directors — and directors forget this. John Meillon, for instance, is more often filming a feature than I am, and the same goes for the crew.

If possible, I like the actors to know all about their roles before we start shooting — that is to be fully aware of what I want the character to be. I want to hear what they think about it, and I want to have a reasonable understanding with them before we start. That's not to say I want every shot to be cut and dried — I think that is silly. Certainly, you have to walk in knowing what you're going to shoot, but you should always retain the option of changing your mind.

Given the tight schedules on Australian films, can you actually afford to change your mind?

It's really a problem. Often you have to drop shots that you would like to have done, and on The Picture Show Man there were many shots I couldn't get in because of the time schedule or because I might not have been competent enough to organize it for a particular day. I am not making excuses; every director who works in Australia has those same problems.

Do you see a director as someone who alters the relative importance of elements in the story as you go along? For instance, if an actor isn't playing a role too well, would you change the character slightly so that you could get a much better performance out of him?

Yes, I would, the only proviso being that you are a director working with someone else's script, you, by reasons of courtesy and hierarchy, should seek the writer's permission. It's an easier decision to make if you are directing your script. I wouldn't even think twice about it. But on The Picture Show Man, I certainly wouldn't have changed Joan's concept of a role without speaking at length with her. The producer also has the right to know, because there is a great deal of money at stake. That's a hard relationship to work at because the producer must bear in mind what the producer wants, especially in this country where the producer has often initiated the project. If a film is going to develop at all, the director must have a fair degree of leeway...

Surely the director's role is much more than simply putting on the screen what has been written. If a film is going to develop at all, the director must have a fair degree of leeway...

Yes, a director is not a director unless he can be an opportunist in a professional sense of seeing something good growing out of the script and then extending it. But when he is dealing with a script he hasn't written, he should tell the producer if he has seen a new approach and seek that producer's understanding for agreement. If you don't, you are in for big trouble, because the producer watching the screen will see something he never intended.

And people on the whole don't like surprises, especially when you are dealing with money.

You can't get away from the fact that films are money, and you can't fool around with a budget of $600,000, most of which is public money. That's a bit awesome. You say to yourself I won't be worried about finance, but you have to be worried; if you are two sets up late one day it will throw next day's schedule out of whack and it's going to cost somebody more money.

This problem of producer/director seems to be one of confidence. The producer looks around for a director who has special qualities for she expects the director to utilize in bringing something extra to film, over and above the script. Now in Australia, not many people have an extensive track record on which the producer can base this confidence...

I agree with you. Joan hired me to direct The Picture Show Man knowing I had no track record for making films for the cinema — I only have a track record for documentaries and television. That applies to a lot of other directors, producers, writers and so on. I think on my second or third feature — if I ever make them — I will be given much more leeway and will expect more leeway.

On The Picture Show Man, I think I got as much leeway as I could have expected. I hear a lot of nonsense about the auteur theory, which I think has crippled a lot of people unnecessarily.
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GUIDE FOR THE
AUSTRALIAN FILM PRODUCER: PART 6
SERVICE AGREEMENTS — 1

In this sixth part of a 19-part series, Cinema Papers contributing editor Antony I. Ginnane, and Melbourne solicitors Leon Gorr and Ian Baillieu discuss the first of a series of talent and crew service agreements the producer must deal with after he has secured a suitable property and the financing to bring it to the screen.

Service agreements for crew and cast have many features in common: for example, a concern for appropriate credit billing; provision for reconstituting the agreement in the event of the employee’s prolonged illness; and general similarity in the approach to breaches; scope of authority of the employee to contract on behalf of the production company; use of name and likeness clauses; and a veto on injunctive relief by the employee. Each agreement, however, has to concern itself primarily with the exact tasks of the particular employee.

Because of the importance the director has in the look and shape of the completed feature film, it is appropriate for the producer to consider his choice for this key post, and having made the choice ponder the extent of ‘creative’ freedom he is able to give him.

However confident the producer may be of the director’s skills and temperament, it is probably well for him to realize that it is generally the producer who has raised the money for the project and it is to the producer that the disgruntled investors will turn if the finished film does not perform at the box-office. The director may be able to rely on the official response the film has received to hype himself onto another production, but the producer may find that his sources of finance have dried up.

While permitting the director all creative freedoms and allowing him to operate as free from interference as possible in the production and post-production of the film, there are a number of key areas where the producer must, in almost all circumstances, retain the final say. The right of final cut is the most obvious of these; others might include key lead casting (in which area marketing considerations frequently have to stray); choice of lab and certain post-production facilities; and all marketing, distribution and exhibition decisions.

In these days of “post-auteur theory consciousness”, the producer must make these points clear in his agreement with the director. The number of post-production disagreements between producer and director are legion, with the Grimaldi-Bertolucci dispute only the most famous of recent memory. Although in disputes such as these it is difficult to be totally clear about the facts, from the producer’s point of view it seems plain that a breached agreement, whether for creative reasons or not, is simply that. Let the producer adequately protect himself at first instance when both sides are smiling at the prospect of the commercial and artistic success they are both about to make.

THE DIRECTOR’S AGREEMENT

Precedent 9A set out below is a short-form director’s employment agreement. The agreement begins by setting forth the employment relationship between the producer and the director, and sets forth some of the activities that the director by custom and convention ought to involve himself with.

Clause 2 sets out the locations at which the director will be expected to render services to the production.

Clause 3 sets out certain other tasks that the director covenants to undertake and gives the producer the final veto on casting. This clause also deals with any written material that the director may contribute to the screenplay and gives the producer the same rights on use and treatment of that material, and the same warranty he has received for the original screenplay from the author as set out in Precedent 3.

Clause 4 deals with the director’s responsibility for any retakes required. If the director has a busy upcoming schedule, he may try to reduce the six-month period set out in the precedent within which time he has to make himself available. It is common for this period to be reduced as low as two months, depending on the speed of upcoming release of the film.

Once again the respective bargaining powers of the producer and the director will decide the issue. Clause 5 provides the producer with further elements of general control over the activities of the director.

The question of the director’s compensation is dealt with in Clause 6. The amount of money and the way in which it is paid to the director for his services is capable of infinite variation. Sometimes the director may be paid a lump sum, payable weekly or in some agreed split between the pre-production time, production time and post-production time.

The director may want portions of his compensation payable over a period of years for tax reasons. He may accept a combination of cash payment and a deferred amount, pari passu, with...

SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE

The publication of this series on the Guide for the Australian Film Producer in subscription form by Cinema Papers, in conjunction with the authors Antony I. Ginnane, Leon Gorr and Ian Baillieu, is proceeding.

Subscribers to the series will initially receive a hard back loose leaf folder containing all the material published to date, together with material not previously published due to limitation of space. As the series progresses further material will be mailed to subscribers at regular intervals.

This subscription service will be an invaluable aid to all those involved in film business including the producer trying to set up his first film, the writer about to sell his first script, the busy lawyer, the accountant or the distribution-exhibition executive who finds himself confronted with new problems as the local production industry grows.

Teachers of film will also find the service a valuable aid.
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other deferrals out of some percentage of producer's gross or net profits. He may want cash, a deferment and a piece of the producer's gross or net profits. As well as a flat compensation package, the director may be provided with first-class round trip transportation to any extra-home territory locations, per diem accommodation and meals. The director may also be provided with a car for the duration of the production.

The ambit and scope of these arrangements will be the subject of discussion between the producer and the director's agent. The producer will be keen to see that some element of the producer's cash compensation is not paid until the last stages of post-production, so as to maintain some hold over the director at a time when he may be preparing for other projects.

In Clause 7, the director agrees that the film, the results of the director's services, will be the sole property of the producer, giving him the right to treat it in any way he deems fit. The director agrees to assist the producer in obtaining any necessary copyright registration for the screenplay amendments he may have made.

Clause 8 gives the producer the right to use the director's name, biography and photo in the production of the film. The producer normally denied the right to imply that the director endorsed any associated merchandising created for the film.

Billing is always a vexed question for actors and technicians; Clause 9 attempts to deal with it. Traditionally the director would receive separate card credit in the form 'directed by' and frequently (but not always) this card would be the last of the main titles. These days it is uncommon for the director, especially, but not necessarily, if he is a producer-director, to receive an additional credit, frequently before the title, or a separate card, reading 'A John Doe film'. Less frequently, and often when the producer is a writer-director, the director may receive a possession credit, before the title, or on the title card: "John Doe's X." The credit clause generally specifies the size of the billing (100 per cent of the size of type used for the title of the cinematograph film), and provides for billing exceptions such as teaser and directory advertising.

Most director's agreements still have what is known as a 'morals clause'. The morals clause is an almost anachronism in its terminology these days. It was of great importance in the Hollywood of the 30s and 40s when the questionable conduct of an actor or technician could be seized upon by the extremely powerful gossip columns to attack the film and its producer-studio for "letting the industry down".

These days a morals clause could still be useful to a producer if he was searching for ways to terminate an agreement with a difficult director, or director-actor, who otherwise be within the letter of his agreement.

Clause 10 is the "morals clause" in this precedent. Some directors will argue that this sort of clause is insulting and offensive and object strongly to its inclusion.

The agreement allows the producer to obtain injunctive relief to prevent any breach of the agreement by the director, but the director is specifically prevented from obtaining any injunction prohibiting the release of the film, even if the producer is in breach. This clause is common in American agreements. It has been suggested however that an Australian Court of Equity might not consider itself bound by this clause. However, as an injunction is only a discretionary remedy at any time, it is probably worth including.

Clause 13 attempts to solve the problem of the

cinematograph film in selecting and assisting in the selection of sets, costumes, music and locations; in preparing film in a manner to enhance production; increasing production values and effecting economies in the production of the cinematograph film; and in the production of the cinematograph film in co-operation with the producer in the interests of the producer with respect to the production of the cinematograph film: in cutting and adding any scenes, extra services required under this paragraph and the Director shall advise the Producer if at any time proposed.

Clause 7 is an example. The agreement allows the producer to obtain the necessary insurance. It is submitted, however, that as the local industry develops the concepts of producer and director will become more and more distinct and that the precedent below looks forward to that time.

PRECEDENT 9A
Employee's Employment Agreement

1. The Producer does hereby engage the services of the Director and the Director hereby engages his services unto the Producer as a Director (as that term is generally understood and commonly used in the motion picture industry of a film Cinematograph Film to be based on a screenplay currently being written by one or more writers in collaboration with the Director). (b) The Producer shall be allowed to express his opinions and suggestions concerning the direction of the Photoplay. (c) The Director shall not conduct any negotiations with any agent or representative of any actor or technician engaged or to be engaged in the Photoplay. (d) The Director shall not make any written or oral contract with any actor or technician engaged or to be engaged in the Photoplay. (e) The Director shall not sign or execute any agreement or instrument in connection with all such matters. (f) The Director shall not make, agree to or in any way be concerned in. (g) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (h) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (i) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (j) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (k) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (l) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (m) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (n) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (o) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (p) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (q) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (r) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (s) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (t) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (u) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (v) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (w) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (x) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (y) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry. (z) The Director shall not make any agreement or instrument in the field of business or industry.

2. The Producer shall be entitled to an option for six (6) months from the date of this agreement for the production of any Cinematograph Film and the producer shall have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings for the purpose of or for any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (a) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (b) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (c) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (d) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (e) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (f) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (g) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (h) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (i) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (j) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (k) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (l) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (m) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (n) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (o) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (p) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (q) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (r) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (s) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (t) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (u) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (v) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (w) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (x) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (y) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings. (z) In any period of time for any purpose whatsoever. The Director shall not have the right to make any added scenes, changes, process shots, transparency, such shoots or additional sound recordings.
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In 1970 I went from Paris to London, after being involved in real estate there, to represent Albert Caraco, a Paris-based agent who represented various independent producers. In the three years I was there, I learnt everything about the film industry from the bottom up. Caraco pioneered the concept of pre-selling films territory by territory and I was involved with the London screenplay output: The Virgin and the Gypsy; Murphy's War; Perfect Friday, etc.

What is a pre-sale basically?

When a producer has prepared a package — that is to say, scripts, director, stars, etc — he can then go to independent distributors in every territory and sell the rights of that film, though it is still to be made, for an in advance guarantee against receipts. Then the producer could go to a bank, at that time the Bank of America, and discount the contract. This money could then be used for production.

The distributor who advanced the amount of pre-sale would, of course, receive no equity as such in the film. His payment was merely the fee and expenses, protected by a completion guarantee. The banks wanted their money. So all the films looked very good on paper.

Neither Dmitri de Grunwald (the producer of London screenplay output) nor Joseph Shaftel (another pre-sales expert of that time) are still operational. What went wrong, specifically with the de Grunwald films?

I think they were to some extent too ambitious: the budgets were too high. The films did not recoup the guarantees, prints or advertising that the distributors had advanced. And the banks wanted their money.

How did you become involved with Hemdale?

While I was in London I met John Daly and at this time his foreign sales manager, Tony Birley, was leaving. So I took Birley's place and handled Daly's foreign sales for two years. At the time we had been producing The Amazing Mr Blunden, Triple Echo, Images, Where Does it Hurt?, and these were films I sold worldwide for Hemdale — including Australia.

Were you involved in the attempted U.S. sale?

No, I had contact with Australian distributors — not Australian films. I was on the other side; I was selling films to Australia.

Were you still with Hemdale when in 1973 "The Cars that Ate Paris" was shown at Cannes?

Yes, that was my introduction to selling Australian films. Jim McElroy came to London with a print under his arm making the rounds of the distribution companies. He showed the film to John Hogarth, who was then head of Hemdale's British distribution company, and I went along to the screening. We liked the film, didn't know what we were going to do with it, but thought we wanted to be involved.

Hemdale did not distribute the film, but we managed to sell it to the British distributor. I then took it on for foreign sale. It was a hard task, but some sales were made: South Africa, West Africa, France, and Britain of course. I think that was all for the first six months.

With the benefit of hindsight, can you say what went wrong with that deal? It seemed the classic case of an Australian deal that didn't happen . . .

Well Frank Moreno, who was then with Roger Corman, saw the film in Cannes. He liked it and wanted to buy it for the U.S. We started negotiations and the contract was to be drawn up by Roger Corman. Two months later, we still hadn't received a contract and we went back and forth exchanging drafts for six to eight months and nothing happened until, nine months later, Roger Corman released a film called Death Race 2,000 which very strangely resembled The Cars That Ate Paris. Frank Moreno had left New World by this time and the deal was never finalized.

Frank was quite embarrassed when we met next year in Cannes and talked about the non-deal, but I
am happy to say that last year I sold the rights of Cars outright to New Line Cinema. We gave them rights to re-edit and re-voice the film, and they re-titled it The Cars That Ate People. We hear that it has done reasonably well.

How did you come to leave Hemdale?

It was in 1974 when Cine Artists were making Aloha Bobby and Rose. Nobody had decided how to go about marketing the film overseas, whether to go to Columbia or Warners, as they subsequently did for certain territories, or sell it independently. Hemdale had not produced anything for two years, and I decided that firstly, I hadn't enough to do within the company, and secondly, I could very well do for myself what I had been doing for them. So I decided to freelance and operate from Paris.

Is this because of your previous background in Paris, or do you especially like the town?

I had never worked in film there but I like living in Paris. London has become very depressing these days and at that time I felt nothing was happening there in independent production. As a result, distributors had no reason to come to London to buy, and Paris was really a better centre for foreign distributors. I started with no cash — I had one office and a secretary — but I was fortunate enough to have an arrangement with Hemdale for the first 12 months whereby I was a consultant for them, looking for European product for Britain. They also gave me certain films with foreign territories unsold, I had The Cars That Ate Paris and was then given For Fake, the film Orson Welles made for Janus in Germany.

The next Australian film you were involved in would have been "Picnic at Hanging Rock" . . .

Yes, that happened a year ago before Cannes. The McElroys wanted me to handle the film, but as they were not the only investors, I had to meet the South Australian Film Corporation and the Australian Film Commission in the person of Alan Wardrope. We had several meetings and they screened the film for me. I just flipped over it and they decided to let me handle it.

When "Picnic at Hanging Rock" first came out in Australia, I think it is fair to say that the initial response was that it might have some difficulty getting its fairly large budget back. Was that your response when you first saw it, and did you expect it would do as well in the West End, for example, as it has?

I was not surprised at all. I think the film has great potential worldwide. In Europe, certainly, it's a film that's easily understood and acceptable to the audiences. I think Picnic was the perfect film to launch the so-called new wave of Australian cinema in Europe. It's a film that could have been made anywhere. I don't think it is an Art House film, and it's certainly not playing Art Houses in London or Paris where it was released in subtitled and dubbed versions.

I understand "Picnic" has been taken off the market for U.S. Is there any reason a sale hasn't been made there yet?

Some of the major distributors liked it, but the U.S. is not a territory I was given to look after.

What territories don't you have on "Picnic"?

I exclusively have Europe, including Britain. All the territories I have been asked to look after are now sold.

You have seen a fair slice of the new Australian films. Could you categorize some of the plus factors that Australian films have on the world market, and also draw out our attention to some of the negative factors?

The major plus factor would be your top production values. Everyone in Europe and the U.S. is amazed that Caddie or Picnic at Hanging Rock only cost around $500,000. I think you have excellent technicians here at all levels, especially lighting cameramen.

When "Picnic at Hanging Rock" was shown at Cannes, I think the French were most interested, and there were five or six other French directors who came to look at it. It was international from the very beginning, in a way that local films in America are not. Australian cinema is very respected in Europe, and it can be a help to have your film respected. The French have trouble with Australian accents, but if the film is not as good as you expect, then you are ahead. And that has happened in the past. I don't say this will be the case in The Last Wave. The rushes I have seen are in the blockbuster class.

Do you see any difficulties for yourself as a sales agent, or for your clients if you become too closely associated in the eyes of world distributors as an agent of Australian films?

I have a very good relationship with Pat Lowell, and I think she is quite happy with the sales I have made on Picnic. We have been discussing Break of Day and Summerfield, and it is early days yet, but I am hoping to handle both.

You also have a lot of talent in Australia. Could you mention "Summerfield" which I understand you are also involved in . . .

I have been talking about "The Last Wave" and haven't mentioned "Summerfield" which I think is going to do very well. The major plus factor would be the quality of the script and Peter Weir's name. So, have a quality director before stars.

But for a pre-sale to an American major, is an American star necessary?

I think Richard Chamberlain is a recognizable name, but he is not a star. I don't think his name alone could have made a pre-sale to the U.S. It is an excellent name for the film and it will certainly make it possible to have a very good television sale in U.S. But it would not help the pre-sales.

What are your views on the AFC and its profile overseas?

All I can judge is the AFC's impact in Cannes last year, and that was excellent. I think it certainly helped in putting Australia on the map. I think the only thing the AFC has to watch out for is if they try the same approach again then they will need the product to follow the campaign.
CANNES 1977

Antony I. Ginnane

One might have tended to attribute the apparent declining quality of the films in the competitive events of the Cannes Film Festival over the past five years to a bad case of deja vu on the part of the viewers, were it not for the protestations by everyone, from Festival president Robert Favre Le Bret and director Maurice Bessy to juror Pauline Kael, that 1977 was not a good year.

Certainly the cancellation of the first day’s programming by Le Bret, because he was unable to get enough suitable entries, added to a gloom caused for Festival president Robert Favre Le Bret and director Maurice Bessy to juror Pauline Kael, that 1977 was not a good year.

Certainly the cancellation of the first day’s programming by Le Bret, because he was unable to get enough suitable entries, added to a gloom caused for Cannes arrivals by the rain-swept weather. So much for the sunny Cote d’Azur; so much for upbeat cinema. Even given the difficulty of finding entries for competitive events in a year when worldwide production has been drastically reduced, there was no excuse for some of the errors and omissions in the official selection. Most scandalous was the inclusion of Yves Boisset’s Mauve Taxi as an official French entry to the exclusion of the new Robert Bresson, The Devil, Probably. But there were other queries: the perennial pretence from Spanish director Carlos Saura, this year entitled Elisa, My Love, and the two British entries: Ridley Scott’s The Duellists and Anthony (4 in The Morning) Simon’s Black Joy.

The Directors’ Fortnight, which can usually be relied on to offset the boredom of the main competition, faltered this year with only Howard Smith’s Gizmo proving memorable. In the Critics’ Week there were no standouts, except for the Japanese entry, The Youth Killer, by Hasegawa.

Failing back on films in the market is usually necessary at Cannes. This year there wasn’t much of a choice. George Romero’s Martin attracted a lot of attention; as did David Cronenberg’s Rabid. Chabrol’s Alice of the Last Fugue, played to one packed screening, while Mark Lester’s Stunts vied with Brian Trenchard Smith’s Deathcheaters for action fans. But these were six out of 600.

All in all it was a lean year. And it has been this leanness, and the recriminations that it caused at official levels, that may make the 1978 Cannes Festival the most interesting for many years, with many changes to management, format and style.

THE COMPETITION

Jan Dawson

"Que le cinéma aille à sa perte, c’est le seul cinéma. Que le monde aille à sa perte, c’est le seul politique." — Marguerite Duras, Le Camion

The opening film of the festival was La Stanza del Vescovo (The Bishop’s Bedroom). The settings for Risi’s film — shot on and around Lake Maggiore — are

Geraldine Chaplin and Fernando Rey (who won Best Actor) in Carlos Saura’s Elisa, My Love.
provoke tolerance, shock, political reflection; effectively, it is calculated to reassure, like any fairytale with or without a happy ending.

The plot concerns an afternoon in 1939, in the course of which two neighbours meet, consummate a hopeless and futureless affection that blossoms from their confinedamasies, then return to their separate and sorry destinies.

The Brief Encounter formula is given a new look because the woman is an oppressed mother of six, and the man is a persecuted and suicidal homosexual. (The reassurance is provided because it is really Sophia Loren and arguably still the world's most beautiful woman; and he is really a legendary womanizer, and screen lover called Marcello Mastroiani.) Their clumsy and comic idyll on one of Mussolini's monster housing estates is inflated to political significance by taking place on the day of Hitler's triumphal visit to Rome, and indeed the end of the day will see Mastroiani led away to an island detention camp.

But such is the power of fairytale, that the audience feels sorrier for the fate of poor Sophia with her unrequited love and her blackshirt husband than it does for the political prisoner. The strutting participants in the blackshirt parade are gently satirized but occupy a primarily decorative function; they are subtilely depoliticized, as much an artistic effect as Pasqualino di Santis' color camerawork, washed out to a palette of greys and pale, pale pinks. Without the historical setting, the film would be an incongruous entertainment, a charmingly performed, old-fashioned three-act play whose 'daring' tolerance of homosexuals is softened by the revealing fact that even a homosexual can make love with Sophia Loren.

With the political background, the film becomes indisputably offensive, continuing the trend of too many films in the 1967 festival of using the Third Reich and the concentration camps as a substitute for political significance. The images of the tiny child alone on the mountainside are genuinely satirized but occupy a primarily decorative function; they are subtilely depoliticized, as much an artistic effect as Pasqualino di Santis' color camerawork, washed out to a palette of greys and pale, pale pinks. Without the historical setting, the film would be an incongruous entertainment, a charmingly performed, old-fashioned three-act play whose 'daring' tolerance of homosexuals is softened by the revealing fact that even a homosexual can make love with Sophia Loren.

Parental authority and the revolt against it have provided adominant motif in this year's films. A classic case, of course, is Cacoyannis' film of Iphigenie, based on Euripides, though in this case sadly not filmed theatre. Cacoyannis goes about the task of opening up the play for the screen with a veritable excess of zeal. His restless camera swirls up and down (and mostly round) the main lines, taking in the half-naked bodies of what looks like the entire Hellenic population (representing the Grotesque Troops waiting for the wind to launch their thousands ships).

The camera's epic sweep and the cast of thousands are matched by the dramatic pitch of Irene Papas' Clytemnestra, giving vent to an unchecked histronic grief on discovering that her husband Agamemnon has (adulteries, betrayals, a strike, a child burned to death) in a muted lyrical style, the film has provoked somewhat inflated comparisons with Jean Renoir. Yet the lyricism (like the comparison) is dampened by the film's epic ambitions, and by the fact that its large cast are never really permitted to make the transition from violettes to truly rounded characters for whom we can feel any depth of human sympathy.

An opening scene little warns us to try and sort out which character is which, or who is married to whom. The warning is well placed, but it leaves us with a little more than an invitation to an extended dance of the generations, at whose joys and sorrows we should uniformly smile. And as at home at all family parties, after a while the smile wears a little thin. Which is pity, since scene for scene, the film's is a fine achievement. warm lyrical, charming and affectionate.

What is lacking is any overall sense of direction or progress, and without that, even though the faces change, the structure becomes wearisomely repetitive. It was originally inspired by Ferri's discovery of his own family photograph album, and its structure increasingly resembles the flicking-over of nostalgia-tinted pages. It is bound together by a sung commentary, an intrusive ballad made considerably more interesting at the reading here by the phonetically-spelled English sub-titles.

If the preceding films were all disappoiting, the good news is about three films (two of them generally dismissed as boring and pretentious) which reflect on and unobtrusively question the nature of cinema, turning their backs on nostalgia and pushing forward into uncharted, and therefore unclimicked territory.

Of these, the most accessible and least controversial is La Dentelliere (The Lacemaker) by Claude Goretta. representing Switzerland in the main competition and in fact a French-Swiss-German co-production containing a superlatice performance by French actress Isabelle Huppert.

Reduced to a narrative outline (girl meets boy, girl loses boy, girl goes mad), its story — adapted from the novel by Forties Hollywood, when the studios were making production for the ladies matinee audience: "women's weepies", they were known in the trade. It is the way the story is told — precise, understated, above all unchoreographed and without a trace of sentimentality — that makes the film's distinction. This, and the fact that it is a film without villains. Its characters, not excluding the determinately ditsy blonde played by Florence Giorgetti or the insecure young intellectual played by Yves Beneyton, are variations on the theme of disappointed hope, a theme which reaches its fullest expression in the final sequence where Pomme (Huppert) sits alone in the sterile room of a mental clinic, knitting.

It's a measure of Goretta's precise power of observation and of his discreet characterizations that his film can transcend the inherent melodrama of this final scene. Pomme's anorexic breakdown is not a scriptwriter's dramatic contrivance, but an inevitable extension of the shy, vulnerable, insecure personality that has been developed throughout the film. It seems as inevitable as the initial holiday romance between this demure hairdresser's apprentice and the introverted student, as inevitable as his

Irene Papas (Clytemnestre) and the extraordinary 12-year-old Tatiana Papamokspou (Iphigenie). Catholic and Iphigenie.

A scene from Paolo and Vittorio Taviani's Padre Padrone (Father Boss) which was awarded the Golden Palm by the international jury.
growing discomfort in the face of her lack of ambition.

And what makes the film so truly remarkable, and so truly innovatory in terms of current cinema, is that its central character is created almost without words. Her silences convey a range of emotions from joy to resignation, amusement, tolerance, defeat, and despair: we and the camera are privileged to see more than (the inevitably egocentric characters with whom Pomma acts out her banal tragedy, and it is indeed in this that part of the tragedy lies.

Yet, in spite of the moral note (of resigned despair, rather than tragic explosion), like all Goretta’s film La Dentelliere is immensely humorous. The girl’s seaside holiday, the extrovert, filled by her lover, throwing her teddy-bear out of the window as a surrogate for herself; the lovers first tête-a-tête, a subtly informal supper punctuated by the sounds of energetic love-making from the room next door: again one feels that if only the characters could see all that the camera sees, they would enjoy themselves so much more.

Descriptions run the risk of reducing Goretta’s film to banality, analysis of it to pretentiousness. It is a work of exquisite simplicity, perfectly — and modestly — achieved. It gives expression, and interest, to a silent sensibility, and this expression can be only grossly paraphrased in journalistic prose.

Also concerned on a narrative level with a potential love that remains unfulfilled is Marguerite Duras’ extraordinary film La Camion (The Lorry), though here the narrative elements are disturbingly secondary. The film is as much a monument to language and the power of imagination as Goretta’s. The camera is privileged to see of the expressive powers of silence.

The couple in Duras’ text are a talkative woman (of whom we know only that she is “declassée” and “d’un certain âge”) and a monosyllabic truck-driver who gives her a ride. We never see these two characters, other than in our imagination induced by the itinerant language and the powerful images of sound, of which the film is almost without. It gives expression, and interest, to a silent sensibility, and this expression can be only grossly paraphrased in journalistic prose.

Equally daring, but primarily visual rather than verbal, my favorite film so far this year is Le Vieux Pays ou Rimbaud est Mort by Quebec director Jean-Pierre Lefebvre. As with the Goretta, it is hard to describe the film’s content, without making it sound clichéd it follows a Quebec pilot, Abel (Marcel Sabourin), from Paris to Marseilles, from the initial love to brief encounter romance. And it deals, quite gently and obviously, with a quest for cultural roots and meaning.

The content is clearly not remarkable, and it is through the film’s subtlety that its expression. It begins in a fine art gallery, with a slightly pedantic lecture, the film’s content, and the difference between expressionism and impressionism, and in the scenes which immediately follow Paris and its occupants — captured mostly in fixed shots which have a slightly surreal and unreal quality — appear in tableaux evocative alternately of Cezanne paintings and touristic postcards.

Abel is unable to relate to the historical colorfulness to the darker-colored scenes of family suffering he witnesses in Charleville (Rimbaud’s hometown, predominantly black and grey). In Marseilles, where a Parisian social worker has also come in quest of her own detached roots), expressionism gives way to impressionism to the play of light, especially on water. But the beauty of the Midi proves ultimately of no more relevance to the Paris parks or the ugliness of Charleville — as Abel concludes — it is all like a vast picture postcard, but he doesn’t know how to send it to. And this sense of dislocation, of people moving through décors to which they can feel no more than an historical relationship, dominates the style of the film.

By turns gay and sad, and for the most part languorously beautiful, its beauty remains, for its Quebecois hero, as separate from his own experience as the Cezanne paintings on the museum walls. The France of his ancestors, the France he has come to find, exists only in the museums and in his imagination.

SELECTED HORS D’ŒUVRES

Antony I. Ginnane

Mark L. Lester’s Stunts is a return to form by the maverick director after the last year of Bobbi Jo and the Outlaw. A script by Barney Cohen provides a hoary old plot line about a couple of stunts working for a company who find their numbers diminishing after a series of freak accidents, and look to themselves to find the killer who must be in their midst.

The script is just an excuse for a series of jumps, crashes, burnings, fights and other acrobatic displays which Lester treats in a tongue-in-cheek fashion. While the exchanges of Robert Forester and Fiona Lewis never reach the comic strip campness of the mother and daughter relationship in Truck Stop Women, Lester manages to suspend audience disbelief between stunts and have us genuinely concerned over the identity of the saboteur.

It is interesting to note that while Brian Trenchard Smith relies on a Carry On style humour in Deathdealchers to lift his juvenile audience over those passages between stunts, Lester uses a different sort of humour, the deadpan serial-like seriousness of his leads to provide similar effect. If he is marginally more successful than Trenchard Smith, it is probably because the Australian accents of Grant Pardoe and Bobbi Jo Hargreaves lend themselves less readily to pop visuals than the Trans Atlantic blandness of Lester’s leads.

Martin is the latest foray into the low budget thriller genre by George Romero, the director of the now classic Night of the Living Dead and the less famous The Crazies. It is further example of Romero’s skill in using the camera, Hitchcock like, to suck us into the plot development, then leave us there to the mercy of the editor and the censor.

The film is a sort of vampiric family tale which might be more about cultural religious mania and the effects of devotional hysteria on a young boy’s impressionable mind.

There is a strange emptiness about the soundtrack, well with the measured imagery of the film. After a most unsettling opening, introducing us to Martin as a boy in a train’s sleeping compartment (is this a dream?), the film skips between sepia-tinted flashback and modern day chill. An unknown cast, headed by John Amplas and Lincoln Maazel, are realistic and believable.

With The Parasite Murders, David Cronenberg, who is better known for his work in the horror genre, takes on a more mainstream project. The film is pitched somewhere on that thin line between terror and black comedy. The horror, often aped with sexual imagery, is frequently chilling as the parasite takes hold of its initial victims; but becomes wildly funny as mayhem breaks out during a plastic surgery operation when the operating surgeon, prey to the disease, slices of a nurse’s finger and attempts to eat it.

Cronenberg is fascinated by images of paranoia. White-coated men in garbage trucks patrol his Montreal under siege, jumping infected bodies into disposal units like some kind of cyphersh re-education unit in some utopian totalitarian regime. Marilyn Chambers in her first non-porno role acquits herself most creditably.

In the Directors’ Fortnight, Howard Smith’s Gizmo was that wonder of wonders — a competing documentary. A screwball collection of newsreel footage of man’s attempts to fly; from early human controlled flying apparatus to numerous ‘human flies’; from men being shot out of cannons to outrageous motor cars, the trickiest moment man’s legs to man the parasitic symbiosis, a hymn to his perseverance and a record of his progress.

The early black and white newsreel footage, meticulously obtained, coupled with more recent newsreel material and especially staged footage is a madcap collection of laughs. 

Perhaps the festival’s most accessible and least controversial film, Claude Goretta’s La Dentelliere (The Laceremaker), with Isabelle Huppert.
THE AUSTRALIANS AT CANNES

Antony I. Ginnane

Even the Australian Film Commission, in its most enthusiastic flights of public relations hype, would not deny that the reaction to the Australian films at Cannes this year was disappointing as compared with 1976. Primarily, the fault lay with the product which was delivered — there was no Caddie, Mad Dog or Picnic to attract widespread international interest. In fact, if it had not been for the worldwide shortage of product, which was most apparent in the second week of Cannes and which turned the Festival Marche into a seller’s market, it is doubtful if many Australian films would have been sold at all. As it was, the AFC claimed that of the 16 films taken to Cannes all were sold somewhere.

Storm Boy is an interesting case, because the combined total of film offers received for that film would have almost doubled in dollar volume its nearest competitor Deathcheaters, which still netted a comfortable $130,000 in sales. The South Australian Film Corporation marketing director, Peter Rose, believed he could do still better by waiting, especially in view of the initial record-breaking domestic release, and decided to hold off.

Most of the other films sold one or two territories, but neither The Picture Show Man or F.J. Holden, which were vaunted as the front-runners this year, proved exciting to foreign buyers.

The AFC again provided back-up for the producers at Cannes with meeting facilities, a switchboard, multi-lingual translators and a video cassette viewing room. While the extent of AFC expenditure was unfavorably compared in the Australian press with the minuscule budgets of the Canadian and British delegations, it is probably fair to say that the AFC does a better job.

The AFC’s main problem seems to be meeting the needs of those producers who choose not to have the Commission’s staff handle their foreign sales, and those producers who are not AFC funded. With next year’s mooted change in the Export Market Development Grants Scheme (yet again) it may well be that the number of Australians at Cannes will decline, after the high point this year.

The Cannes trip is a necessary blood-letting for any Australian producer or entrepreneur, in as much as it throws the novice into the real world of buying and selling on commercial merits without the aid of government subsidy or national pride to ferry along the inveterate losers. For the future, the AFC may have to make some hard marketing decisions on the question of taking all local films produced each year to Cannes. Of this year’s crop three or four were virtually unsellable, and one doubts if the token distribution deals they may have picked up would have even partly recouped the cost of their Cannes junket.

While there is a danger of the AFC bureaucracy being given more power than they already have, if they are allowed to arbitrarily choose what films they will promote, it must also be remembered that any producer can enter his film in the market of his own volition.

On the other hand, the track record of the AFC in investment choice over the past 12 months makes one question whether it is competent to make such a selection. But someone has to do it. Better four or five obvious sellers on display than 16 of varying commerciality.

In sum, the Australian presence at Cannes reiterated the strength of Brian Trenchard Smith as a commercial action director (cf Man From Hong Kong in 1975); confirmed the need for an official Australian presence; and proved yet again that no amount of hype can sell films the public or the distributors do not want.

TERRITORIES SOLD AT CANNES

| Dot and the Kangaroo: Spain, Sweden, Denmark, France, Peru, Central America, Venezuela, Norway, Italy, Greece, French Canada, Puerto Rico, Santa Domingo, Germany, Belgium, Negotiating the U.S. |
| Break of Day: Italy, Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, Peru, Bolivia, Germany, Ecuador. |
| Storm Boy: France, Canada, East Asia, Belgium, Mozambique, Norway, Germany, Italy, Denmark, Latin America (6 countries), Japan. |
| Summer of Secrets: Italy, U.S. |
| Fantasm Comes Again: Canada, Britain, Greece, Lebanon, Belgium, Switzerland. |
| Fantasm Comes Again: Canada, Britain, Greece, Lebanon, Belgium, Switzerland. |

F.J. Holden: Central America, Denmark, Germany, Sweden, Columbia, Puerto Rico, Santa Domingo.

Raw Deal: Sweden, Israel, Morocco, Central America, Peru, Venezuela, Italy, Greece, Denmark, Columbia, Puerto Rico, Santa Domingo, Iran.

Fantasm Comes Again: Canada, Britain, Greece, Lebanon, Belgium, Switzerland.

Summer of Secrets: No information as yet.

Singer and the Dancer: No information as yet.

Let the Balloon Go: Latin America (four countries).

Picknic: Latin America (three countries).
Peter Sykes, born in Melbourne in 1939, has been living on and off in London since 1964, where he has gained a reputation as a leading horror film director. His latest film, "To the Devil ... A Daughter", an Anglo-German co-production, was based on the Denis Wheatley best-seller.

Sykes first came to international attention in 1971 with "Demons of the Mind", which was labelled 'Horror film of the Year' by the London-based International Times, and gained a place at the Cinema Fantastique Festival in Paris.

During his years in London, Sykes directed a number of thrillers and comedies, including "The Committee" (1968), "Venom" (1971) and "The House in Nightmare Park" (1973).

Sykes, who will return to Australia this year, plans to direct "Eddie and the Breakthrough", a film of ethnic and multi-national violence located in the opal fields of Coober Pedy. The film will be an Anglo-American-Australian venture with an international cast.

Peter Sykes was interviewed for Cinema Papers, at his home in Florence, by Basil Gilbert.

After seeing "Demons of the Mind", film historian David Pirie described it as, "strange and compelling", and said you were one of "the most promising young directors" to work for Hammer Films. How did you get started in this genre?

I have always been fascinated by German Expressionist cinema — F. W. Murnau is one of my favorite directors — and this may have influenced me. However, the chain of events that led to Demons of the Mind began with the 16mm feature documentary, Walkabout to Cornwall, I made for the BBC. It was about a colony of Australian surfies living at Newquay on the Cornish coast and the wild parties they held. I offered it to the ABC following the Sydney Film Festival in 1967, but they said it was "not fit for public consumption".

Was this your first film in Britain?

Before Walkabout to Cornwall my experience in filmmaking had been limited to an 18-month training course with the BBC as a TV and film cadet. Before that I worked with another Australian, Donald Levy, a Ph.D. in physics, who had turned to making documentaries; he now teaches film at the California Institute of Arts. I was very impressed with Levy's documentary Time Is, so I wrote to him and he invited me to join him on the production of his first feature, Herostratus, an experimental film which set the Greek myth in contemporary times.

Walkabout to Cornwall was my first independent feature documentary. At the time, I was working freelance, and the following year I was commissioned to make a number of documentaries for the British Pavilion at EXPO '67 in Montreal. The series was called Britain Around the World, and it led to me meeting Peter Brook of the Royal Shakespeare Company. Later he invited me to be executive producer of Tell Me Lies!

Was your job as an executive producer mainly an administrative task?

Working with Brook meant doing everything: staying up all night writing scripts with him, talking with writers and musicians ... it was both administrative and creative. It was exhausting and incredibly stimulating, because he has an enormously active mind.

Tell Me Lies! was based on his musical "US", which was very controversial; it dealt with the lies perpetrated by both sides about the war in Vietnam. In the film we took a single idea from the play — the suicide by burning of an American Mormon protester on the steps of the Pentagon — shot a version of it in front of the U.S. embassy in London, and added further docu-
The hitch-hiker (Paul Jones) after decapitating the driver (Tom-Vempinski) in The Committee.

The whole thing was most hectic and we caught the action with a number of cameras.

How did you get to direct your first feature, “The Committee”?

Walkabout to Cornwall had a particular appeal to an American economist living and teaching in London, Max Steuer, the son of the famous Hollywood legal family. Max had written a macabre little story, called The Committee, and he asked me to turn it into a film. Max was really a frustrated filmmaker, and his legal background helped give the film a Kafkaesque quality. The Committee is more surrealistic than realistic, something of a sociological fantasy. For example, as the film opens, a young man is given a lift in a car, and when the car breaks down the owner looks under the bonnet, the young man decapitates him with the edge of the bonnet. Later the head is sewn on again and the body is slapped back into life.

A democratic committee, not a legal judge, decides whether this is a crime or not. It was very polemical.

The film was greeted with both praise and abuse by the London critics, but R. D. Laing liked it. Ian Wilson, the lighting-cameraman, had caught the mood beautifully, and the next thing I knew I was offered a couple of episodes for the British Avengers series on television.

It all sounds more like science-fiction than horror...

The spiders were part of dream and fantasy sequences which form a focus of the girl’s fears. For a setting we had the usual archetypal things such as moonlit lakes with shadowy banks deep in the Bavarian forest, with the young girl clad in translucent veils trying to escape from her obsessions — running away and being caught up in spider webs...

Very romantic ... in times of super-realism in the cinema...

It was my parody of High Noon, called Noon Doomsday, which got me an offer to do Venom, a little pot-boiler about sex and spiders which was shot largely on location in Bavaria. It features 19-year-old Czech actress, Neda Arneric, as a phobic young girl who believes that she is endowed with the power of a venomous spider and brings violent death to anyone she loves.

But the true villains were the spiders. We had a number of large bird-eating tarantulas flown in from Louisiana, in the U.S. You have never seen anything so vicious in your life. If they were put in the same space together they would attack each other, they were killers.

We had dozens of them, each about the size of a tennis ball. In the scenes where they had to crawl across human flesh, we had layers of wax put on the skin of the actors and actresses concerned, for the spiders gave a fairly nasty bite. They were quite horrific, making a hissing noise just before they struck. So we had a man standing nearby with a long pole, so that if they were going to strike, he could knock them out of the way.

We also shot some interesting scenes using microcinematography, showing how the spiders fed themselves.

Venom was certainly less realistic than recent films such as The Texas Chain Saw Massacre, but even that film has a high degree of romance in it. It is a very theatrical film, making use of well-established dramatic techniques. Venom is romantic in a more traditional and conventional way, but it is part of a valid film genre. Stylistically and visually it probably owes a debt to Murnau's Sunrise.

Who wrote the screenplay for "Venom"?

When I was asked to join the project a script already existed, but I was not completely happy with it. The producers allowed me to rewrite it, but when they saw the number of changes I had introduced they said I had written a different film to the one for which they had received financial backing. However, I was allowed to make certain changes in the script and the film looked beautiful.

Hammer Films saw Venom liked it, and asked me to make a film for them called Demons of the Mind, based on the life of Mesmer, from whom the word 'mesmerize' comes. I was given a fairly weak script, so I rewrote it after doing some research into Mesmer and his scientific techniques.

For instance, I went to the Welcome Institute in London, which had a medical museum, and there I discovered a fascinating device called a scarificator. It is a kind of mechanical leech.

In Mesmer's time, people frequently used leeches to draw blood letting to cure a wide range of physical and mental illnesses. The scarificator looks like a beautifully-engraved musical box. You place it on your arm, spin a handle, press a button and seven razor-sharp bladeclaws come up from underneath and dig into the flesh. The incisions are tiny but deep and over each cut is placed a little glass cup which has been gently heated over a Bunsen burner. The suction then draws blood up into the cup.

Mesmer would also hypnotize women while they were holding copper rods immersed in tubs of water and so on. His methods were not acceptable to the medical profession in Vienna, so they kicked him out.

However, Demons of the Mind is actually about a Mesmer-surrogate, Dr. Falkenberg, who has Mesmer's great flair and showmanship. He tries to justify himself by applying these methods to an aristocratic family living in a remote part of Bavaria.

I understand the censor deleted a rape scene...

It was more than a simple textbook rape scene. The censor didn't like the violence where the son of the family stuffs mud and earth into the girl's mouth to prevent her from crying out. We shot this in rather extreme close-up. It was very realistic.

Then there was a dream-sequence where the father, Baron Zorn, is being analyzed by Dr. Falkenberg and he talks about seeing this rather sexy girl masturbating with blood over her body. It was all shot through gauze — very impressionistic.

Would you describe the general style of "Demons of the Mind" as Gothic?

I tend to film very realistically, but I also give the audience some chance to use their imagination. I believe I have a feeling for the Gothic image, that is, a love of complex architectural settings, a feeling for detail of dress, of mood, of lighting, all with a slight element of exaggeration.

Was the film shot entirely in the studio?

We wanted a Bavarian castle, but rather than go to Bavaria, we researched in Britain and found a castle which had been built in the early 1900s near Brighton by a rich German banker — an architectural 'folly'. It was huge, and I was able to put the camera where I liked. The staircase was fabulous, the sort of thing you couldn't build in the studio.

However, I couldn't shoot everything there, so I unscrewed the huge thick doors and I boarded up the window panes and took them from the house and used them on the set. I was very lucky in having a most brilliant British designer working with me, and I learnt a great deal from him.

Who was that?

Michael Stringer. He designed not only for appearances, but also from a strictly practical point of view. The set was perfectly designed for perspective and camera angles. It was a tremendous number of takes, but Ray Milland did the lighting — he's the man Josephy speaks so highly of — and the result was a visually exciting film.

Did "Demons of the Mind" make money?

The critics thought it was good, but it didn't have the same impact on the public. It wasn't a recognisable horror subject; there was no Frankenstein in it. "What is it supposed to be about," they asked, "a melodrama?" It was a bit of a mess. I felt a bit confused; it had a lot of violence in it, perhaps too violent for its time.

I believe "Demons of the Mind" was the biggest production Hammer Films had made at this time, what was the budget...

The budget was £250,000 (SA392,500). That was relatively expensive, but the film got encouraging reviews and received the 'Horror Film Award of the Year' from International Times.

It also gained a place in Paris at the Cinema Fantastique Festival in the horror film section. It has become a cult film.

Where did you go from there?

Clive Exton, one of the top British writers for cinema and TV (he did 10 Rillington Place for Richard Fleischer), came to me and said, "I've seen your Demons of the Mind, I'm producing my first film called The House in Nightmare Park with Ray Milland and Frankie Howerd, how do you feel like doing a comedy?"

The film was to be a thriller-comedy, an American-created genre that Hollywood found to be a commercial smash-hit. A funnyman is placed among straight people, and well, the twain never meet. They look askance at him ("Who is this oaf?") and he assumes the role of square and strange, not at all like him. This is true farce, not mere slapstick. Blend in a few horror or thriller elements to this contrast and you have an exciting thriller-comedy.

For you, this was something old and something new?

That's right. I had already learnt to handle the thriller aspect, but with this type of comedy both Frankie Howerd and I were on new ground. He was used to playing stand-up comic roles of the Carry-On type, and now he had Ray Milland and a very good supporting cast — Kenneth Griffith, Hugh Burden, Rosalie Crutchley — a terrific cast.

Frankie Howerd had a 'character' role of a typical Dickensian reader of Shakespeare, and this was quite different to stand-up comedy. He had to become accustomed to doing a number of takes eight or more, instead of a single 'first-take' born of his comedic training.

For Ray Milland and the others this was familiar territory.

What about yourself?

I have always loved comedy, and favorite directors of mine such as Howard Hawks have demonstrated that one could make both screwball comedies and tough gangster films. It was much the same with Billy Wilder who made films as diverse as Some Like It Hot and Sunset Boulevard.

I wanted to work in comedy, so I went back and studied all the old silent films in the thriller-comedy genre, and learnt a great deal.

How important was the story in "The House in Nightmare Park"?

In a typical thriller-comedy, the story is relatively unimportant. This was an inheritance story. The setting is a big, dark, Gothic house with a comic element in among rather sophisticated people. Once they discover that he is due for a large inheritance, they plot and scheme to get it.

The whole piece is really a number of set scenes to chill and thrill the audience, and to mystify. Who is the killer? Who will the next victim be? That sounds like melodrama, but it has the edge of wit.

In one scene the repatriated British family from India put on a play for the evening's entertainment. They all dress up like gollywogs and nurses and do a macabre little dance where they all drop like puppets. Frankie Howerd is playing the part and he says, "Oh, my God! What do they do for an encore?" Then a woman screams and one of them is found with a dagger in the back. There are also some rather chilling twists in it, and visually it worked very well.

Concluded on P. 95.
### FILM CENSORSHIP LISTINGS

#### JANUARY 1977

**FILMS REGISTERED WITHOUT ELIMINATIONS**

For General Exhibition (G)

- All This and World War II: H. Rosenberg/Machar, U.S. (178:36 m)
- The Brother and the Swab: Vangelis, Greece (265:48 m)
- I'll Be Back: Susan Arl, U.S. (254:50 m)
- The Flies, Class A Grade A: Nikos Karapidis, Greece (187:45 m)
- I Have a Suffered a Lot For You: Studio Films, Greece (191:36 m)
- His Mother's Boy: Studio Films, Greece (273:20 m)
- The Jungle: Mimar Sinan Films, Turkey (250:41 m)
- Messenger: S. R. Koutoulis, Greece (217:45 m)
- The Strongest Karate (16mm): Y. Rawasoh, Japan (91:20 m)
- Truth Is Better: Silt Films, Greece (226:50 m)
- Umut (Hope): Lake Films, Turkey (219:45 m)
- We Are Penniless, My Love, Studio Films, Greece (208:07 m)
- The Wild Swans: C. Irimia, Italy (180:20 m)

For Restricted Exhibition (R)

- April Fool: Oenerya, Sweden (279:20 m)
- The Brothers Swear to Vengeance: T. Sagone, Italy (263:50 m)
- Swept Away: C. Adams/D. Owen, Canada (2590:00 m)
- Run, Virgin, Run: B. J. Curtis, U.S. (2029:82 m)
- Koritsi Bomba: C. Adams/D. Owen, Canada (2590:00 m)
- Moving Violation: P. Hanzell, Jamaica (1121:00 m)
- His Mother's Boy: Studio Films, Greece (273:20 m)
- The Last Tycoon: R. Altman, U.S. (2468:00 m)
- Mr Klein: R. Altman, U.S. (2880:00 m)
- The Cassandra Crossing: R. Wunsch/S. Friedman, U.S. (3265:00 m)
- The World's Last Sex Act: (Reconstructed version) (a): S. Harris, U.S.
- Special Conditions
- For showing not more than twice at Sydney Film Festival and then re-exported
- Not shown. Hong Kong
- For Mature Audiences (M)
- Not shown. France
- Not shown, Italy (2935:00 m)
- Dromos Iro-on (Hero's Road): A. Ferrigno, Italy (1130:00 m)
- Dark Victory: B. J. Curtis, U.S. (2029:82 m)
- The Long Holidays of 1936: R. Oppenheimer, U.S. (2469:00 m)
- Raise Ravens: E. Quejereta, Spain (2550:00 m)
- Girls in Love (La Mea de Dama): E. Quejereta, Spain (2550:00 m)
- The last film noted as inside Film Censorship Bulletin No. 11: Swept Away

**MARCH 1977**

**FILMS REGISTERED WITHOUT ELIMINATIONS**

For General Exhibition (G)

- The Incredible Sarah: H. Strauss, U.K./France (1267:24 m)
- The Last Message: Golden Harvest/R. Chow, Hong Kong (2405:20 m)
- "The Incredible Sarah": H. Strauss, U.K./France (1267:24 m)
- L'Emigrante (The Emigrant): M. Meszaros, Hungary (3000:00 m)
- Films Refused Registration

- Banging in Bangkok: S. Bach/K. Friedman, U.S. (2633:28 m)
- For Restricted Exhibition (R)

- The film was passed uncut in Australia in spite of having censorship problems in many countries.

### ELIMINATIONS

- Reason: Indecency and Indecent violence.
- Reason: Indecency

### FILMS REFUSED REGISTRATION

- Bajak Film, Turkey (1645:00 m)
- Laager: J. Corman, U.S. (2112.11 m)
- E Napoli Canta: A. Ferrigno, Italy (1827.28 m)
- No 1 Am Not Mad — No I Am Not Wise: N. Melas and Faros Films, Greece (2500:00 m)
- Banging in Bangkok: S. Bach/K. Friedman, U.S. (2633.28 m)
- Film Censorship Bulletin No. 9/76

### FILMS REGISTERED WITHOUT ELIMINATIONS

- (For showing not more than twice at Sydney Film Festival and then re-exported)
- Not shown. Hong Kong

### ELIMINATIONS

- Special Conditions

- Reprinted from Cinema Papers, July — 37

---

**For Restricted Exhibition (R)**

Safar Express: Foro/Creatia, Italy/W. Germany (2743:40 m)
- Mila: C. Cahalane, U.S. (1619:00 m)
- The Last Tycoon: R. Altman, U.S. (2468:00 m)
- Eleanor: P. Bart/M. Palevsky, U.S. (2176:30 m)
- The Cassandra Crossing: R. Wunsch/S. Friedman, U.S. (3265:00 m)
- The World’s Last Sex Act: (Reconstructed version) (a): S. Harris, U.S.
- Special Conditions
- For showing not more than twice at Sydney Film Festival and then re-exported
- Not shown. Hong Kong
- For Mature Audiences (M)
- Not shown. France
- For Restricted Exhibition (R)

- The film was passed uncut in Australia in spite of having censorship problems in many countries.
For more than 45 years, Cinesound and Movietone were synonymous with newsreels in Australia. In common with most other newsreels, they were produced as entertainment. But from 1931, until television made their closing inevitable, they provided a valuable record of Australian history.

In the 1920s, the Australasian Gazette, Paramount Animated Gazette and Pathé Animated Gazette were among the major Australian newsreels. By 1927, Paramount had reached its 500th issue, and Australasian was into its 800th. Twentieth Century-Fox also filmed some Australian news items, but generally joined these on to their overseas newsreels.

Less significant in retrospect, but perhaps just as important to the audience, were the numerous local newsreels such as the Express Gazette, the William Weekly News, Spencer’s Gazette and the Topical Budget which uniquely reflected urban life of the twenties and earlier.

Ray Edmondson, in a tribute to Cinesound and Movietone (Cinema Papers, March-April 1976), said only Fox and Australasian survived the transition to sound — Fox as Movietone News, and Australasian as the Cinesound Review.

The Herald Newsreel, which began in 1931, might have been viable, but it was absorbed by Cinesound the following year.

Most of Movietone’s and Cinesound’s material has been preserved, though not always in complete form; but of the thousands of reels of news film issued before the 1930s, only a few remain. Most of this material has vanished, no doubt a victim of the notion prevalent in the thirties that if a film didn’t have a soundtrack down the edge, it was worthless.

At the height of the Depression, major producers such as Paramount and Pathé probably made a considered judgement not to enter the sound news field; but for the local newsreels, the reason was much more basic. Produced on a shoestring, often a one-man operation, or allied to a small photographic studio, they had neither the resources to launch into sound, nor wide enough distribution to make it economically viable.

Indeed all the more surprising, then, to find, as reported by Ray Edmondson, that “... Around 1948, a newcomer even briefly joined the field, the Perth-based Westralian News, which was aimed at local audiences who were not seeing much of themselves in the Sydney-produced reels. Though of good quality, the reel lacked the economic base and production facilities necessary for survival (sound recording and printing had to be done each week in Melbourne) and it quietly founded before its first birthday.”

In fact, the year was 1947, and local audiences were certainly not seeing much of their state in either of the national newsreels. But this was not the reason for the newcomer emerging. It was a rather more interesting story than that, and although its economic base was small, it suffered from the more serious disadvantage that it was an independent venture and lacked the connections with distributors and exhibitors necessary to get it into the theatres.

In its brief history in 1931-32, the Melbourne-based Herald Newsreel tried to set up a much broader base, and contents lists in the records of the National Library show that it covered about as many events in WA as Cinesound did in its first 10 years. In WA, the reel was called The Western Mail Newsreel, in association with a local paper which is still published, though the name has been changed to The Countryman. It appears that nobody there today remembers The Western Mail Newsreel.

In early 1947, a large basement restaurant in central Perth was being converted into the Mayfair Newsreel Theatre — the first new theatre and “newsreel theatre” to be opened in Perth since the pre-war years. Newsreel theatres were operating in eastern states cities at the time, running a 60-70 minute program on a continuous basis, consisting of newsreels, travelogues, cartoons and other short films available in the distributors’ offices. Surprisingly, they were good money spinners, drawing an audience from visitors to the city.

Cinesound and Movietone had their headquarters in Sydney, and from their coverage, one could get the impression that from 1931 to 1975, most Australian news happened in NSW and to some extent in Victoria. Perhaps most of the newsworthy events did occur in these two states. Certainly, the bulk of the audience was there, but it hardly resulted in a balanced view of events in Australia.

For example, the contents lists of the two newsreels for the 1930s show that Cinesound restricted its coverage of events in WA almost entirely to the arrival at the Port of Fremantle of personalities from overseas, while Movietone covered similar events and a few additional news and magazine items each year. On one occasion, at least, Movietone took their sound equipment to Perth, while Cinesound never ventured across the desert with theirs.

The promoter of the Perth venture, Joel Moss, found that overseas newsreels were available to the theatre, but the local trade had closed ranks against him, and they would not supply either Cinesound Review or Australian Movietone News. Moss and his supporters were pessimistic about the prospects of their newsreel theatre without an Australian newsreel, and they decided that a newsreel would have to be produced in Perth. This was not the first time that an exhibitor had entered into a film production venture to assure himself of films for his own theatre, and it wasn’t the last.

A new company was set up — Southern Cross Newsreels Pty Ltd, later changed to Southern Cross Films Pty Ltd. Moss and Perth accountant John Macaulay were among the founders, and Macaulay’s partner, Bill Duff, was company secretary. Almost all the capital was raised locally. As producer and cameraman, they engaged Leith Goodall, who had been with Hoyts for 20 years, and was until then their chief projectionist. For four years during the thirties, he had been Fox Movietone’s freelance cameraman in WA. He agreed to work full time on the newsreel produced by Southern Cross.

There were no film processing or sound
recording facilities in Perth in 1947, and Goodall went to Melbourne to make arrangements with Roy Driver of Herschells Films for the lab work, editing and sound recording. Herschells was a long established production house, and had provided the base for the Herald Newsreel in 1931 and 1932.

The theatre could not be completed in time and more than one newsreel item was prepared and filmed prematurely. But all was ready by the second week of March. The first screening at the Mayfair Theatrette was to an invited audience on March 10, and the doors were opened to the public the next day. The program included the first issue of Westralian News.

From then until production ceased, a new issue appeared each Friday. Usually, each issue consisted of three items, but the issue of September 5 was devoted to a single event — the centenary of former WA statesman and explorer Lord Forrest.

Considering the staff, equipment and other resources available to their competitors Cinesound and Movietone, it was no small achievement for a local company with one camera and one employee to turn out a weekly newsreel which effectively filled the niche at the Mayfair.

To West Australians it was apparently just another newsreel, and although Film Weekly referred to it as a "popular attraction" at the Mayfair, and the morning daily commented favorably on its quality, it didn’t really attract much attention.

Film Weekly described the weekly routine of production of Westralian News: “Every Thursday night the negative is sent with the script to Sydney, where it is processed and sound recorded. It is returned by air and screened the following Thursday”.

It was sent to Herschells in Melbourne, not Sydney, and was issued each Friday. When shooting material, Goodall made notes which were sent with the unprocessed film to Herschells. He didn’t attempt to write the complete commentary for them, but gave sufficient information, and made suggestions on how the film might be edited. Artwork for the titles was also done by Herschells. The commentary was recorded by Melbourne radio announcer Lewis Bennett.

With the filming and production done by one man with one camera, and the editing, writing of commentary and sound recording done 3200 km (2000 miles) away, it was a big achievement by Goodall and those at Herschells that 35 weekly issues were produced on schedule. If it didn’t immediately reach the standard of Cinesound and Movietone, Westralian News could surely be excused. Not the least of its difficulties was a poverty of newsworthy events. Perhaps after all, the news really did occur in Sydney and Melbourne.

Westralian News scored no scoops, but conscientiously covered local sporting events, visiting notables, conferences etc., and the time-less magazine items which were the staple diet of the newsreels. The issue of July 18 included “The Drawing of a Lottery”, “Cycle Races at Maylands” and “Cigarette Paper Manufacturing”, but the next issue on July 25 offered more topical items: “Field Marshal Montgomery Visits Perth”, “Country Week Hockey”, and a magazine item, “Scenes at the Zoo”.

The time lag between the events filmed and appearing on the screen ought to have been a serious disadvantage in comparison with the national newsreels. But in 1947, the latter were released in Perth a week after their appearance in the east, so Westralian News was little, if at all, behind them.

Production costs were around £80 per week, and in spite of earlier expectations that it would be distributed throughout the state, the only regular screening was at the Mayfair, returning a rental of £10 per week. (Moss was canny enough not to commit the Mayfair too deeply.) It should have been a great success in WA, but perhaps the same closed ranks of the trade that denied the Mayfair the national newsreels in the beginning, also discouraged the exhibition of Westralian News in other theatres.

In 1947, coverage of WA events by Cinesound and Movietone was just as sparse as in the thirties, and it must have been a unique experience to WA people to see themselves on the screen as they had not done since 20 years earlier and were not to see again until the coming of television 12 years later.

By October 1947, it was clear that Southern Cross Films had no way of bridging the gap between the £80 production cost and the £10 rental income. Successful as the newsreel had been in the limited context of the Mayfair, they couldn’t continue to carry that sort of loss. When the distributors offered to make Cinesound Review available, it was decided to cease production of Westralian News.

Issue No. 35 appeared on October 31, and on November 5, the Mayfair screened Cinesound’s Melbourne Cup Special. By November 7, Westralian News had faded away, the last independent newsreel to disappear from the Australian scene. No mention of its passing appeared in the local press or on the screen.

Southern Cross Films stayed in business another four years, and in that time made 15 documentaries for government and private sponsors. In 1952, the company ceased production. Leith Goodall joined the WA Education Department’s film unit, continuing his career as a cameraman until his retirement. The company had been many years before its time, and if it had survived until television began in WA, it would most likely still be in business today.

Surviving negatives and prints of Westralian News are preserved in the National Film Collection, Canberra, and in the WA State Film Archive. 16mm viewing prints are available for study at both centres. ★
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Bernardo Bertolucci
"It's an example of the internal contradictions of capitalism," Bernardo Bertolucci said when someone remarked that his film "Novecento" (1977), which exalts socialism, was made partly with American money.

The contradictions have not ceased since the film's completion. They now concern its quality and length. The film had a mixed critical reception in Italy: its lyrical recreation of peasant life in the early years of the century was praised, but even many who lauded Part 1 found Part 2 of the 5-hours 10 minutes film boringly didactic. The novelist, Natalia Ginzburg, for instance, criticized the film in a lengthy article in the leading Italian daily 'Il Corriere della Sera'.

In April 1977, Bertolucci was still arguing with his producer Alberto Grimaldi over the film's English language version. Grimaldi has prepared a 3-hours 15 minute version for Paramount. Bertolucci claims this "clandestine version" is an "infringement of his rights and an ideological censorship". Grimaldi replies that the contract foresaw a 3-hours 15 minutes film, and this length enables the film's point to be made with more force. Bertolucci has a contract for five more films with Grimaldi. He will not make them, he says, unless there is a satisfactory outcome to the "Novecento" argument.

The following interview, conducted in English by Desmond O'Grady, was recorded with Bertolucci while he was completing "Novecento".
For a director who is still only 34, you have had remarkable success both critical and commercial. . . .

For you 34 means I am young. But for me I am very old because I started at 21. I have been making films for 13 years. A different point of view on my age changes the question.

Has success changed you?

I don't think so, because what does the success of a film mean? It means you have a chance to do what you want in future. That's the important thing. All the rest is mythology or bullshit.

But a director must be faithful to himself, that's important. I don't think my work has changed.

What do you do when you are not working on a film?

I am like a vegetable. I think I am living only when I am shooting.

What's the longest period you've had between films?

Four years, between Prima della Rivoluzione and Partner. It was very hard, very difficult. I found it impossible to find the money for the film I wanted to do. During this period I wrote three scripts I couldn't realize, I was working in a way, though.

Your father is a poet and film critic. You were first known as a poet. Why did you choose filmmaking rather than literature?

Like every boy, I used to imitate my father. I began at seven writing poetry and wrote till 20. And I published a book. But when I started to make films I stopped writing poetry. It was impossible to do both things. The poetry was some kind of inheritance. It was in the family; my father was a poet, and I used to read poetry when I started to read. It was something in the house; you could feel it in the air. Cinema was much more something that I discovered. I was searching for a language, a cinematic language, so I stopped writing poetry. It was like a sort of exorcism.

What was the decisive influence on you in this choice?

My father was a film critic, so very often I went to theatres to see films. When I was 20 a friend, Pier Paolo Pasolini, made his first film, Accatone; he asked me to be his assistant.

It was an important experience to be with him on his first film, because he was discovering cinema, discovering his cinematic language. For example, when he made a close-up it was like the first close-up in film history. When he made dolly track, it was like the first. Because he came from literature, he was very innocent on the level of cinema language. So it was a very strong experience with him.

I then made my first film at 21, La Commare Secca. The story came from a short novel by Pasolini.

You once said Hemingway and Fitzgerald were decisive in your choice of cinema. In what way?

You made a film of 'The Conformist'. In what way do you repeat the rhythms of Moravia's novel, and how far did you feel free to change it?

I told Moravia immediately we began shooting The Conformist that I wanted to re-invent the story and the characters, because I didn't want to make a sort of illustration of the book. It's not simple when you take a literary work, because you really have to invent again the reason, the interior sense, of the book. And, I think, for example The Conformist the film is different from the novel. But at the same time, it's faithful.

When you have chosen a novel such as 'The Conformist' what do you find the most useful element? Has it been a character, a rhythm or images?

Sometimes you may make a film and be interested in something which does not appear as the reason for the film. For example, in The Conformist it was my great love for the cinema of the end of the thirties. A lot of critics and journalists asked me: I was born in 1941, how could I recreate the atmosphere of 1937 and 1938? They said it was so real. I think the cinema is a collective memory. So all the films made of this period (I must say films I liked), I used as my experience, my memory. At the same time, when you make historical films like The Conformist you speak about the past, but you are also speaking about the present. It was important for me to describe this character of The Conformist like a modern character, like someone who can exist today. That's important, because I also think you have only one verb in the cinema, it is the present, even when you are shooting the past. It is always the present for the audience.

What do you see as the differences of language in cinema and literature?

This is a strange moment for literature. Perhaps all moments are
I change a lot of my script when I am shooting. If I don’t want to illustrate a novel, I also don’t want to illustrate a script. So the script is something I don’t open while I am shooting, I go ahead on the memory of the script, changing lots of things.

The moment I am shooting is important — the space where I am shooting, the feeling of the people who are in front of the camera, and also the feeling of the people who are at the back. It means, I want to be very open. If there is a cloud and you have not foreseen it, you must use the cloud passing in front of the sun. The light is changing, but if you can capture this change of light in the film it’s very important because for me l’hasard (chance) is the most important thing in making films.

Strange, but this is particularly so. I look around and at what happens to me: it seems books are disappearing or, at least, books in a home have a different meaning from what they once had. There has been a change, that is, in the relations between people and literary language.

I believe it depends to a large degree on a kind of bombardment we’ve had in the past 10 to 15 years, a bombardment from neo-capitalism, consumerism and so on. There has been a kind of violence against all of us, particularly against local cultures — popular culture. The face of the world has changed. Cinema is a language which registers always the present; there are so many examples — nothing is so tied to the present, nothing gives you so much the feel of ‘38 in France as Renoir’s La Regle du Jeu, or of ‘42 in Italy as Visconti’s Ossessione. I see it as a great archive in which the monstrosity of consumerism, neo-capitalism — all because of its links with socialism.

At the beginning of this long, confused explanation I wanted to say — without comparing in the narrowly qualitative sense cinematic and literary language — that there is an objective impossibility, I believe, for literature at the present moment to give any picture of what is happening. Cinema manages to do this perhaps because it’s a hybrid language in which you get music, images and everything mixed up, which succeeds in conveying the feeling of the period.

I have just finished 11 months working on Novecento. And, coming out of that experience, in which I was cut off from everything, looking around at the other arts is like looking at a battlefield after the battle has been lost. Music is down some deep well from which you hear cries coming every now and again, painting is slaughtered on the canvas, literature is dying, if not already dead. I feel filmmakers are privileged at this moment because of cinema’s hybrid nature, which is made of all other arts and contains all other arts.

Before shooting, do you have it all plotted — the gestures, the actions . . .?

What is your next project? Are you going to film Dashiell Hammett’s novel ‘Red Harvest’ as you said you would?

I don’t have to do it. Maybe I am too weak in front of what is happening; besides, there are a lot of films about the thirties in the U.S., about the gangsters, and I am bored by them. I want to make a film about this moment in this country.

And plan less . . .

Yes, I live myself.

What would you like to achieve as a filmmaker?

I would like to answer with a tautology: a filmmaker is a filmmaker. When I was shooting Last Tango in Paris as a ‘re-invention’ of Moravia’s novel.

What is your next project? Are you going to film Dashiell Hammett’s novel ‘Red Harvest’ as you said you would?

I don’t have to do it. Maybe I am too weak in front of what is happening; besides, there are a lot of films about the thirties in the U.S., about the gangsters, and I am bored by them. I want to make a film about this moment in this country.

How far have you advanced?

How far can you go when you have 170,000 metres of film in the editing room? I have some ideas, but Novecento is not finished . . . that’s the problem.

What would you like to achieve as a filmmaker?

I would like to answer with a tautology: a filmmaker is a filmmaker. When I was shooting Last Tango in Paris as a ‘re-invention’ of Moravia’s novel.

What is your next project? Are you going to film Dashiell Hammett’s novel ‘Red Harvest’ as you said you would?

I don’t have to do it. Maybe I am too weak in front of what is happening; besides, there are a lot of films about the thirties in the U.S., about the gangsters, and I am bored by them. I want to make a film about this moment in this country.

Haven’t you an overriding passion?

Yes, to materialize my dream. It’s a beautiful . . . er . . . joke. *}
In this issue, Cinema Papers begins a series of checklists on film directors. It includes all those who are Australian or are permanently resident here.
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Subsequent issues will feature checklists on documentary filmmakers, those who have made short features since 1970 (45 mins and over) and those who have directed at least two short films. All filmmakers of surf films will be listed in the documentary section unless they have made a film which has some form of fictional narrative.

Cinema Papers welcomes and requests additions, corrections, etc, to the list below, together with any information relating to future listings. The next issue will concentrate on directors of short features.

CROMBIE, Donald
  Jenny Langby (74), Caddie (75), Do I Have to Kill My Child...? (television film — 76). Current project: The Irishman (77)

DAHLIUS, Marc
  Squeezing My Boy (70)

DELING, Bert
  Pure S (75). Current project: Child of My Time

DIAGUIN, John
  The Firm Man (73), The Trespassed (75). Metal Finishing (76). Building a Bridge (76). Current project: Mouth to Mouth

EDDY, Paul
  The Box (75)

EGGLSTON, Colin
  Fantasm Comes Again (77), The Long Weekend (77)

FRANKLIN, Richard
  And His Ghost May be Heard (73). Old Man’s Eyes (73), Convention Checkout — Melbourne (73). The True Story Of Eskimo Neil (75), Fantasm (76). Current project: Patrick.

FREEMAN, Warwick
  Demonstrator (72)

FRIENDSCH, Peter
  Harry from Australia (75). Current project: Black Red, White

HANNAM, Ken

HARRIB, Sandy
  Stone (74). Current project: The Drums of Mer

HOWES, Oliver
  Toota (episode of Three To Go — 70). Woksking Blobron Tolien (74). Let the Balloon Go (75), Opera Company (75)

JEFFREY, Tom
  The Removalists (75). Current project: The Reckoning

KAVANAGH, Brian
  A City’s Child (71). Current project: A Mystery of a Hansom Cab

KUKULLU, Alyen
  A Handful of Dust (73), Golden Gate (75). Current project: Battle for Broken Hill

LAMOND, John
  Australia After Dark (75), The Alphabet of Love and Sex (77)

LOVEN, Chris
  806/The Beginning (71), Eagle Rock (72)

MANGAIMELE, Giorgio
  Beyond Reason (76), The Irishman (75), Of Man and Legend (76). Current project: In Search of Anna (76).

MART, Dusan
  And the Word was Made Flesh (71)

MARSDEN, Ralph
  Sabbath of a Black Cat (74), Tell Tale Heart

MAXWELL, Peter

MCCALLUM, John
  Nickel Queen (71)

MCCULLOUGH, Chris
  Avengers of the Reef (75)

METCALFE, Edgar
  The Olive Tree

MILLS, Ian
  Solo Flight (75), Hurdling (76). The High Jump (76). A Day at a Time (77). What Is Spina Bifida (77)

MORA, Philippe
  Trouble in Melopolis (British — 71). Swastika (British — 74). Brother Can You Spare a Dime (British — 73), Mad Dog Morgan (76)

MURRAY, John B.
  The Naked Bunyip (71), The Husband (episode of Lidbit — 72)

OHLSHORN, Terry
  Scobie Malone (75), The Green Machine (76)

PATTERSON, Gary
  Retreat, Retreat (71). How Willingly You Sing (75). Here to You Mr Robinson (co-director — 76)

PEKARD, Hans
  Stockade (71)

PORTER, Eric
  Marco Polo Junior versus the Red Dragon (71)

POWER, John
  Big and Small (72), They Don’t Clap Losers (74), The Picture Show Man (77)

ROBINSON, Brian
  Jack and Jill: A Postscript (co-director — 70). A Fine Body of Water (70), Game Show of the Ringmasters (71)

SAFRAN, Henry
  Listen to the Lion (75), Storm Boy (76)
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EDDY, Paul
  The Box (75)
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Within the sphere of international film festivals, Rotterdam's 10-day marathon is as far removed from Cannes as London is from the Antipodes. The event is housed in a labyrinthine anti-laboratory complex, liberally studded with closed-circuit video rooms, pummelights, light shows, and other emblems of a vanishing psychedelic age.

Its audiences are primarily young, local and enthusiastic (at least enthusiastic enough to tolerate good-naturedly the messiness of program changes and capture minute program changes); and if there is among them a predominant style, it suggests the snobbish side of the alternative society — a genuine refusal of consumerism, rather than the frivolous consumption of eccentric fads and fancy dress.

This earnest unconcern with flash and filigree is clearly reflected in the festival's programming. A member of the Federation Internationale des Festivals Independents (which includes Edinburgh, Perth, the Cannes Quinzaine and Berlin Forum), and affiliated to a generously subsidized distribution company of the same name, Film International is committed to the screening of independently produced films and to building an alternative circuit for that overcrowded umbrella, the "alternative cinema.

Although this policy precludes the selection of big-budget, big-studio productions — and also tends to limit the participation of big-name directors to the occasional minor work (infrequently quickies by Chabrol, Herzog and Borowczyk) or film maudits (Dennis Hopper's The Last Movie) — it's a measure of Rotterdammers' effectiveness as a preview of emerging talents and barometer of emerging trends, that so many of its obscure selections later find their way into the different sections at Cannes.

This year, perhaps more than in the past, the new names proved a stronger cause for excitement than the old. The future appeared, very properly, to rest with the avant-garde.

Of the better-known directors, the only one to be running on form was Jean-Marie Straub. Most often seen in his domestic audience, his Fortini/Cani reworks the central idea of his earlier Not Reconciled (the subject of 2 films) in a post-war society committed to the politics of oblivion) through the rigorous Marxist techniques of his more recent History Lessons.

The tone is authoritative, if not downright dogmatic. The thesis is that Arab images have replaced anti-semitism as the instrument through which totalitarian capitalist interests/superpowers divide and rule, distracting oppressed minorities from their true nature of the class struggle. The narration is provided by the Italian communist writer Franco Fortini, reading without emotion from his book The Dogs of Sinai (I Cani del Sinai). And what brings the rather demagogic text passionately, persuasively to life, is, incongruously, its relationship to the film's barely moving images.

The abstractions of political argument are balanced by the concrete world of the Italian locations, which force home the connection between fascism and material "theatres" in which it has more manifestly erupted. Fortini's recitation of his Jewish father's war-time arrest takes on an unbearable suspense from being heard over a long-held shot of the street in Florence where it took place, and where ominously little has changed.

The oblique, questioning relationship between text and images brings out the links between past and present, Europe and the Middle East. The camera stays in Tuscany, but the subject extends well beyond Sinai. Fortini/Cani is unashamedly an intellectual film; and, paradoxically, on intellectual idea, which the superficially incongruous camerawork makes palpably concrete, is the impossibility of showing economic interests in action. Of the unacceptable face of capitalism, perhaps the hardest feature to accept is that the face itself remains invisible.

Other known directors working abroad proved less effective. Had Borowczyk's Letter from Paris been his first film, it would most probably have been his last. Its record-breaking montage (800 shots in 40 minutes), accelerating through traffic, monuments and pedestrians to a dizzying descent into the Metro, comes across less as the "ideological film" he has claimed than as a Look at Life with a bad case of the DT's. As a possible indictment of the overcrowding and inhuman speed of a modern metropolis, it fails: its tactics are those of the society it is presumably attacking, and its exaggerations render that urban experience almost too inhuman for human eyes to watch without blinking.

More amusing, but also something of a disappointing monotonie, is How Much Wood Would a Woodchuck Chuck, Werner Herzog's documentary about the world auctioneering championship in New Holland, Pennsylvania. The play-off of some of America's fastest talkers has a certain eerie fascination (the film is subtitled "Observations towards a new language".), but Herzog's fascination with the extremes of human behavior leads him to misjudge just how much of a wood-chucking litany the public can stand.

Meanwhile, Pennsylvania's Amish community, a more dignified but no less extreme group, remain tantalizingly on the fringes of the central observation, neglected but suitable subjects for a 'real' Herzog picture, undulterated by the influence of the Leacock/ Pennebaker school.

Chabrol's Alice, ou la Derniere Fugue was a disappointment of a graver order; a confidence trick depicted by its clever sleight of hand as to bypass all the subtile transfers of guilt and comedies of genre. Chabrol's habit of marked his film's finest.

Its opening title character packs her bags and walks out on her self-absorbed husband to drive off, alone and distressed, into a stormy night. The dim lighting of the conjugal apartment, the slightly ausiere decadence of its furnishings, above all the acute angles from which the opening sequence is photographed, so that — instead of a confrontation — the marriage appears to be dwelling in separate spaces: all these suggest an almost palpable evil, from which Alice's retreat is as strong an impulse towards reparation as Janet Leigh's ill-fated night-drive in Psycho.

Indeed, the Hitchcock reference is cleverly sustained to the point where the heroine seems to alter in a dinky little chateau whose elderly proprietor seems frozen in the manner of a bygone age. But with the first dawn, bringing with it the succession of vanishing characters, moving walls, animate objects, dead bodies and mysteriously materialized people who refuse to answer questions, Hitchcock goes through the looking glass, and the heroine's name — Alice Carroll — takes on a portentous significance.

Instead of his usual network of relationships, Chabrol this time offers us a magical mystery tour of a character's unconscious nightmares. Unfortunately, the mystery itself, created by Sylvia Kristel, whose mannifical charms are principally compensated for the tabula rasa of her facial expressions. The "surprise ending," if not exactly a surprise, comes as a welcome relief.

More simple on the surface, and infinitely more challenging in its simplicity, was Rene Allo's Moi, Pierre Riviere (not to be confused with the Christine lipinska film of the same name, Pierre Riviere which was shown at last year's Perth Film Festival). Where Lipinska acknowledged the influence of Jean Genet and associated Riviere to Brechtian materialism. And his reconstructed account of the young French peasant who murdered his mother, sister and brother, carefully echeads subtle or dramatic emotion in favor of an understanding that, if sociology had not become such a tarned word, might best be described as sociological.

Extracts from Riviere's prison journals — combining detailed accounts of his family life with an almost messianic interpretation of his own act — alternate with the testimony culled from his neighbors by the Calvados authorities to provide the film's spoken texts. The question of Riviere's possible schizophrenia remains unresolved, and largely irrelevant.

For Allo's film is materialist in both senses. Using a local and non-professional cast to recreate the living conditions of the countryside (300 days on location), he imposes Riviere's actual act as a normal response to the brutal conditions of a life of poverty. Life to which a father Riviere makes barely a passive resistance.

Allo's matter-of-fact reporting — of a child rejected by his mother almost from birth, of a father, more attached to her furniture than to his child, who uses her husband as a day laborer from whom to extort money, of a husband faithful to the institution of marriage while deriving none of its benefits — so establishes the mean...
and grinding poverty of peasant lives as to exonerate all his characters. We see no villains, only victims. Pierre's crucifying of frogs, unemotionally recorded in long-shot, is more an act of protest or cry for help than an act of brutality. A set of incontrovertible effects and causes, in factual context, the costume drama remains equally open for Freudian or Marxist interpretation.

The device of the play or film within a film was a feature of progressive cinema long before Rivette's innovatory use of it in Out One Spectre (a standby of the Hollywood musical—a batch of people getting together to put on a show—as well as a staple strategy in Bergman's early works). It emerged with a new twist, however, in 1977, with rehearsals for an imminent performance depicting for group political activity: last in danger of becoming a contemporary cliché, is the motif of a bunch of people getting together to put on a revolution. Or even a counter-revolution.

In countries where freedom of speech is drastically curtailed or outlawed, the recourse to theatre-as-metaphor makes sound historical sense. (Angelopoulos's O Thiasos/The Travelling Players can be easily understood in these terms.) But where the device has outlived its historical necessity, it often leaves behind it a generation of generation of unwilling victims, unwilling to differentiate between allegory and direct speech.

The most extreme case of this was represented at Rotterdam by the Greek director Pandelis Voulgaris, whose first feature, The Engagement of Anna Voulgaris, showed such precision of observation. After Anna was arrested by the junta and deported to the island of Gyros, and this experience provides the basis for his new film, Happy Day. Its setting is a Greek island which serves as a training ground for press-ganged army recruits and as an interrogation centre for the recalcitrant.

In spite of the recurrent intimations of torture, humiliation, brutality, the film's focus of interest is the preparation of a concert party for a group of visiting officials of whom one tight-lipped female dignitary will be honored as a surrogate for Mother Nature. The slogan-shouting drill of the choir, the role of a rather degenerate priest as stage director, the grotesque American influence evident in the final performance— all these connote the ingredients of a fascist regime. But they also serve to minimise its horror. It's just not the idyllic settings which lend a rosy glow even to scenes of torture; rather, it's the formal, choreographed quality of so much of the movement. The inescapable sense of highly spirited boys preparing a camp-fire concert lends an air of innocence to a shameful moment of history; intended, perhaps, to exonerate the misled masses, but here extending even to the executioners themselves.

Frank Cassenti's L'Affiche Rouge also relies heavily on the element of performance, albeit more self-consciously. The title refers to the notorious poster produced by the Gestapo in France to discredit the Resistance as a terrorist movement comprised of Jews and foreign agitators, and to the execution of 23 immigrant resistance fighters, later known as the Manouchian group, which followed the poster's publication.

Cassenti's own uncertainties—about the possibility of describing events which occurred before he was born, and of integrating a rigidified moment of history into the continuous present—become a part of the film's text, and also of its method. His characters are a group of actors trying to stage a re-enactment of the 1944 executions, and seeking to deepen their characterizations through discussions with the victims' surviving relatives.

Alternating between the illusory realism of the past tense, and the no-less controverted reality of the fictitious present, the film juggles with the spectators' disbelief in emulation of the Brechtian tradition. Unfortunately, the balance is miscalculated; the problems of dramatic representation receive fuller consideration than do those of political repression. The past remains essentially an historical tableau, eclipsed by a present tense whose primary colors and sunny philanthropists dictate a dominant carnival mood.

Of the films which used dramatic production as a narrative element, the most exciting was by Edgardo Cozarinsky, whose 1971 first feature, L'Affiche Rouge, is still banned in his Argentina. Cozarinsky—more fortunate than many of his former associates—is now working in Paris, and the experience, and mythology, of exile provide the basis for The Apprentice Sorcerers.

The title characters are a loose-knit group of Latin Americans educated in a displaced facsimile of European culture and now, trying, in an essentially phantom setting, to realize their dreams of art or revolution. A deliberate echo of Walter Benjamin's sunken city, the Paris they inhabit is photographed like an exquisite ghost town, a series of monuments to imperial greed which now serve merely as the backdrop to foreign fantasies. The one Parisian we meet, a Proustian hostess played by Marie-France Pisier, goes under the improbable name of Carmen Umlaut.

The film's central intrigue involves a stolen briefcase containing evidence that Latin America's "parallel police" are also operating in Europe, and a succession of mysterious disappearances, kidnappings and assassinations among the young exiles who come into contact with it. Though photographed in the best melodramatic tradition of the film noir, the grim political reality from which the characters have thought to escape and which proves more terrifying for remaining—within the film's own terms of reference—totally unexplained.

Meanwhile, on a third level, one of the exiles records on black-and-white film the rehearsals for his production of Danton's Death. Buchner's text, and his feverish dream of history feeding on its own makers, provides an authoritative model for the characters' more shadowy activities. At the same time, it offers a false correspondence for Raoul (the stage director, played by Peter Chalke), it becomes a last-ditch attempt to escape through culture and the rigidified mythologies of a past revolution from the elusive struggle in which, unwillingly and unconsciously, he is grimly involved.

The formal, dramatic elements are fully integrated into the scenario, and one reason Cozarinsky's film works so beautifully is that the tenuous relationship of art to revolution is one of its central themes. Drama is less clearly defined as a distinct formal element in Tras-os-Montes, a loving portrait by Antonio Rens and his wife Margarida Martins Cordeiro.
of a desperately impoverished region in the north-east of Portugal, and a hymn to the peasant power to survive both feudal conditions and successive colonizers. Using a local cast of non-actors, the film interweaves folklore, fairytale and documentary observation to flesh out, through very different methods, many of the same arguments raised by Glauber Rocha and Robert Kramer in their separate, and separately disappointing, agit-prop accounts of Portugal's recent revolution.

The slow-moving narrative, taking its rhythms from the lifestyle it records, makes no distinction between myth and reality. That the region's principal export is people is stated only obliquely, and is rather to be deduced from Reis' portrait of a village inhabited only by women, children, the elderly and infirm. The absent husband is represented by the occasional letter home, or invoked by the messenger who brings news of the nearby mining disaster which adds to the tenuous relationship between art and revolution.

One other trend emerged from this year's Rotterdam selection: Freud is alive and well, and apparently programmed for some entertaining skirmishes with the women's movement. Visually, the most powerful of these skirmishes was Un Reve plus long que la Nuit, the second feature by Niki de St. Phalle, who combines some of her own wittily erotic sculptures with a construction by kinetic sculptor Jean Tinguely, one of whose monster works here provides the setting for an erotic equivalent of Dante's inferno.

The film's theme is a young girl's initiation into womanhood, sexual experience, with the girl played by St. Phalle's daughter Laure Conominas (last seen as Bresson's Guinevere). Like St. Phalle's first film, Daddy, this one is obsessive about the beateliness of men (all muscle power and prancing ego). But where Daddy was primarily a verbal assault on the potency myth, Reve is stunningly pictorial, an Hieronymus Bosch vision modified to the mechanical obsessions of the twentieth century. The male organ is depicted as a metal machine whose orgasm releases gold confetti, limp red balloons, or even a jack-in-the-box. In a final holocaust, pink cannons shaped like phalluses are the weapons men use to destroy one another.

Cerebral rather than visual, but also exquisitely funny, is Anatomie d'un Rapport, co-directed by Antonietta Pizzorno and former Cahiers critic Luc Mollet. The latter stars as an unsuccessful filmmaker whose relationship with his girlfriend (Christine Hebert) is inhibited, disrupted and all but destroyed by her liberated conversion to the clitoral orgasm and his own inability to achieve satisfaction other than in the traditional missionary position.

The style of the film, with its claustrophobic setting and obsessive self-analysis, reminds one of Eustache's Mother and the Whore, though the idea of making a comedy about the obsolescence of the vaginal orgasm is startlingly more innovatory.
INTERNATIONAL PRODUCTION ROUND-UP

FRANCE

Romy Schneider has three films lined up: Liliana Cavani's Lulu, Claude Sautet's 'Sarah Cross'; and Jospeh Losey's Take Over, which is to be scripted by David Mercer (Providencce).

Bertrand Blier is to be reunited with Gerard Depardieu and Patrick Dewaere (they made Gold) for Blier's Get Your Handkerchiefs Ready. Film will also star actress Caroline Laure.

Francois Truffaut has signed with United Artists to do Henry James' The Vanished Fiancee.

One-time horror director Jean Rollin, has turned to porno with Sexual Vibrations.

Claude Zidi to direct Jean-Paul Belmondo and Raquel Welch in L'Animal; and Louis de Funes to return to the screen in Une Pie Dans L'Poirier (Robert Dhery).

Bertrand Tavernier has completed Les Enfants Gates with Michel Piccoli, while Jean-Louis Bertuccelli wraps-up L'impecable.

New French films will include Edouard Molinaro's L'Homme Presse; Pierre Schoendoerffer's Le Crabe Tambour; Luis Bunuel's That Obscure Object of Desire; Bob Swaim's Nuits de la Visibilité; and Germain de Près; Paul Morrissey's Torc; and Liliana Cavani's Les Mot's Pour Le Dire.

ITALY

Mauro Bolognini's new film is to be Pot Luck with Shelley Winters and Max von Sydow.

Director of Slum Boy Giulio Paradisi, is preparing The Old Man and his Little Bird, while Dino Risi, Mario Monicelli and Ettore Scola prepare a three-part film entitled The New Monsters. All of the above will follow Rosie, The Whirlwind.

Luigi Comencini is to direct The Cat for Sergio Leone which will star Mariangela Melato and Ugo Tognazzi, with music by Ennio Morricone.

New Italian films include Tonino Valerii's Sahara Cross; Dario Argento's Suspiria; and Salvatore Sampieri's Nene. Particularly interesting among recent Italian films is I Belong to Me with Stefania Sandrelli, Maria Schneider and Michele Placido. The film is promoted as being, "written, produced, directed, photographed, designed, edited and scored exclusively by women." The director is Sofia Scandurra.

Protage of Pasolini, Sergio Citti, has completed Cassotto with Catherine Denoieve, Jodie Foster and Mariangela Melato.

U.S.

Robert Mulligan's new film will be Bloodbrothers which Stephen J. Friedman will produce for Warner Bros.

David Helfgarn, director of Hollywood on Trial, is to produce The Boss's Son. Film will be directed by Bobby Roth.

Billy Wilder and I.A.L. Diamond have again teamed for Fedora. Based on Thomas Tyrson's Crowned Heads, it stars William Holden and Martha Keller. Shooting is on Corfu.

Robert Altman is presently shooting A Wedding for 20th Century-Fox. Director of Photography is Vilmos Zsigmond who shot McCabe and Mrs Miller. Images and The Long Goodbye.

Don Siegel is filming Telefon from a script by Peter Hyams who directed Peepers, Our Time and Lustful. Film stars Charles Bronson, Lee Remick and Donald Pleasence.

Louis Malle's first American film is Pretty Baby with Brooke Shields and Keith Carradine.

Paul Mazursky returns after Next Stop Serefinich Village with An Unmarried Woman. Starring Jill Clayburgh and Alan Bates, it is from Mazursky's own script. Lord of the Rings is being made as an animated feature by Ralph Bakshi.

British Karel Reisz is making his second American film, Dog Soldiers, from the best-seller by Frederick Forsythe.

All MacGraw returns to the screen for the first time since The Getaway, in Sam Peckinpah's Convoy, a film inspired by the hit song of the same name.

Scriptwriter of Taxi Driver, Paul Schrader, is to direct his first film, Blue Collar. Teilly Savina is making a similar step with Mati.

Clint Eastwood returns with Gauntlet; Sidney Poitier with A Piece of the Action; Herbert Ross with Neil Simon's The Goodbye Girl.

Gordon Willis to co-write Alan J. Pakula's new film, Comes A Horseman and Wild and Free. It toplines James Caan and James Fonds.

GERMANY

Rainer Werner Fassbinder is to film Vladimir Nabokov's Despair. Scripted by Tom Stoppard (Jumpers), it stars Dirk Bogarde, Andrei Ferro and Peter Kern.

Werner Herzog to follow Stroszek with Kautschuck. New films include Hans Jurgen Syberberg's Hitler, a film from Germany: Wim Wenders's The American Friend, P. J. Ottoson's Joy of Flying; Bernhard Wicki's The Bridge; and Peter Patzak's The Sail.

SWEDEN

Ingmar Bergman's next Swedish film will be Autumn Sonata which will commence shooting in Norway in September.

Jan Troell will follow Bang! with The Flight of the Eagle.

New Swedish films include Jan Hall-Luff's The Heli, Jack, Arne Mattsson's The Lorry; and Mats Aker's The Assignment (from a Per Wahloo novel).

ELSEWHERE

Claude Chabrol is to direct Blood Relatives in English, in Canada. It stars Donald Sutherland, Jodie Foster and Stephane Audran. Jean Genet is to script and direct After Nightfall. The film is to be shot over eight weeks in Spain.

Director of Topkapi, Jules Dassin, is in Athens filming Melina Mercouri and Elia Kazan's Maya and Brenda.

New Japanese films include Kon Ichikawa's The Inugami, Ako Jissoji's Uamaro's World, and Le General et son Empire des Sens with star of Empire of the Senses, Eiko Matsuda.

New Dutch films include Adrian van Hoos's The Shok of Love; Niko van der Hooy's The Man in the Bowling Hat; Pim de la Parra's Double Play; Paul Verhoeven's $2 million Soldier of The Queen; and Herbert-Curiel's Cancer Rising.
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Robin Copping, Director of Photography on 'Eliza Frazer,' talks about Eastman color film.

"It was Eastman 5247 Color Negative all the way through . . . We were dealing with the 1830 period and it had to look totally genuine, so we were using lots of lamps, fires, moonlight and lanterns. Overall, we were trying very hard to get the actual light that would have existed at that time. This is where the combination of very modern lenses and the new 5247 really paid off. We were able to work to very very low light levels, in fact lower than I've ever worked at before. If I hadn't pre-tested for this particular technique, I don't think I would have believed what sort of sensitivity the film stock had."

"We carried out fairly extensive tests for about a week or ten days before we actually started shooting, and we found that the sensitivity of the emulsion to this kind of lighting was quite remarkable, so we used it throughout the film. Overall, I would say that it was the most difficult thing I have had to photograph . . . I'm very happy with the end result."

Eastman 5247 Color Negative - a remarkably sensitive film.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Distributor</th>
<th>SYD.</th>
<th>MLB.</th>
<th>PTH.</th>
<th>ADL.</th>
<th>BRI.</th>
<th>Total $</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>SYD.</th>
<th>MLB.</th>
<th>PTH.</th>
<th>ADL.</th>
<th>BRI.</th>
<th>Total $</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Fraser</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>(13)*</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>68,762</td>
<td>652,863</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)*</td>
<td>(2)*</td>
<td>(2)*</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>143,945</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break of Day</td>
<td>GUO</td>
<td>(7)*</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>27,421</td>
<td>254,964</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>284,776</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caddie</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>(13)*</td>
<td>119,977</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>63,292</td>
<td>241,746</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(12)*</td>
<td>117,585</td>
<td>104,590</td>
<td>62,601</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>263,641</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don's Party</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>(13)*</td>
<td>126,675</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>208,159</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4)*</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>49,355</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devil's Playground</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>(13)*</td>
<td>66,808</td>
<td>(13)*</td>
<td>113,600</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>179,408</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(12)*</td>
<td>99,935</td>
<td>121,774</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>36,913</td>
<td>50,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Boy</td>
<td>SAFC</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>127,634</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>54,585</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let the Balloon Go</td>
<td>FOX</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>53,339</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>13,676</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>97,215</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(2)*</td>
<td>6,256</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>6,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deathdealers</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>21,984</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>33,528</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>56,629</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2)*</td>
<td>10,722</td>
<td>8,049</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>4,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Deal</td>
<td>GUO</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>32,952</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>44,371</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>6,777</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barney</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>11,036</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>26,598</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(2)*</td>
<td>9,499</td>
<td>7,863</td>
<td>(5)*</td>
<td>29,666</td>
<td>22,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway One</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>21,124</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>21,124</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer of Secrets</td>
<td>GUO</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>6,759</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>11,361</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>7,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure S</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasm</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>5,375</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>5,375</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8,225</td>
<td>42,319</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>42,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>GUO</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>674,773</td>
<td>664,454</td>
<td>225,712</td>
<td>239,234</td>
<td>104,104</td>
<td>1,908,277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>340,082</td>
<td>344,858</td>
<td>180,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,545,014</td>
<td>2,899,803</td>
<td>1,633,463</td>
<td>868,855</td>
<td>841,499</td>
<td>7,888,864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,080,696</td>
<td>2,291,557</td>
<td>1,116,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,219,787</td>
<td>3,564,257</td>
<td>1,908,277</td>
<td>1,108,089</td>
<td>945,063</td>
<td>11,696,941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,420,778</td>
<td>2,636,415</td>
<td>1,207,721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Box-office grosses of individual films have been supplied to Cinema Papers by the Australian Film Commission.
* This figure represents the total box-office gross of all foreign films shown during the period in the area specified.
* Figures are drawn from capital city and inner suburban first release hardtops only.

---

1. Australian theatrical distributor only. RS — Roadshow, GUO — Greater Union Organization Film Distributors. FOX — 20th Century Fox; UA — United Artists; CIC — Cinema International Corporation, FN — Filmways Australasia Distributors, BK — Key Films Distributors; COL — Columbia Pictures. REG — Regent Film Distributors; CCG — Cinema Centre Group; AFC — Australian Film Commission; SAFC — South Australian Film Corporation; MCA — Music Corporation of America; S — Eamonn Trees. 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.
THE MEASURE OF COLORFILM’S COMPETENCE

Squeeze a Flower
Don Quixote
The Cars That Ate Paris
The Hands of Cormack Joyce
Night of Fear
Colour Me Dead
That Lady From Peking
Sidecar Racers
Inn of the Damned
The Man From Hong Kong
Willy Willy
Promised Woman
Rolling Home
The True Story of Eskimo Nell
Scobie Malone
The Removalists
Let the Balloon Go
The Great McArthy
Picnic at Hanging Rock
Caddie
Mad Dog Morgan
Oz
The Trespassers
Deathcheaters
The FJ Holden
Summer of Secrets
Break of Day
Eliza Fraser
Don’s Party
The Devil’s Playground
Raw Deal
The Picture Show Man
Pure S
Highway One
Between Wars
Demonstrator

Colorfilm ensures optimum quality in grading negatives by using modern Hazeltine Color Analysers. This obviates the need to resort to old fashioned pilot printing methods which endanger your negative whilst printing individual frames. Everybody at Colorfilm realizes “You can’t do today’s job with yesterday’s methods and be in business tomorrow.”

colorfilm A SPECIAL KIND OF PERSONALIZED SERVICE

COLORFILM PTY. LIMITED,
35 MISSENDEN ROAD,
CAMPERDOWN, N.S.W. 2050.
IN SEARCH OF ANNA

"The basic story is of a character named Tony who comes out of prison and confronts the people from his past who have, more or less, been negative influences on his life till then. The second story is about him hitch-hiking to Sydney to find Anna, who represents the positive values of the past. As he hitch-hikes to Sydney he gets picked up by Sam, a woman in an 1939 Buick. They fall in love; Sam leaves the guy she is living with and they head off to Queensland to find Anna. But Anna becomes something else and the need to find her gets less important.

"It's a story about coming to terms with one's past and then with the present, accepting the here and now and moving into the future with a positive attitude towards life."
In an interview you did at the time of "27A", "In Search of Anna" you mentioned as a pilot for a television series...

Yes, I had an idea for a television series about a young guy who leaves home in search of Anna. Each week would find him in a different place and the hook was that he was getting closer to finding Anna who was then, and still is, symbolic of the woman one dreams about. Just as the partner in one's first relationship is idealized in time and becomes something unreal.

Anyway, we were just about to shoot the pilot when Hayden * and I suddenly felt we didn't have enough faith in the script. Perhaps, the story was not ready to be told at that stage.

You had the finance already arranged?

We were financing it ourselves — we had just won a $5000 award for 27A.

Why did you decide to shoot the film on the road, all the way from Melbourne to Surfers Paradise, when I imagine you could have cheated and shot it within 100 km radius of Sydney?

We could have done that and just had a second unit do some wide shots of the car. But it seemed to me that if we could do it on the road, then there would be a lot of advantages. The whole film was shot in sequence and there was a strong feeling of travelling. We would shoot one scene in the car, then drive 50 km to do another. So, day by day people got to know each other, just like the two main characters get to know each other in the film. The hope was that this sort of rhythm of shooting would have an effect on the overall result.

Do you like to shoot in sequence within a scene as well?

Yes, we appeared to do that a lot. It adds much to the overall result — especially to the performances. With someone like Richard Moir, for whom this was the first time out as a lead actor, we shot the first scene of the film first. I kept him separate from the whole crew on the first day and when he walked out of jail there was the whole crew confronting him, and this had a lot of effect on how he acted in that scene. After all, Tony is coming out after six years in prison and it must be quite a shock.

The argument against shooting in sequence is that while the early material is generally the weakest, it is still what the audience sees first...

We have a structure whereby the two weeks shooting in Melbourne and the five weeks shooting on the road are of two virtually separate stories. The first scene in the film is Tony on the highway; the second is him coming out of prison; the third him on the highway; the fourth him back in Melbourne, and so on.

It is two weeks out of his life, but we have taken the first week and the second week concurrently; so we go Monday, Monday; Tuesday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Wednesday, etc. Both stories then climax at the end and both climaxes relate to him coming to terms with the past.

By having this crosscut structure we were able to throw in a lot of tensions, because the audience gradually gets information which makes them think that Tony is not actually looking for Anna, but is on the run after having killed Jerry. It is not till near the end, when there is a final confrontation between Tony and Jerry, do you realize what happened.

This tension also relates to the theme of the film: that of being torn between the past and the present.

Do the characters change much because of the road aspect of the film?

They change through being together; being alone and always moving. Sam is the spirit of the present, taking him along, teaching him about love and women and life.

Are there many scenes of the car travelling?

Yes. We used basic equipment like a limpid mount. Noel McDonald, the grip on the film, had just done F.J. Holden and was very au fait with that sort of shooting, though we did quite a lot more than was in F.J. We also had a tracking vehicle with an A Frame and a three metre crane on the back. If we were on the long frame, for instance, we could sit in front of the car's nose, go down to the wheels, then crane up as they start their dialogue.

We had the finance already arranged and as it was in 1979 there was a lot of rattle and noise, so we decided to post-sync at the start. We are doing that here at Smart Street, and I am excited by the prospect of post-synching. I think we will get a very good soundtrack.

What are you doing for sound in these scenes?

We have to post-synch all the car interiors as the Buick was not as quiet as it was in F.J. We put him in a studio and he gave us an hour of music. He saw all the sequences that were to have music and recorded a lot of music for the film.

You like the effect of post-synching...

Yes. I used to be totally into 100 per cent location sound, but I have gone right off that now.

Was that because of the problems on location?

No, it was because of the final product. When you lay the tracks you have to put in a base level of sound to cover the bad spots and cuts. You don't have complete control over your track and I don't like that base level. I prefer to have a completely silent track into which you put only what you want. That seems to me the best way to control what people hear.

Is there music in the film?

Alan Stivell who plays a Celtic harp was out here recently, and he recorded a lot of music for the film. We put him in a studio and he gave us an hour of music. He saw all the sequences that were to have music

* Hayden Keenan, owner of Smart Street Films with Storm.

* Mike Edols, director of photography.
and we explained what sort of feeling we wanted. He was brilliant — the music gives the film a whole new feeling.

**Why did you decide to produce the film yourself?**

Originally I approached Natalie Miller and asked her if she would produce it for me, but she didn’t want to. Then I talked to Cecil Holmes who said, “Do it yourself, it is not such a big deal.” I have a lot of respect for what he thinks and so I tried it.

Eventually I talked to Judy Morris because I had an image of her, which I later found out to be incorrect, that related to things like *Between Wars* and *Libido*. I also felt that because I hadn’t produced anything before they might think I wouldn’t be able to get my shit together with the private investors. If I could prove to them before they met that I could get private money, then they would think I was okay.

**What was the budget at that time?**

We went in with $231,000, but it looks as if it will go over about $30,000. This was mostly because after I had raised the money there was the big devaluation: Kodak went up, as did many other things. Consequently, a lot of my contingency fund of 15 per cent was chewed up before we shot a foot of film.

**How did you feel making the film on a tight budget?**

I believe you can make a really good contemporary film set in one location and with generous shooting ratio for about $300,000; $230,000 for a road movie was very tight. I also budgeted for a seven to one ratio, but ended up shooting ten to one — which is comfortable for me and I don’t think I would go for less in the future.

**Was this figure the minimum needed to make the film or because you felt it represented a possible return in film hire?**

If the rule of thumb is that you have to earn four times as much as you budget to break even, it seemed to me that the cheaper the film the better. But also, if the film was gutsy and accessible, with a down-to-earth approach and no fancy frills, I felt it could take $1 million at the box-office and break even. It seemed to me a financially good proposition, and the investors obviously thought so, too.

**You obviously have a very strong commitment to your film...**

My commitment is total. I will do anything I can to assist the film in becoming as good as I hope it will be.

Also, I have only directed films that I have instigated or been a party to instigating, and only from scripts I have written. So I can’t say how it might be different if I directed a film for someone else, written by someone else.

But if you decide to write, produce and direct a film, you know that it is going to be two or three years out of your life. And if you are going to spend this amount of time, what is the use of doing it if you are not really committed to it.

There are a lot of people for whom the aim of the object is just to make a film. But the aim should be...
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.
to make a film because you have something to express — it is not the film itself that is important, it is what the film expresses.

Many Australian directors don't remember that; they cop out by saying that you have to get your films to an audience and that they would need mass appeal. But I believe, unless a film has something to say, has a direction in mind — which all comes from the spirit of the person involved initially — then the film is not going to do well anyway. You can have some sort of preconception of what the market will pay to look at, and you can try to make a film to that preconception. But the chances are that it won't pay off because you are doing it with the wrong aim in mind.

How do you see the film's commercial potential?

I think the film has a directness and a purpose; it has an entertaining reality and the audience will enjoy it. It has a dog, it has cars; it has violence, love, sex, humor and music; it has two very interesting people, and 3200 kilometres of highway.

It is a very complex story which will come across as being very simple. I think the structure of the film will be one of the basic strengths.

The look of the film is different. Break of Day, Summerfield, Getting of Wisdom and Picnic at Hanging Rock, for instance, are all full of yellows and browns, faded or muted colors, soft focus and so on. The look of our picture is different: it has blues, hard contrast, hard focus, saturated colors. It is a very contemporary look.

Have you decided on a marketing approach at this stage?

We didn't sign up with a distributor at the start or during production; we thought it would be better to be independent. We have complete control, and if we are lucky and end up with a good hand of cards, we should be in a good position to deal.

Would you be tempted to side-step the distributors, like Fred Schepisi planned to do on "Devil's Playground"?

We are considering that, too. We are in a good position to do that in Melbourne, because of Natalie Miller's knowledge of Melbourne. In any case these are problems no one is pressing us to make instant decisions on, and that's the way I like it. I am thinking of doing a couple of test runs with the film in a theater and seeing how people react to it. They may react completely different to what we expect; they may not catch what we thought they would, yet they may catch something else. Their reactions will, to a degree, determine the sort of theatre we put the film into, and the sort of push we give it.

The kind of audience we want is one that enjoys thinking, enjoys laughing, enjoys being distracted, without being treated as morons. It is for people who, when they spend $3.50, like to feel as if they have been taken somewhere — in every sort of way.

Take a film like Carrie or Obsession: they are not great films, but they are good American films — they are solid. Obsession bored me until the last 15 minutes, but that last 15 minutes was worth $3.50. I liked Carrie a lot more, but there were only two moments in that. The last 15 minutes were also boring until the last flash. But that flash was worth $3.50.

There isn't one Australian film that has had a flash like that. You don't get any highs, any lows, or any flashes. There is no purpose behind the making of most films here. Nobody seems to have anything relevant to say and as a result the film has no impetus, no direction and, therefore, no guts. And if a film doesn't grab you by the balls, you feel you have wasted your $3.50. What I am hoping is that our film will have balls and people won't feel they have wasted their $3.50.
John Daniell who has spent a lifetime in the film industry came to the Commission following 9 years with Ajax/APA during which time he served for 2 years as President of the Film Producers Association of Australia.

I suppose the first thing to sort out is the difference between Lachie Shaw's Creative Development Branch and the Project Branch in the Commission. Basically Lachie's branch handles grant situations whereas we look at investment or loan proposals in the commercially viable script development and production areas.

There are several aspects to our work but it's reasonable to think that script development is where it all starts. The Project branch consults a pool of outside assessors as well as circulating these projects within the Commission. The assessors are drawn from professionally active script writers, directors, producers, exhibitors and distributors. As well as making those types of recommendations we also get involved in a stage between script development and production investment, i.e. advising a producer on realistic budgetting.

I suppose we're investment brokers in a sense but only in as much as this branch must process all investment applications to the commission. Also we are in the business of advising producers how to attract other investors to the project. One thing that is proving attractive to private sector investors in Australian features, is the Project branch's role in monitoring all production expenses. Whilst there's no way that we will get involved in creative decision making, we do use our personnel and experience to see that every dollar gets a dollar's worth of product.

At least the project branch never sees a lukewarm customer, everybody is dead keen to get their project going. So it's important to have some idea of the application deadlines. July 22nd for the August Commission meeting. September 23rd for October and November 18th for the December meeting.
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### Production Survey

**SUMMERFIELD**
- **Prod Company**: Clare Beach Films
- **Dir Company**: New Life Films Pty Ltd
- **Director**: Wayne Porter
- **Screenplay**: Clive Fowles, Stephen Slatter
- **Photography**: John C. Wigglesworth
- **Music**: John Zutavern
- **Sound Recordist**: Alan Harris
- **Sound Editor**: Stuart C. Williams
- **Make-up**: Val Waring
- **Prod Accountant**: Tamara Martin

**THE GETTING OF WISDOM**
- **Prod Company**: Mapletree Films
- **Dir Company**: Film London
- **Director**: Vivian De Angelis
- **Screenplay**: Vivian De Angelis
- **Photography**: Peter Lord
- **Music**: John Lunn
- **Make-up**: Susan Wright
- **Prod Accountant**: Philip Newby

**THE GREEN MACHINE**
- **Prod Company**: Kirlin Productions
- **Dir Company**: DRP
- **Director**: Philip D'Adamo
- **Screenplay**: John C. Wigglesworth, and Stephen Slatter
- **Photography**: John C. Wigglesworth
- **Music**: John Zutavern
- **Make-up**: Val Waring
- **Prod Accountant**: Tamara Martin

**HOT TO TROT**
- **Prod Company**: Voyager Films Pty Ltd
- **Dir Company**: Film London
- **Director**: Vivian De Angelis
- **Screenplay**: John C. Wigglesworth, and Stephen Slatter
- **Photography**: John C. Wigglesworth
- **Music**: John Zutavern
- **Make-up**: Val Waring
- **Prod Accountant**: Tamara Martin

**JOURNEY AMONG WOMEN**
- **Prod Company**: Kirlin Productions
- **Dir Company**: DRP
- **Director**: Vivian De Angelis
- **Screenplay**: John C. Wigglesworth, and Stephen Slatter
- **Photography**: John C. Wigglesworth
- **Music**: John Zutavern
- **Make-up**: Val Waring
- **Prod Accountant**: Tamara Martin

---

**FULLY AWAITING RELEASE**

**FANTASMA COMES AGAIN**
- **Prod Company**: Film London
- **Dir Company**: Stan Collyer
- **Director**: Stan Collyer
- **Screenplay**: John C. Wigglesworth, and Stephen Slatter
- **Photography**: John C. Wigglesworth
- **Music**: John Zutavern
- **Make-up**: Val Waring
- **Prod Accountant**: Tamara Martin

**THE ELECTRIC CANDLE**
- **Prod Company**: The Electric Candle
- **Director**: John Scott
- **Screenplay**: John C. Wigglesworth, and Stephen Slatter
- **Photography**: John C. Wigglesworth
- **Music**: John Zutavern
- **Make-up**: Val Waring
- **Prod Accountant**: Tamara Martin

---

**58 — Cinema Papers, July**
MAIDENS

THE NIGHT NURSE

RODEO

SHADOW SISTER

SOUNDS LIKE NUGNI

MAIDENS

PRODUCERS, DIRECTORS, and PRODUCTION COMPANIES

I include your current and future projects in our production survey. Forward your production details and skills to:

Production Survey
Cinema Papers
700 Bourke St
Melbourne, 3000
Telephone (03) 329 5983

For details of the following 16mm films consult the previous survey:

Backroads
Brother Number One: The Boys
The Educational Smorgasbord or the Old
Farmer's Strike Again
Highway One
Hollywood, Hollywood
Hope
Just Another Night
The Legend of Yowie
Mouth to Mouth
The Living Goddess
Love Letters from Terabithia
Mad G&M: A Graphic Novel
The Alternative
Gone to Ground
Monaco
Racing on the Rock
We Aim to Please
Where the Action is

TELEVISION SERIES

Producers of television series and films are invited to assist the co-ordinator of the column by sending complete details of cast, crew and processes of each production to Cinema Papers. 143 Therry St. Melbourne 3000.

YOUNG RAMSAY

The story of a family "farm" set in a Victorian coastal town near the NSW border, featuring a young veterinarian.

YOUNG RAMSAY

THE JUBILEE AND BEYOND

AVEC FILM UNIT

For details of the following television series see the previous issue:

Bluestone Boys
Sleepy
The Box No 56
The Outsiders
The Sullivans
Who Do You Think You Are?

THE MAKING OF ANNA

PRODUCERS, DIRECTORS, and PRODUCTION COMPANIES

Include your current and future projects in our production survey. Forward your production details and skills to:

Production Survey
Cinema Papers
700 Bourke St
Melbourne, 3000
Telephone (03) 329 5983

For details of the following 16mm films consult the previous survey:

Backroads
Brother Number One: The Boys
The Educational Smorgasbord or the Old
Farmer's Strike Again
Highway One
Hollywood, Hollywood
Hope
Just Another Night
The Legend of Yowie
Mouth to Mouth
The Living Goddess
Love Letters from Terabithia
Mad G&M: A Graphic Novel
The Alternative
Gone to Ground
Monaco
Racing on the Rock
We Aim to Please
Where the Action is

THE MAKING OF ANNA

AVEC FILM UNIT
THE CLAIM

Producers: Ross Campbell, Lesley Hammond
Producer: Ross Campbell
Screenplay: Ivan Gaal
Photography: John Leake A.C.S.
Color Process: Eastman

Synopsis: Examines the uniquely important role played by the airport in the lives of the people who pass through it.

South Australian Film Corporation.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION

This film shows the efforts being made by concerned teachers in obtaining parental involvement to solve the problems of delinquent students, particularly in the education of young offenders.

LEISURELINES

Prod Co: Newfilms Pty Ltd
Exec Producer: Norman Laird
Screenplay: Peter Clarke
Sound Producer: Peter Johnson
Editor: Colin Waddy
Color Process: Eastman

Synopsis: A film aimed at students — the basics of driver education.

SAFE LOADS

Prod Co: Malcolm Smith
Exec Producer: Malcolm Smith
Screenplay: Terry McEwan
Sound Producer: Peter Johnson
Color Process: Eastman

Synopsis: The film stresses the concept of safe loads on trucks.

THE HERMIT

Prod Co: Department of Film Production Tasmania
Exec Producer: Donald Bromley
Screenplay: Donald Bromley
Sound Producer: Peter Johnson
Color Process: Eastman

Synopsis: This film is set on an island which is cut off by tide and dunes around an old roadway leading nowhere. The film shows the tourist's attitude towards the island.

HISTORIC STANLEY

Prod Co: Department of Planning
Exec Producer: John Edwards
Screenplay: Richard Brennan
Sound Producer: Mike Prowse
Color Process: Eastman

Synopsis: To introduce people to the architectural, industrial and social history of the town.

WOOL

Prod Co: Pepper AudioVisual
Screenplay: John Dick
Color Process: Eastman

Synopsis: An introduction to the Australian wool industry.

WORKER PARTICIPATION

Prod Co: South Australian Film Corporation.
Screenplay: Tony Gilroy
Color Process: Eastman

Synopsis: To introduce people to the peaceful revolution in South Australian industry and how it can benefit people.

DEPARTMENT OF FILM PRODUCTION TASMANIA

The Production Company for the following film is: Department of Film Production Tasmania.

DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS

Prod Co: South Australian Unit for Drug Abuse
Screenplay: John Edwards
Color Process: Eastman

Synopsis: The value of art in the school curriculum.
SYNOPSIS

A series of five educational documentaries to provide a better understanding and appreciation of forestry, management and preservation.

NO WHERE ELSE

Director...Sherry James
Screenplay...Ted Ogden
Producer...Norman Lord
Exec Producer...Ray Barnes
Editor...Frank McIvor
Sound Recorder...Peter McKinley
Mixer...Frank McIvor
Synopsis: The film concerns forestry and it's management that promote the mutually beneficial attractions of the North-West region.

ROSS BRIDGE

Director...Rodney Munro
Screenplay...Norman Lord
Producer...Norman Lord
Exec Producer...Ray Barnes
Mixer...Frank McIvor
Synopsis: The film is concerned with forestry and it's management that promote the mutually beneficial attractions of the North-West region.

TROUTH FISHING IN TASMANIA

Director...Peter Kay
Screenplay...Peter Kay
Producer...Don Anderson
Exec Producer...Ray Barnes
Sound Recorder...Peter Kay
Synopsis: This film concerns forestry and it's management that promote the mutually beneficial attractions of the North-West region.

WHY TASMANIA

Director...Philip Kay
Screenplay...Peter Kay
Producer...Don Anderson
Exec Producer...Ray Barnes
Synopsis: Producing the film will yield the following positive results:

1. Increasing public awareness of forestry, management and preservation
2. Promoting the mutually beneficial attractions of the North-West region
3. Encouraging tourism to the region
4. Attracting industry to the region
5. Creating employment opportunities
6. Improving the quality of life for communities in the region

VICTORIAN FILM CORPORATION

The Victorian Film Corporation has the following productions to offer:

TV SERIES

12 Antigons and Music $2,640
Flax $1,020
Tracy $1,120
Richardson
Teddy Richardson $1,845
Suzanne Walter
Par Melissa $950
Timothy Wooller
Section 83 $4,445
- Project funded to double head stage
Supplementals:

Homecoming $1,900
Paul Grant
The Stylo $850
David Roberts
Time Flitting $2,000
Peter Doherty
Dead End $776

VICTORIA

Robert Burns
Hydrocarbons and Western Port $1,200
- furnished to the Minister for Industry
John Kirk
Bowie $1,000
- furnished to the Minister for Industry
Morgan
Crawford Productions

PRODUCTION DEVELOPMENT JUNE 1977

The following investments and loans have been made:

SCenario Development/Pre-
Production Activities

Keen Salut
Break Point $6,500
John Michael/Jeanine Brian Beth
Bettinger $5,000

PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES

Sampan Productions
Weekend to Kill $2,000
Prithi Institute of Film and Television

Gemm Productions
Sun on the Stubble $85,000
Voyager Films

The Last Wave $6,300
Provided as a bridging loan

Raw Deal
Up to $6,300 was approved for additional production expenditure

CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

FEBRUARY 1977

The following information was held over from the previous request:

ADVANCED PRODUCTION FUND

Projects requiring immediate funding

Bruce Allen
Crying in the Garden $2,000
Gordon Dick $1,200

Amanda Grieve Productions

Beverly Cartmell $5,000
Peter Soronson

S. A.

K. R. Barnum and T. Bass $3,500
The Tracker $2,500 (funded to double head)
Unlimited $3,000

W. A.

John Hart
Wilong Kirkroyd $1,000
Laura de Lope

SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT FUND

Projects recommended for funding

Bruce Allen
The Infant $1,500

N. W.

Joe Deidoo
Gina Between Changes $2,000
Bob Ellis/Richard Beckett
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PRODUCTION FUND

George Barnard
Deadly $9,000

W. A.

Debrah Hours
Survival $1,000

S. A.

UNION

Doco $8,000
Twinings $1,000

EXPERIMENTAL FILM AND TELEVISION FUND

George Barnard
Summer Street $5,000

W. A.

Barbara Cartmell
End To End $1,000

S. A.

VICTORIA

The following grants for the development of creative and experimental film and video work have been awarded:

CHRISTOPHER KOREN

Christopher Gower
Undertakers $2,000

W. A.

Valerie Kippen
The Proposal $2,000

S. A.

D. P. PLINER

The Artist Good Evening Nothing But
$6,000
Unlimited $6,000

Q UENSLAND

John Hart
Unreal World $1,500

EXPERIMENTAL FILM AND TELEVISION FUND

George Barnard
Wild West $2,000

MARGARET FINK

Journey $1,000

Q UENSLAND

Margaret Fink
Buckley and Giverse $1,000

EBERTON/BLUEPRINTS

The Final $2,000

FAIRYTALE

Toy Story $1,000

F I L M PRODUCTION FUND

Paul McAdam (NSW)
Survival $1,000

GRAZIOTINO

Don Carruthers
Blowing in the Wind $1,000

DUDLEY

Mia McCarty
Family $300

ROBERT TUCKER

Margaret Fink
Deadly $1,000

SANDY RICHARDSON

Simon Lewis
Dance Me $1,000

DANIEL LEEDS

Barbara Cartmell
Summer Street $5,000

MICHAEL KEMPSON

Richard Puller
Ridge $1,000

WILLIAM BURKE

Zoe Hayman
Living It Up $1,000

EUGENIO CAFARCA

Zoe Hayman
Eternal $1,000

VICTORIA

The following grants for the development of creative and experimental film and video work have been awarded:
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Unlimited $6,000
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EXPERIMENTAL FILM AND TELEVISION FUND

George Barnard
Wild West $2,000

MARGARET FINK

Journey $1,000

Q UENSLAND

Margaret Fink
Buckley and Giverse $1,000

EBERTON/BLUEPRINTS

The Final $2,000

FAIRYTALE

Toy Story $1,000

F I L M PRODUCTION FUND

Paul McAdam (NSW)
Survival $1,000

GRAZIOTINO

Don Carruthers
Blowing in the Wind $1,000

DUDLEY

Mia McCarty
Family $300

ROBERT TUCKER

Margaret Fink
Deadly $1,000

SANDY RICHARDSON

Simon Lewis
Dance Me $1,000

DANIEL LEEDS

Zoe Hayman
Living It Up $1,000
"Solo" is an Australia/New Zealand co-production set in the vast pine forests of New Zealand's North Island. It's a love story starring Vincent Gil and Lisa Peers and was produced by David Hancock and Tony Williams, directed by Tony Williams and photographed by cinematographer John Blick.

The story is about four people who lead solo lives. Paul Robinson (Vincent Gil) is a fire patrol pilot, scanning pine forests. He chooses the isolation of a cockpit for seven hours a day. Paul rears a young son, Billy (Perry Armstrong), who is a solitary, intelligent child living in the world of his imagination. Living in the forest in the totally isolated atmosphere of a fire watchers tower is Catweazle (Martyn Sanderson), an eccentric workmate and friend of Paul and Billy. Catweazle spends seven months at a time gazing from his tower, writing books about UFOs, grids and other mystic theories he has been developing himself. Into this rather bizarre world comes Judy Ballantyne (Lisa Peers), a young Australian hitchhiker who is savoring freedom after a narrow escape from an early marriage. It is through her lives that we first see the forest and the strange, lonely lives of Paul, Billy and Catweazle.

The central action of the film develops around the relationship between Paul and Judy as they fly across the spectacular countryside in his restored Tiger Moth biplane with Billy in tow. The mood is at times delicate, sometimes lyrical and even tense as the two people reach out for each other from their different worlds. The focus of the film is when Billy, who is feeling left out of the situation and trying to gain attention, attempts to fly the old biplane solo and crashes, bringing to earth the fantasy of the trip and the relationships.
Was it difficult getting the money together for an Australia/New Zealand co-production?

No, it was surprisingly easy. Tony Williams and I talked the idea for the film in October 1976 and we had a script ready for presentation to the potential backers by Christmas. The Seven Network then committed themselves to investment by early January 1977, and New Zealand's Queen Elizabeth Arts Council and four New Zealand businesses followed suit with the balance. We started shooting on February 21.

Why did you decide to film in New Zealand?

The story has a New Zealand background. There are exotic pine forests here in Australia, but nothing with the scale and beauty of those in New Zealand. The timber industry there is one of the world's largest and our central character is an aerial firewatcher, a uniquely New Zealand occupation.

What were the problems associated with shooting a film 2000 km from your Sydney office?

The problems were greater than living the same distance away but within Australia. For example, when we were shooting at Waimarama, which is a beautiful beach on the east coast, we were filming on a Monday, and it was Tuesday before we could get a flight out from the local airport to get rushes to Auckland. Wednesday before the Customs agents had transhipped them to Australia, Thursday before they cleared Australian Customs and Friday before they were processed and viewed by Artlab. It took just as long for them to get back to us on location for viewing. In fact, we were two weeks into the shoot before we saw our first rushes. This eventually caused a problem, because a lens fault developed which was not apparent to the camera crew on location. The fault only affected scenes shot with very low light levels, affecting both focus and depth of field. It involved considerable re-shooting at locations we had already left. For most of the shoot we were not only 2000 km from Sydney, but generally hundreds of kilometres from any major New Zealand centre, which naturally caused communication problems. Our travelling production office was also marvellous. Pat Cox, who was in charge of production, and his assistant, Sue May, always had things under control no matter where we were. In fact, the management and co-ordination of the film couldn't have been better.

How did the Australian and New Zealand crew members work together?

Extremely well. The New Zealanders were the top people available and I think the Australians were actually quite surprised at the extent of their expertise. There was never a 'them' and 'us' situation — it was always a 'together' unit. The same applied to the actors, although Vincent and Lisa knew Davina and Martyn's work in Australia — as well as New Zealand.

Of the two co-productions you have been involved with — "Man From Hong Kong" and "Solo" — which had the fewer problems?

Well, the experience of working on Man from Hong Kong taught me a few things about co-production, so that by the time I had come to produce Solo I was more prepared for problems that might arise. The films are entirely different, of course. On Man from Hong Kong I was executive producer and the film was being made by two large corporations, while with Solo it's Tony Williams and my production, so I had much more control of the situation. On Man from Hong Kong there were tremendously different attitudes between us and the Chinese on every level — cultural, personal and professional. But the differences between Australians and New Zealanders are very subtle. We have already mentioned the problems but the pluses are much more important to point out. The assistance we were given at every level, from Government Ministers, to major New Zealand corporations, to small businesses and the man in the street was incredible. There was so much positive interest in the film from every area, it was terrific.

Do you intend doing more Australia/New Zealand co-productions?

Tony Williams and I have another project (Little Trippers) which we are in the process of planning now. We already have a second draft screenplay and have selected the main locations. Bill Sheat (executive producer on Solo) and I have been talking to people about investment. I find that New Zealand, while being similar to Australia in many ways, has so many different backgrounds and ways of life. The main character in Solo is an aerial firewatcher, and to know knowledge and existence exists in the forests here. The background to Little Trippers is a small town whose main industry is the killing of deer from the air — for export as venison. New Zealand is probably the most air-minded country in the world — both Solo and Trippers feature flight as a background.

Do you believe "Solo" has overseas potential?

It is a love story and, therefore, has universal appeal. It is the story of a man who grew up in the fifties falling in love with a girl growing up in the seventies. It handles single parent/single child situations, a very topical theme. It also explores man's great passion for flight. All these things give it a tremendously wide appeal.

How do you intend selling it overseas?

After the initial release in Australia and New Zealand, we will take it to Cannes. Apart from that, Tony and I have contacts in the U.S. and Britain whom we will be seeing.

What sort of financial deal do you have with your backers?

I think a very good one. The backers have 65½ per cent and we have 34½, which is better than the usual split. The US is a very good country to have a handle on. This has enabled us to give a good percentage to the cast and crew.

Did you give percentages instead of high fees?

Nobody on the film got a very high fee, but certainly nobody was scratching for a living. Obviously we wanted a good ensemble feeling, which I believe is only created by those involved being shareholders in the production.
Tony Williams is perhaps the best-known film director working in New Zealand. He was assistant cameraman for Pacific Films when he was 16 and five years later director of photography on two New Zealand features, “Runaway” and “Don’t Let it Get You”.

Williams made his debut as a director on two documentaries for the BBC “Release” program: “Takeis Unlimited”, shot in London and Paris, and “Sound the Trumpet, Beat the Drum”, made in Iran.

Williams returned to New Zealand and spent five years making independent documentaries for New Zealand television, three of which won the Feltex “Best Television Program of the Year” award in consecutive years. He directed a one-hour musical special for American television, and the “First Edition”, which was to become the widest distributed New Zealand film.

Williams’ previous production, “Lost in the Garden of the World” — shot at the Cannes film festival — has received festival screenings in New York and Edinburgh. Williams now operates his own company in Wellington, New Zealand.

How do you feel about co-production with Australia?

I feel it is our only hope of survival. Over the years we have lost gaffers, cameramen, editors, directors, producers, writers and actors to the Australian film industry. Our market is too small for us to get our negative costs back here, so it is important that we work hand in hand with Australia. Not only bringing Australians here, but bringing back New Zealanders too. What we can offer Australia is another three million people, which helps the box-office, as well as additional areas of finance not available to purely Australian films.

How did you and Martyn Sanderson go about writing “Solo”?

It was my outline. I got together with David in Sydney and discussed it with him. He liked it, so I wrote the treatment. Martyn then came in and we worked as a team. For example, I would write a skeleton outline for a scene and give it to Martyn, who would either rewrite it or say it was good enough to leave as it was. If he rewrote it, he would then hand it to me and I would correct what he had written. It was a collaborative effort.

How do you as a director feel about having a producer always around on the location?

In David’s case it doesn’t worry me at all, because we complement each other very well. He is creative, very enthusiastic, and has terrific energy. If it was someone else . . . for instance, I worked on The Rise and Rise of Michael Rimmer in London, where the producer used to come down if we were going into overtime and yell the gaffer to turn the lights out. There would then be an argument between him and the gaffer, and, of course, the director. We have never been involved in any of those situations.

David and I are co-producing the film, so it isn’t like having someone watch over your shoulder.

You were a cameraman and editor before becoming a writer and director. What influenced you to move from one area to another?

I was always interested in films and wanted to direct. It was really a matter of taking the opportunities as they came, so I started off as a camera assistant. I was in my early twenties when I lit two feature films for John O’Shea (Runaway, Don’t Let it Get You). Then, I left New Zealand. I wanted to stop being a technician. I worked with Sandy McKendrick in Hollywood and for a period with Alain Resnais in Paris.

In Paris I decided that editing was closer to the process of writing and directing, so I gave up the camera and joined the BBC as an assistant editor, got my ticket and then went freelance as an editor and began directing in London before I came back to New Zealand. I always wanted to be a director, but you can’t start directing films, you have to know something else first. I started off as cameraman by chance.

Do you always edit your own films?

No, not always. I have edited many of my films but more recently I have worked with an editor I used to work with at the BBC, Ian John. He is not available for Solo as he is editing Sleeping Dogs. There was nobody else I felt secure with, and as I have edited features I decided to cut the films myself. In fact, I would prefer to work with an editor, because it’s better for the director to keep some sort of distance from his work. However, until I meet a feature editor I feel happy with, I will probably continue to cut my own films.

As a director, do you find New Zealand a good place to work in?

As a New Zealander I have an affinity for the country. I have always wanted to live and make films here, but it’s very frustrating. Freelancing New Zealanders have a hard time trying to get experience directing dramatic productions. We have an enormous television system, but they don’t like using freelance directors; they keep importing refugees from the BBC and ITV. I have been luckier than most and have a very comfortable existence here. But it’s ironic that I have had more support from the U.S. and Australia than I have had from my own country.

Do you feel that the resurgence of the Australian film industry has had any effect on New Zealand?

Very much so. Until now a feature film was a distant dream we all aspired to, but couldn’t really see happening. It wasn’t until I began to see people I had known as camera assistants at Supreme Sound many years ago, turning out superb work as directors of photography, and commercials’ directors directing superb feature films, and spent some time at Cannes a couple of years ago interviewing Australians for a documentary I was making on the Festival, that I realized these were our people; they weren’t British, they weren’t American, they were Australians and they were our friends, very much like us, thought like us, were the same age as us. So I thought, well, I have as much talent as these people, so what was possible for them was possible for me.

How do you relate to the actors in “Solo”?

We are trying to make Solo a very intimate and personal film. Because there are only a few actors we’ve had time to develop each role as well as develop close relationships. For example, when we first met Perry Armstrong, who plays the 14-year-old boy, he was quite a delicate, quiet schoolboy. But now he has blossomed into a fantastic human being.

We spent a week in the Sounds working on improvisations and developing roles and have some beautiful performances from all the actors.

How do you define your role as a director?

I prefer to act as the first member of the audience to see the film. Everyone else on the crew has so many technical problems to worry about—lighting, camera, sound—that a director should, for my taste, be the one concerned with how the shoot is going to look to an audience. I don’t ever scream or shout, and I believe in holding conversations with the actors instead of yelling out orders from behind the camera like a sergeant major. Actors are vulnerable people who need to be given support; they should never be criticized in front of the crew.嵴
LISA PEERS

What do you consider the best areas of the film?

There are lots of areas, but the crew area is particularly good. Bob Allen (the location sound mixer) is fantastic; working with him is a real treat. With him doing sound you can whisper, you don't have to worry about projecting. You don't have to think about the microphone, although, of course, you are always aware of where it is. He is always there, catching you breathing. And John Blick, the cameraman, is great too. He doesn't mind me having a look through the camera. He tells me how big the shot is and exactly what's going on.

You obviously enjoy being close to the crew, helping in all sorts of ways on the location. Do you find most actors prefer this?

Often not, but I really love the way everybody is helping everybody over here. If I am not doing a shot, I like to help setting up the lunch. Now, in Australia, it's beginning to happen like overseas, where if you are a grip you are not allowed to do anything else — if you are a cameraman you are not allowed to do anything else. Actors are only allowed to act, and between shots you just have to sit and wait. But I like to help — to be involved in everything.

Do you ever contemplate working behind the scenes?

I would love to. Continuity interests me, but I would have to devote a few years to it to get it right. So, at the moment, I am going to restrict myself to my chosen area — acting — and get that right before moving into other areas.

Do you identify with the role of Judy Ballantyne?

In some ways, yes, and in others not at all. We are the same generation with similar attitudes to freedom, but I feel she is more passive than me. I always feel a need to question everything that a character does and says, and I often feel a need to question what Judy does and says, because I would probably react quite differently. But I like her, and I hope the audience will like her too. In a few of the earlier scenes she appears quite vulnerable and lost, though constantly protesting independence. Basically, I feel she needs time to discover herself, and she obviously realizes that staying with Paul (Vincent's character) is not the solution to her problems. I can strongly identify with her need to keep on moving and growing.

How do you feel about having a lead role in a feature?

A bit nervous, I suppose, I didn't worry so much about Sunday Too Far Away — although that was one of my first jobs — because I was quite happy about my performance. I thought it worked. But with this I have a lot more responsibility on my shoulders; they have to like me. If they don't like me, that means they don't like a third of the film. So this is really the most responsibility I've ever had.

Do you enjoy working with Tony Williams as a director?

Yes. The week down at the Sounds was excellent because we all got to know each other and there wasn't any work pressure. I had never met Tony or David before, although I knew Vince when he was living in Melbourne. Having that rehearsal period was useful, because there wasn't much time for rehearsal while we were shooting the film. During that period we swam and relaxed, although we went through the script every day and examined our roles. I find Tony easy to work with; he listens to all my ideas and feelings. He is great to have around during the rushes too; he can answer questions about his choice of takes. It helps to have some insight into how he plans to cut it. Editing is an area that interests me too, and I like to know that Tony will be editing this film. It gives me extra confidence.

VINCENT GIL

Is this your first lead role in a feature film?

Yes. I played a hickie in Sandy Harbutt's Stone, but this is my first lead.

How do you feel about the part?

Well, David Hannay brought Tony Williams one afternoon and they started talking about Solo. It took a while for me to realize they were considering me for the lead. Anyway, David took Tony away to see some of my work; then they came back the next day and offered me the part. I felt a bit like a kid who had been hit in the face with the Christmas pudding — overwhelmed and excited. Having read the script, I knew it was the best opportunity I had ever been offered and right now, though I know it's a bit early to say something like this, I feel I am doing the best work of my life. It's the opportunity as much as anything. All the right ingredients have fallen into place.

So you like the rushes you have seen so far?

Yes, I really like them. I always love and hate rushes at the same time, but these are really good. I think they are always a pretty good indication of how the film's going to look.

Have you worked with David Hannay before?

Yes, we first worked together as actors on The Battlers and then again on Stone, on which he was the executive producer.

And has it been a good experience?

Indeed. My feelings about him were never really complicated on Stone, although I know how much he likes my work. He is the sort of guy who sings praises of his friends to the heavens, and I always find that embarrassing. But, for a couple of weeks before Solo, I moved about with him and Tony, which was an incredible experience. As a producer I like the areas in which he chooses to function, because if I were a producer I know those are the areas I would choose. Like being on the location all the time, for instance. I knew a few of the crew were amazed by him always being there — perhaps even felt it was an intrusion. But I always found it comforting. Occasionally he would lay a couple of points on me and I would think: "That's right." We all need that.

You came over to New Zealand a week early for a sort of holiday-rehearsal. How was that?

Concluded Overleaf
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Lisa, Perry Armstrong, Martyn Sanderson, David and Tony Williams and I went to the Sounds (on the South Island) — it was a period of getting to know each other. There was no set rehearsal time, but we talked a lot and went over our ideas for the script. We were all given the opportunity to contribute a great deal, which is really unusual in this business. We all added to our characters and to each other's characters, so that by the time we went to the first location, we knew where we were going.

How do you find Tony Williams as a director?

I love the man. He has a perception about humanity that is so delicate. He has this ability to modulate my excesses as an actor; I sometimes get caught up in it and need someone to sort of censor my performance, to help me get the essence, and for me he does that beautifully.

You usually play the part of a heavy. How does it feel being a romantic lead?

Well, of course, being a lead of any sort is a tremendous responsibility. But I feel happy about the part. It's a great change. I think a lot of casting people lack the imagination to cast actors in a variety of roles. I have been playing heavies for years — weirdos and drug addicts. I love playing them, of course, and over the years they have been very good to me. But it's good to do something totally different. I suppose actors who always play romantic parts have the same complaint — they are all dying to play homicidal maniacs.

How do you find working with Lisa Peers?

I was delighted she was chosen for the part. She has something — a quality. You look at anything Lisa has done and you will see it. There is an essence to her that is close to what freedom is, and you can see it in her work. It's exciting.

David Hannay  
Continued from P. 63

How do you see your involvement in a film?

As a creative one. I like to involve myself in every aspect of making the film — scripting, casting, make-up, locations, performances, art direction, post production — everything. Fortunately, this hasn't created a problem with any of the other contributors, because most of the time I have been in accord with their views anyway, and on the few occasions there were disagreements everything was worked out amicably. During the shooting I was on location all the time and saw every foot of film shot. I have always thought that a producer owes it to those who have invested in his judgement to involve himself totally in every area.

If you feel that involved, why aren't you directing the film as well?

Firstly, the possibility of my directing this film was never in question. Tony and I have been talking about making films together for the past six years, and he was always going to be the director of any film we did together. I love his work — always have.

What about directing generally?

Well, I intend to. But when I do, it would be something so totally personal that it couldn't be understood or done as well by anybody else. Until that situation arises, I am quite happy working as a producer.

Why did you cast Vincent Gill and Lisa Peers in the leads?

I've known Vince for 10 years and I think I've probably seen everything he has done. He is my favorite actor, so when Tony and I talked about the character of Paul Robinson, I knew that Vince would be great for the part. So I took it round to meet him and then showed him an episode of Bluey in which Vince guest-starred and he really dug him and agreed with me.

Casting the girl wasn't that easy. I had instantly understood who Paul Robinson was, but the initial idea I had for Judy was not the same as Tony's. He obviously knew the character better than I did, so he had to tell me about her beyond what was in the script, as the character in many ways was someone in his life that was important to him. We fined it down to two people; both were right, and we looked at their work on film before making a decision. Although we couldn't talk with Lisa because she was in New York, she had the right quality for the film.
## Services & Facilities Guide

NB: This list is not comprehensive but represents only those who were willing to participate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSFERS</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>N.S.W.</th>
<th>VIC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) ¼&quot; tape to 16mm mono</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) ¼&quot; tape to 17.5mm mono</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) ¼&quot; tape to 35mm mono</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) ¼&quot; tape to 16mm stereo</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) ¼&quot; tape to 35mm stereo</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Equalizing or filtering during transfer</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>No!</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Numbering on magnetic tape of each take</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Sheet listing details: sync pulse; equalizing; slates; etc</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) SN Nagra transfers</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Speed variation during trans of original ¼&quot;</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DUBBING STUDIOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Number of dubbers</td>
<td>16mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Number that can be interlocked</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Rock &amp; Roll dubbing</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) High speed rewind dubber</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Facilities to mix onto 35mm</td>
<td>(i) Single track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Three track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Four track stereo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Six track stereo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Facilities to mix onto 16mm</td>
<td>(i) Single track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Three track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Three track or single track double-head changeover projection facilities</td>
<td>(i) 35mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 16mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Cartridge sound library</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Number of cartridges employed simultaneously</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Number of loops employed simultaneously</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Number of inputs into mixing desk</td>
<td>12 24 25 12 5 12 20 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Mixing desk has</td>
<td>(i) dialogue equalizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) graphic equalizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) noise gates or kepexs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) general equalizers on each channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v) echo or reverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vi) extras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m) Dolby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n) Size of dubbing theatre</td>
<td>70' x 35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o) Size of screen</td>
<td>16'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p) Remote electronic footage counter</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q) Post sync to picture</td>
<td>(i) dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Fx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r) Facilities for recording music score to projected film</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s) Line-up tone on head of mix</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(t) Optical neg printing</td>
<td>(i) RCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Westex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(u) Cross-modulation distortion testing facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Transfer three-track mix to mono optical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(w) Dolby cinema stereo optical printing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x) AB comparison between optical answer print and soundtrack and the master mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart designed by Peter Kelly.

*These facilities are not at present available to private producers.*

---
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A drama full of falsity, Roots. Lorne Greene as John Reynolds (right) and Vic Morrow as Mr Ames.

Tom Ryan

Australian television recently featured two highly-publicized productions — The Nixon Tapes and Roots. In The Nixon Tapes, David Frost’s "confrontation" with Richard Nixon was, "for the first time since the Watergate expose", going to provide millions of "America watchers" an opportunity to see "the private face" of the disgraced U.S. president. And the dramatization of Alex Haley’s Roots was to be a "terrific emotional experience...a very meaningful story for everyone...with a universal relevance".

The experience then of joining millions of viewers around the world on these much-heralded occasions was to be "historic" — the resultant community insight anticipating a new direction for television. Yet, the letdown was inevitable; the extraordinary dishonesty which lay beneath the two "dramas of confrontation" — between Nixon and his choric interviewer, and between white and black, against a background of African and American history — underlining the fact that television is more in tune with procreating palatable myths, than with probing beneath the surfaces of history.

Alistair Cooke in his "Letter From America" (ABC Radio) found in Nixon "a tragic figure", drawing on the man’s plunge from power to evoke a tone more in keeping with Sophocles, than with a side-stepping Frost interview. Frost’s questions and Nixon’s responses certainly provided a potential stage for such an insight, though as it happened it was more into the pathetic lack of self-awareness of a man bent on self-justification than into a tragedy.

In addition, their avoidance of matters which might have demanded a complex response. Of course, Roots is fiction, and in spite of the claims of those who paradoxically demand that "historical fiction" has to adhere strictly to "the facts", whatever they are, it has to be judged as fiction.

What it lacked as such was any interesting dramatic tension, the sort of shifting sympathies that made a large part of Rich Man Poor Man (Book 1) and Luke’s Kingdom (which will be discussed in the next issue of Cinema Papers) such compelling viewing. Adapted for television by William Bunn (the creator of the Starsky and Hutch series), Roots sacrifices the opportunity to explore those individual moments in its characters’ lives for the sake of achieving an epic quality. The result is a drama full of falsity.

From the start, its attempts to depict a mid-eighteenth century African life are distorted by a romantic conception of an alien world — all clean huts, closely-cropped lawns and verdant forest areas. The wisdom handed down by the elders to the prospective men sounds uncommonly like the liberal platitudes that one might expect to find in contemporary media editorializing, the humanist conception of the drama being comfortably sustained simply by implanting those values on the foreign culture, urging our acceptance of it because it is essentially like our own.

The black man is made "worthy" because he is presented as a facsimile of the white. The issue of confrontation between black and white is thus diverted. However much one might endorse the declared intention of the author and makers of Roots — to create better understanding between black and white — the means employed to this end are patently dishonest. The dramatic complexities one could find in Richard Fleischer’s film, Mandingo, are dispelled by a one-dimensional treatment of the drama, by a loading of the sympathies in trite melodramatic form on to those who are "victims", refusing us a broader perspective on this fictional piece of American history.

As so often before, the U.S. has tried to bare its soul, to make public its conscience. In Nixon Tapes and Roots it has only succeeded in missing the point. ★

*This mistaken assumption, unfortunately, seems to hold sway in much of the current critical response (in Cinema Papers and elsewhere) to Australian dramas which deal with historical subjects.
working in the television industry is doomed to television (a predominance of police series) as omissions are inevitable. With the cinema, directors, writers, actors, actresses, cinematographers and sundry technical assistants have won attention for various contributions to the films on which they have worked; because accessibility to specific television dramas is limited to a single viewing, any creative focus in this area has been centred on the major recurring features of the dramas — the stars, or, more accurately, the characters who return week after week to find themselves cast in a new situation, or a variation of an old one, or a duplication of one from another series. While one need say no more than Kojak, or Columbo, or Hawkeye, or K早 to establish a point of reference for discussion, names such as Ivan Goff and Ben Roberts, or Robert Collins, or Joseph Wambaugh allow no easy recognition.

It is not our claim that those who have played their parts in the creation of various series, and of the individual episodes of such series, automatically deserve critical attention. Yet many of the writers and directors who have worked in television have demonstrated in their work a considerable degree of wit and intelligence, qualities which deserve recognition. With the constancy of the technical crews working on a particular series, the fact that one episode of Police Woman or Little House on the Prairie is arguably superior to another, or at least different from it, seems to indicate that this variation can be ascribed to either the writer or the director, or shared by them.

Any critical analysis of the work clearly needs to go beyond this; and attention needs to be given to the production system which defines the parameters within which individuals have to locate their efforts, and to the system of structures and signs which make television but one aspect of visual communication. However, it seems that within this visual communication attention ought to be given to the possibility for personal expression. The fact that the episode of Wagon Train directed by John Ford ("The Colter Craven Story") exhibits a particularly "Fordian flavour", or that Sam Peckinpah's work on Theatre of Stars ("The Lady Is My Wife") provides a fascinating early glimpse of his remarkable visual style and of his recurring concern with the destructive aspect of sexual relationships should speak for itself. It is too easy to bring an accumulated and retrospective body of knowledge of Ford and Peckinpah to their television work. What is more difficult, but necessary, is that such knowledge needs to be constructed around those who find themselves, or choose to be, functioning only within television drama.

The recurrence of particular names within and across series should provide access to the possibilities of continuities, of "family resemblances" which, when combined with numerous other "family resemblances" (between particular episodes of the one series; between various series within specified genres; between television dramas which belong to the "realist narrative" tradition), can only serve to aid our understanding of the way in which those dramas are working.

The closer one gets to the television drama, the closer one is able to define a useful theoretical/critical framework for television analysis which, to date, seems to have been content to appropriate television to the broader categories of "popular culture", or to present a false face in the form of irrelevant sociological data.

Readers will recognize in the following checklists the names of veteran film directors who have turned their hand to television: Jack Arnold, Vincent Sherman and Alfred Hitchcock; of others who have since moved into film: Stuart Rosenberg, Steven Spielberg, Joseph Sargent; of others who regularly direct tele-movies: Marvin Chomsky, Boris Sagal, Alexander Singer; and of actors who have occasionally had a shot at direction, generally of episodes in series in which they star: Michael Landon, Peter Falk and Harry Morgan.

The lists in this issue are limited to directors and writers of American television drama series, though we have bracketed the comedy work of particular directors and writers included here. The next issue will deal with American television comedy.

The information presented focuses primarily on the television series of the late 1960s and 1970s, though, where available, credits before this time have been included. For those who are interested in further researching the area, the writers (who can be contacted through Cinema Papers) can give individual titles of series episodes for most of those in the checklists.

(P) denotes a pilot episode for a projected series, some of which appear never to have come to fruition. The placing of an asterisk by a name is to indicate the opinion of one or other of the writers that the work of that individual has been consistently impressive or is likely to be of interest.★
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The Evolvement of a Television Series Drama

Monte Miller

In Britain, it takes up to two years to develop a television drama series. It usually evolves from an idea conceived by a single writer; but sometimes from pooled ideas within a production organization.

Australian television cannot afford such delays, and this tendency to re-use in serials and series being thrown together in a hurry. As producers have a tendency to follow earlier successes — costs being what they are. So the way the innovator in the U.S., and in Australia particularly, is not easy to determine. We haven’t been able to continue to be developed into formats for series and serials, and are continually offered up to television channels. Sometimes an idea will appeal enough for the station to fund a pilot, but usually there will be some idea conceived by a single writer; but some producers have a tendency to follow earlier ways of the innovator in the U.S., and in Australia successes — costs being what they are. So the television channels. Sometimes an idea will much time developing an idea as far as pilot business management, it dealt with the problem of running a small manufacturing business. Neave conveyed his weekly lesson in the form of an amusing little story about a young executive applying for a job interview. Instead of needing a new job, he had merely wanted his airfare to Surfers Paradise, where his girl happened to be.

Some months later, Neave contacted me and said he was interested and asked to see a script. At first we had different motives in wanting to make the series, although we had the aim. I, for instance, felt that as business management and industrial relations affect so many of us in our daily lives, there would be a rich dramatic vein worth tapping.

We then decided to make a joint application to the Film, Radio and Television Board for script development.

We agreed to call the series The Battlers, but didn’t know then that there had been one with the same title in the 1960s. That one was about a young pugilist, while ours was to be about the battlers in every strata of society. We summed up our theme as, "What happens to the people involved?" As well, there was the hint that individuals relations affect so many of us in our daily lives, there would be a rich dramatic vein worth tapping.

We met the Film and Television Board assessors, and a few months later were told that we had been awarded a grant to enable us to develop a screenplay for the first episode of the proposed series.

We planned the series for a while and felt it might work better if it was set in a country town. We were not looking for an industrial Bellbird, but something that would encapsulate the idea of the series.

We would suppose that the company, a die-caster and motor vehicle spare-parts manufacturer, established in the city, had moved to the country town under the decentralization plan. It had then amalgamated with a smaller and more recently established company. The new company employed about 300 people, many of them migrants. Some of the work force had moved up from the city with the company.

The new company found it had become a major influence on the town, a role it had neither sought nor anticipated, but to which it had to adapt. The company was subjected to the pressures of the industry it served, including the pressures of the multi-national. It also had to cope with changes of direction taken by the Federal and State governments, a multitude of bureaucracies, and there was always the potential threat of conflict with the trade unions.

I called on the Minister for State Development to find out what was entailed in moving a city business to the country, or in setting up a new business at the country town. I worked it out, as the series was set in the country, it could be made in the country, possibly by using the facilities of a country television station. The Minister was enthusiastic about the possibility of a production venture for bush television, though making could strain the facilities of his station. So, I realized I had to write the script with the limitations of the station in mind.

Neave and I spent much time working out the characters and once we felt they were emerging as real people, we started thinking about the first episode. This pilot, as well as having to introduce the characters, had to deal with the outbreak of a strike.

I discarded the first six pilots until I got something that I felt was at least partly right. But I then realized that the basic problem was that I had no direct knowledge of industrial relations — all my information was second or third hand. I decided to do my own research.

I spent a lot of time talking to union officials at the Trades Hall, people at the A.C.T.U. and the Trades Union Training Centre, organizers of the Amalgamated Metal Workers’ Union, and of the Metal Trades Industries Association, managers in several companies, and individuals in labor and management. I watched how stop work meetings were conducted, and also followed Arbitration Court proceedings. I dealt with mankind as a whole. Or abstracts. It conceals facts and puts things in a way that softens the effect.

What interested me about these industrial disputes was not statistics, but the effect such actions have on the lives of individuals. That is, "What happens to the people involved?" As Paddy Chayefsky said in the golden days of American television: "Television tells a small story about a familiar character and pursues this small story with relentless literalness to one small synthesized moment of crisis . . . dramatic construction is essentially a search for reasons . . . television is the marvellous world of the ordinary".

Neave and I then completed the first episode and called it "The Principle of the Thing". Both sides (management and labor) were locked into an inflexible stance because of the principle involved, and I realized that both sides wanted the strike because it would strengthen their positions. It would show that often there was no simple solution, and finding the real reason for a dispute was often extremely difficult. But he didn’t tell us that at the same time complex relationships between the characters: these ranged from loyalty, to perfidy, to complete indifference.

The script was written with production at BTV in mind, and it was realized that scenes could have been constructed in the studio, but scenes were written to be taped in corridors, the reception area, etc. Exterior scenes were to have been taped by the outside broadcast van.

We made up a presentation kit and this included the script, background information, character notes and further story lines. We also included some production details. It looked good and created a lot of interest: everyone liked the script. But he didn’t tell us that at the same time the ABC was doing a co-production with New Zealand on a drama series based on a similar subject. So the script for The Battlers hit the ABC a couple of weeks before their first episode of Moyers was aired.

I believe the script of The Battlers is good and the idea sound, and I believe it has good possibilities for an absorbing series. Perhaps The Battlers needs re-thinking. It could be treated as "The Rag Trade or On The Buses". Or it might be set in the hungry thirties, a period which is becoming increasingly relevant to contemporary times, and which has the attraction of nostalgia.

But the Battlers doesn’t belong to the present Australian climate where ratings are what it is all about. After all, television exists purely to deliver audiences to advertisers. Its only role is flogging goods, and the commercialism is more important than the programmes. Like a Playbox centrefold, it promises much, but delivers nothing — not even a dream.
"High Rolling is a chronicle: a record of a journey undertaken by two young men. And, at the same time, it is a study of the close relationship that exists between them and binds them together. "Tex and Alby — one American, the other Australian — reflect a coming together of national cultures already well established in this 'lucky country'. In High Rolling there is no heavy polemic. It is rather an entertainment piece of high energy, strong drama and that ironic comic sense for which the newest range of Australian films has become famous."

Director ............... Igor Auzins
Producer ................. Tim Burstall
Production Manager ..... Tom Binnn
Director of Photography Dan Burstall
Art Director ............... Leslie Binnn
Sound Recordist ........ Barry Brown
Editor ....................... Edward McQueen-Mason

Texas ...................... Joseph Bottoms
Alby ....................... Grigor Taylor
Lynn ........................ Judy Davis
Arnold ........................ John Clayton
Barbie ........................ Wendy Hughes
Susie ........................ Sandy McGregor

Top: Joseph Bottoms as Tex.
Middle: Judy Davis as the 16-year-old hitch-hiker Lynn.
Far left: Alby (Grigor Taylor) fights off Arnold's (John Clayton) advances.
Left: Grigor Taylor and Joseph Bottoms.
SUMMERFIELD

"A young schoolteacher goes to a small fishing town in Victoria to take over the school as the previous teacher has disappeared without trace. He becomes fascinated by the people living at 'Summerfield', an island farm, and involved in the mystery of the teacher's disappearance against his better judgment. Think of the worst that could happen — then think again."

Director..................................... Ken Hannam
Producer....................................... Pat Lovell
Director of Photography ............ Mike Molloy
Art Director,............................. Graham Walker
Sound Recordist .................. Ken Hammond
Editor......................................................... Sara Bennett
Music..................................... Bruce Smeaton

Simon Robertson......................... Nick Tate
David Abbott............................... John Waters
Jenny Abbott......................... Elizabeth Alexander
Sally Abbott............................. Michelle Jarman
Dr Miller................................. Charles Tingwell

Top left: Michelle Jarman as Sally Abbott.
Top right: Simon Robinson (Nick Tate) comforts Jenny Abbott (Elizabeth Alexander).
Centre: Nick Tate with Geraldine Turner who plays Betty Tate.
Bottom: Nick Tate and Michelle Jarman.
Bottom left: Dr Miller (Charles Tingwell) and David Abbott (John Water).
OUT OF THE SKY COMES THE SCREEN'S MOST INCREDIBLE SPECTACLE OF MEN AND WAR!

Joseph E. Levine presents

A BRIDGE TOO FAR
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Joseph E. Levine A BRIDGE TOO FAR
(starring in alphabetical order)
Dirk Bogarde
James Caan
Michael Caine
Sean Connery
Edward Fox
Elliott Gould
Gene Hackman
Anthony Hopkins
Hardy Kruger
Laurence Olivier
Ryan O'Neal
Robert Redford
Maximilian Schell
Liv Ullmann

From the book by Cornelius Ryan
Screenplay by William Goldman
Produced by Joseph E. Levine and Richard P. Levine
Directed by Richard Attenborough

Original Motion Picture Soundtrack Album Available on United Artists Records
THE F.J. HOLDEN
Susan Dermody

I came away from F.J. Holden charged with elation that such material could be so well handled, though I also found myself faced with several nagging doubts.

The best thing about F.J. Holden is that it 'sees' so intensely. It has found certain strategies of looking at life in those kerbed and sealed, but barely civilized, western suburbs of Sydney; strategies that permit the viewer to glimpse the marvellous in the real, and to be fascinated and unperturbed doing so.

The lives we look at are teeming with detail and impulses; yet they are resoundingly empty, uninhabited spaces, unaware of the possibility of conscious action altering the pattern of existence.

F.J. Holden places one inside the houses, backyards, hotel bars, shopping malls and cars of these people in privileged closeeness to their life-style. The smallness of the spaces forces one, almost always, into a closer-than-medium-shot proximity with them and the accumulated detail of their lives — the kerosene heater, the fish tank in the corner, the china swans in flight on the wall, the set of glasses (won at the club), and so on.

One is forced to intrude far into the lives of Kevin (Paul Couzens), Anne (Eva Dickinson), and their families, and in this I am reminded of many eastern European films, such as Fireman's Ball, which also look unwincingly on human beings trapped in the moment-to-moment effort of finding an appropriate response to life, and usually failing to find it in time, if at all.

The film manages to celebrate the extraordinary-ordinariness of these lives in their narrow but almost obsessively interesting variety — the character of Anne for example. One gets a complete sense of the boundaries of her life — working at Banks-town Square (desperately relieved to be out of school, and quietly proud of being at this obvious hub of existence); drudging for her deserted father and two very much younger brothers; allowing herself to be fucked by Kevin's mate Bob, so that eventually Kevin will take his turn; developing and ably handling some kind of relationship with Kevin until he (almost accidentally) steps on its most vulnerable spot and makes it absurd and unendurable to her.

All the time, she is predestined to be the rather thin-lipped, thin-faced woman she already is, in her future life of drudging for some other bloke, some other kids. Yet in all this, she has stature: her life is worthy of thought and close attention, and her character is a self-contained entity, requiring respect.

Kevin, too, is given this measure of celebration, just by having the details of his life acknowledged, one by one, in a coherent series. The casting and handling of almost all the characters of the main story carries with it a sense of responsibility towards the people concerned.

An important exception to this general rule, however, is the character of Deadlegs, played by Gary Waddell, and all the bits of story that are gratuitously dragged in by his occasional entry and re-entry in the film. He is an annoyingly irrelevant character, whose genealogy can be traced back through the slightly kooky side-kicks in films like American Graffiti, Rebel Without a Cause, and television serials like Doby Gillis, the Archie comics, etc. Whenever he is around, we are meant to be laughing rather mockingly at the mindless exertions of eating-drinking-fucking that the western suburbs substitute for living.

Another of the film's strategies is David Gribble's apt and agile camera. For instance, shots from within or alongside the car are sufficiently varied and inventive as to be rarely boring, though they make up so much of the film.

There are many patterns of interaction between car and camera movements, as well as one or two lovely surprise shots. For example, as Kevin and Bob drive through the streets after their smorgasbord lunch at the club, the car slows towards the camera, which is waiting at the far side of the intersecting streets. The Holden stops, and for a moment it is impossible to know why, until two skateboard riders appear from the left, moving down the centre of the street. The Holden pauses for them before turning in their direction, and the camera pans left.

There is something magical about the materialization of the two kids on skateboards, and even more so about the kind of gentle sympathy between car, skateboard, camera, and the rhythm of the moment.

There are also a few well-chosen moments when the camera stays on a street corner left empty by the car as it turns and disappears up or down a suburban street, leaving us speculating on the (always similar-but-different) details of the kerb, nature strip, front fence, and house as the car recedes from sight and hearing.

Camera movement within the houses is accomplished too, especially the witty, descriptive dollies through the house where the party is on, first anonymously as we move through the rooms, then subjectively as Kevin searches drunkenly for Anne, and finally as we track backwards before the father of the house advances to do battle with the source of disruption (Kevin, swearing in the kitchen at Anne).

There is also a certain wit to the epic crane shots which occasionally rise above the telegraph wires to a grandstand view of

A drunken Kevin (Paul Couzens) verbally spars with Deadlegs (Gary Waddell) prior to disrupting the party by swearing at Anne. F.J. Holden.
the terracotta roofs and western suburbs sunset. As well, there is the crane up at the end of the drag-strip meeting at 'Brickie', when we rise to an overview as the police book the kids and clear the area. Then, in a beautiful series of time-lapse dissolves towards dawn, the fluorescent lights become increasingly small and unimportant, and a magnificent range of clouds appears along the eastern sky.

But there are other examples of a much too-heavy hand on the material, such as when the camera pans fast from the lawn-mower to Kevin's bedroom window (behind which he is trying to sleep), back to the lawn-mower, as it revs loudly and unattended.

Or worse, when we are forced into an extreme close shot of the garden gnome that Kevin is about to hurl through the ripple glass front door of the party house, after we have already had ample opportunity in long shot to notice that there are garden gnomes at equally spaced intervals along the porch rail.

It is good to make the comedy easily accessible, but at times this comes uncomfortably close to a kind of bear-baiting. So between one point of the film and another an uneasy ambivalence becomes apparent. One moment the material is being 'naturalized' for its audience - made perceptible and excitingly important - but at another it is held at a slightly contempuous distance, and caricatured.

The real 'stuff' of the film is the minimal story of the lives of people like Anne and Kevin, and how something almost happens between them.

So my enthusiasm for the great vitality of the film - the vitality of the material itself and of the intelligence with which it is uncovered and observed - is qualified by serious doubts about the uncertain intentions of the film towards its material. There are just too many signs of undisguised exploitation of the material going on for it to be possible to overlook them and notice only the intelligence and perceptiveness of the rest of the film.

Instead of the Bankstown ethos being permitted to unfold into the minimal shape of the story, another ethos is intruded here and there, one that holds itself at a slight but detectable intellectual distance and disdain from Bankstown life, and so feels obliged to tug and pull at the material until it is deformed into recognizable caricature for our knowing laughter. Which is a shame in terms of the final worth of the film, even if it proves to be a cunning strategy in terms of figures at the box-office.

JUST A WOMAN
Scott Murray

"Real presentiments take shape at depths never visited by the mind, so that they sometimes lead us to perform acts which we interpret in quite another way... An unduly man who is about to die but does not suspect it, suddenly puts everything around him in order. His life changes. He sorts out his papers. He gets up early, goes to bed early, and gives up his vices. Those around him rejoice, so that his brutal death seems all the more unjust. He was about to lead a happy life." Raymond Radiguet.*

There have been numerous films where men and women make adjustments to their lives when faced with death, but very few aim higher than an exercise in sentimentality or easy emotion: the man realizing he is going to die in the trenches making a heroic attack on enemy defences; the drunken surgeon spurning drink and saving humanity for his last, brief hours; etc. Generally these films tell of people who, when faced with their own mortality, make sacrifices; they deny themselves for the good of man.

But Just A Woman (Docteur Francoise Gailland) is different, the emphasis inverted. It places events on a personal, not heroic, level. It examines with great insight a couple's attempts to put their collective life in order. And it represents yet another confirmation of Jean-Louis Bertuccelli's considerable talents. Bertuccelli is that most out-of-vogue beings, a humanist film director.*

Dr Francoise Gailland (Annie Girardot) is living a near-divorced existence with her husband, Gerard (Francois Perrier). Suddenly she is faced with the possibility of an early death. This realization, and a growing awareness of her lack of motherly attention for her two teenage children, motivates her, at least partially, into reassessing her life.

Francoise begins to doubt her false marriage, where each partner freely indulges in extra-marital affairs, and each pretends an open, tolerant mind. She begins to suspect her teenage son is right and that she is indeed living a lie. In the past, Francoise had tossed away these doubts by putting them down to tiredness, now she can no longer afford to do so. Francoise abandons her lover (Jean-Pierre Cassel) and returns to her husband.

This reunion is particularly moving, because by this stage Francois Perrier has already well conveyed Gerard's terrible loneliness. Thus, when he returns from work one afternoon and finds Francois home, one immediately feels his joy, and in a sense, his relief. But this joy is immediately cut from under him as Francois, embracing him, exclains: "I am sick. I am afraid." In one devastating close-up Perrier suggests Gerard's contradictory feelings: joy at Francois's return; disillusionment in believing he is needed only for his strength. It is a beautiful scene.

But this new relationship begins again, and in time grows into something finer. This is best seen in the lunch date between Francois and Gerard where he remarks, "I have been putting my life in order." Momentarily embarrassed, Francois changes the tone of the conversation with an aside that a renewed marriage is perhaps well made.

As well, one finds in most of the other relationships in the film, a coming to terms with what is really important; a conscious sorting out or balancing of the scales. But the message is in no sense moralistic, for Bertuccelli is as much critical of the lies in the new freedom as is it of those in false marriages. Whether Francois and Gerard are together at the end is really unimportant. What is important is that they have learnt to care and accept the responsibility of this care.

Another example of this putting in order, is the relationship between mother and daughter. Francois regards being considered a friend more important than being considered a mother and deliberately allows their relationship to become one of laissez faire. But in doing so, Francois abandons her maternal role and, as a result, her daughter merely uses her as a source of strength whenever caught in a situation she finds inextirpable — her pregnancy, for instance.

Here, Francois at first resists the demand and Elizabeth (Isabelle Huppert) in exasperation (in a later scene) cries out: "I thought you were my friend." With more awareness, Francois can now reply: "I am not your friend, I am a coward.

Given the extraordinary box-office success of the film in France, it is surprising to find how much Bertuccelli has avoided sentimentality: the ending with its detached narration; Francois's plea to her favorite surgeon; the family's visit before the operation, etc. This refusal to trivialize emotion adds great power to those few moments which are intentionally emotional.

for example, when Francois is being wheeled into the surgery and Gerard's hand enters comforting, unexpectedly from the side of frame; or in the film's most difficult sequence where Elizabeth helps Julien (William Coryn) cut his hair.

Julien's attempt at confronting his parents by stealing a mirror and his disappointment that even this act is ignored, tempts him to return to his previous isolationism. But as the scissors pass through his hair, he seems to be starting anew. The scene could, of course, have proved oversly symbolic, but Bertuccelli keeps well clear of the dramatic and tosses the scene away with Julien's remark: "Father is right — the mirror is ghastly.

Just A Woman is, in conclusion, a notable film for many reasons. Annie Girardot's and Francois Perrier's performances are extraordinary, as is Bertuccelli's direction. But more important, the film is a valuable and sensitive argument on the need for caring. Old fashioned, conservative and, at times, simplistic, it may by some be dismissively. Fortunately, its lesson cannot be missed.


THE PICTURE SHOW MAN

Basil Gilbert

If there is any truth in the assertion that male writers cannot do justice to the female psyche in their novels and plays, and women writers castrate their literary creations, then this may account for the success of Joan Long's production of Caddie and the relative failure of her recent The Picture Show Man (directed by John Power).

The story, of the trials of a young Australian woman of the late 1920s — a Sydney barmaid who has to struggle for herself and her children in the Depression. The Picture Show Man, on the other hand, is a gentle comedy, a light-hearted inventory of the tribulations of a slightly romantic, middle-aged showman who travels the countryside of New South Wales, accompanied by his son, a pianist and a dog, seeking his fortune with a mobile picture van.

These situations differ in form and content. Caddie has a tragic element, an all-pervading sadness, that is exquisitely blended with a soft-focus nostalgia provided by the wardrobe designer and the art department. The script of the film is an adaptation of the successful Australian novel of the same name which was published in 1953 and soon ran into three reprints.

The Picture Show Man has a simpler foundation. It is loosely based on notes for a short story collection of down-to-earth reminiscences which present a historical vignette, rather than a compelling narrative. Penn's Pictures On Tour concerns itself mainly with the slow, silent film presentation to the outback community, and to this simple text Ms. Long added sentimental touches of romantic intrigue. She also recognized the dramatic value of moving the time forward to include the traumatic and exciting events which accompanied the change from the silent cinema to the first talkies.

A glance at copies of the Sydney journal Film Weekly of 1928 tells just what these changes meant: litemight systems using industrial ether and oxygen were gradually replaced by electric arcs, and with synchronous motors the film itself, alternating current generators were needed to replace the old direct current ones. Soon the concert pianists who accompanied the silent films with dramatic or romantic music — and who gave the audiences the chance of a singalong in the interval — had become unemployable, historical anachronisms.

The Picture Show Man delineates these events with a gentle humor that works fairly well in the area of situation comedy. When Larry (Harold Hopkins), the son of showman Pop Pyn (John Meillon), meets grazer's daughter Lucy (Sally Conabere) at a lake just after morning, the emotions expressed are tender and touching, although continuity girl Jan Tyrell apparently did not notice the changing waterline which modestly clothed lucy's naked, skinny-dipping torso, but which varied from shot to shot as if in conformity with a censorship code. The bush-track race meeting also provided an opportunity for some simple fun, with Pop's horse Stringy Bark going off in the wrong direction and dropping dead after the event. It was a naive humor, but the audience was caught up in the excitement.

Less exciting, however, were the comic sequences which made use of dialogue and repartee. These were reminiscent of the Arthur Askey radio melodramas of the pre-television years, which parodied genuine Victorian melodramas. For example, when piano-tuner Freddie Graves (John Ewart) arrives at the country mansion of widow Duncan (Jeannie Drynan), the pair are soon snuggly seated on the piano stool. The conversation forms a long sequence of double entendre.

Hc: "A very beautiful instrument, I see, hasn't been tuned for some time"
She: "Not since my husband died ..., he used to attend to things like that ... and so on. Freddie Graves's seduction is finally achieved with home-made strawberry cake and a large pot of tea.

Some of the audience responded immediately when they recognized Garry McDonald (television's Norman Gunston) in the role of Lou, the opposition pianist, as he clouts Freddie with a frying pan and is pushed fully-clothed into a dam by an indignant Larry. This was a recognizable slapstick that surprisingly always seems to work (though it is done much better in Let The Balloon Go).

Less efficient however, were the verbal interchanges between Lou and Pop. For example, at the racecourse, Pop has just acquired a black racehorse, when he encounters Lou.

John Ewart as the travelling pianist in John Power's nostalgic comedy, Picture Show Man.

Francois Perrier's performances are extraordinary, as is Bertuccelli's direction. But more important, the film is a valuable and sensitive argument on the need for caring. Old fashioned, conservative and, at times, simplistic, it may by some be dismissed. Fortunately, its lesson cannot be missed.
Lou: "Good morning, Mr. Pym. Some mount you've got there. I hear he's a bit of a dark horse."

Pop: "You might be surprised, he's quite a stayer."

Lou: "He stayed around a bit too long if you ask me. Gotta see a man about a horse. Good luck!"

Pop: "Worm!"

The idiom is Australian, but is it funny? The theme of Picture Show Man is original, and technically the direction is polished, but the screenplay is more a comedy of errors than a catalogue of sly, dry wit. So, it is unfortunate that director John Power was apparently reluctant to criticize or elicit on producer/writer Joan Long's screenplay. This dominance by the screenwriter is the very opposite of the Hollywood system, where a screenplay is subjected to multiple rewrite suggestions by a number of profession writers, or from the European system, where the director of a film frequently modifies the original conception of a script to suit his artistic vision.

Both methods have advantages and disadvantages. It may not be good for the ego to have one's creative material ruined by hack writers or poor editors, but equally, several creative minds working in close harmony are frequently better than one in isolation. Should the creative control of a film be in the hands of the writer or the director? Perhaps the answer is compromise, with productive teamwork in the initial stages and close consultation in the final ones.

With The Picture Show Man, cinematographer Geoff Burton has demonstrated that the brilliance of his photography in his earlier films, such as Storm Boy and The Fourth Wish, was no chance event. Although he claimed in the Cinema Papers interview that he has not attempted to emulate the painter's art, one immediately responds to his beautifully impressionistic camerawork, especially in the race meeting sequence, where the soft-focus follow shots have a poetic simplicity and beauty; and in the telephoto close-ups of the horses' feet bringing the picture vans across the Australian countryside.

These haunting images are nicely reinforced by Peter Best's musical score, which is highly evocative of the toe-tapping mood of the late 1920s. John Meillon is proving himself to be one of the more versatile of our home-grown actors, and it is still a thrill to see him as a nervous idealist, with pretension of rival showman Palmer can only be described as a non-event) and demon­pretation of rival showman Palmer can only be described as a non-event) and demon­pretation of rival showman Palmer can only be described as a non-event) and demon­pretation of rival showman Palmer can only be described as a non-event) and demon­pretation of rival showman Palmer can only be described as a non-event)}
that the whole dark chapter was a phenomenon of U.S. life which not only hasn’t been expunged but could arise again. If a spokesman can be prevailed upon to open the debate, the case for U.S. intervention is pretty strong. Yes, Ronald Reagan, a “friendly” back in 1947, when he was president of the Screen Actors Guild, is the Secretary of State for the Republican Presidential nomination was gathering force. Reagan contends thatHUAC was a response to public sentiment (a classic case of hindsight confusion of cart and horse). His latter-day soft line apologia (soberly befitting a post-Watergate White House aspirant) is cross-cutting compared to the ranting evangelism of his fellow 1947 “friendlies”.

One of the things Helpert has examined is the committee’s contention that there was communist ideological influence upon the content of Hollywood films — as distinct from scantly-covert communist organization within the industry’s unions and professional associations. It sounds pretty preposterous at this distance, but a recurrent theme of the McCarthyites was the claim that Red propaganda was being slipped into films. It was cited as justification for such awkward propaganda vehicles as The Red Menace, The Iron Curtain and I Was a Communist for the FBI. Just how Leninist precepts could be “worked into” a film was never really explained. Pressed, the cold warriors would resort to generalities so sweeping that they could have been used against Frank Capra, John Ford, Lewis Milestone or anyone else who had ever made a film of some social significance.

Much has happened in the last quarter-century to help us scrutinize the true motivations of Senator McCarthy and his fellow bandwagoners. Apart from current aspirations — one of theHUAC Hollywood inquisitors was a junior Congressman from California, Richard M. Nixon — their purpose can now be seen as part of a general effort to ensure a secure home base from which the escalating Cold War could be fought.

Anyone who has ever engaged in the polemics of the McCarthy era can anticipate several objections to this analysis. John Birches, of course, will nail it as all part of the communist conspiracy. On the other hand, the film is likely to draw from some small “1” liberals the sort of reaction which the escalating Cold War could be fought.


MENACE
Keith Connolly

Just as Hollywood on Trial provides a didactic background to Martin Ritt’s The Front, an Australian documentary arrives to give an antidote insight to how the McCarthy wave rolled around the Western world. Twenty years ago, Robin Boyd observed that it usually took about half a decade for U.S. styles to be watered down and adopted in Australia (which he dubbed “Austérica”). But he was talking about cars and other consumer fashions. Political modes caught on much faster, and still do. By the time the House Un-American Activities Committee was terrorizing Hollywood and finding secrets in pumpkins in the late 1940s, Australian politicians were kicking the communist can with unprecedented vigor. There’s much doubt that the impetus for this crusade came from the U.S., which regarded a vigorous domestic anti-communist stance as concomitant to Cold War alliance (not that conservative politicians anywhere needed urging to do what, for them, came quite naturally).

John Hughes’ Menace is on harder ground than David W. Helpert’s Hollywood on Trial in that it deals with attacks on a political party rather than a section of its supposed adherents. Most of the Australians who are shown reminiscing about traumatic events of 25-30 years ago were active, overt members of the Communist Party. But where Hollywood on Trial is smoothly organized and accessible, Hughes’ documentary tends to confusion and is, in places, downright daunting.

Such comparisons, however, should also note differences in approach — and acknowledge the limitations under which the Australian filmmakers worked. Hughes’ film, helped by a grant from the former Film Council, needs more newsreel and other flashback footage to establish historical references. And where these were unavailable (the sparse material used was also hideously-expensive) more stills, art work and newspaper clippings would have helped.

Hughes says he was denied access to a 1952 Australian anti-communist propaganda film, also called Menace, which he wanted to illustrate the atmosphere of the time. His 1977 Menace concentrates largely on the Victorian Royal Commission into the Communist Party (1949) and the subsequent defeats of the Menzies federal government’s attempts to legislate for suppression of the Communist Party in 1950 and ’51.

Hughes’ film sets out to delineate the historical imperatives and social effects of these events. It is forthrightly partisan in its condemnation of the anti-communist crusade, seeing it as reactionary, repressive, fascist-oriented, but also reasonably clear-eyed about the old guard communists who tell it like it was — for them. Here, Hughes is again some distance from Helpern in matters of style. Hughes relies more heavily on his “eye witnesses” to fulfil his narrative, and go against his “eye witnesses” to fulfil his narrative, and is, in places, downright daunting.

Clues emerge that three of the principal raconteurs are veteran communist leader Ralph Gibson, barrister Ted Laurie, Q.C., and Spanish civil war international brigader Lloyd Edmonds — but most people will have to be pretty sharp to realize that the others include celebrated artist Noel Counihan and trade union leader George Seelaf (A pity, too, that some of Counihan’s famous paintings of the working class movement in the 1930s were not used as mood-setters).

Rather than relying on these unidentified people to supply the background, the film would be better for a brief narrated resume. The many sequences of recollection vary in effectiveness. Where they are warmly personal and anecdotal, Hughes’ film, helped by a grant from the former Film Council, needs more newsmagazine and other flashback footage to establish historical references. And where these were unavailable — and where these were unavailable — the sparse material used was also hideously-expensive — a picture of world events with considerable impact. But a plethora of medium shots (rapidly-interesting with news papers headlines spinning like bombshell extras in a Monogram gangster quickie) showing chatting figures are less successful.

Some of these recitals are allowed to lapse into dry recap of political aims and actions, some work well (usually when the accounts are personal and anecdotal). But not often enough. One gets the feeling that Hughes sacrifices empathic form to ideological content. Towards the end, too, come several declaratory, surrealistic passages from an Australian Performing Group production, The Golden Holden, which are intrusive, puzzling and, finally, irritating.

If the object here is to provide a thematic link between vivid scenes of a recent May Day march and shots of the beleaguered left of the 1950s, it is both misplaced and unnecessary. After one’s first ironic reaction ("plus ca change...") the richly-colorful scenes of the latter-day scenes convey the message well enough: Ideas go marching on.

Films include: I CAN JUMP PUDDLES, BUÑUEL CLASSICS, WIVES, STUBBY etc.

Our season, which will be screened later this year, have never been seen in Australia before. Experiences indescribable because only cinema and not words can describe them; you have seen the goodness and beauty of everyday things and everyday people; you have had saddening too because you will see them no more, they are already gone.” Most of the titles in this imported season of thirteen features were previously unseen here. Screening August/September/October.

We have secured brand new 35mm prints of eight titles by six distinguished directors of the Italian New Wave. Period subjects. This imported season of thirteen features includes eight titles previously seen a few small, memorable, unforgettable actions, beautiful because sincere, and it is saddening too because you will see them no more, they are already gone.” Most of the titles in our season, which will be screened later this year, have never been seen in Australia before.

Five Films by Yasujiro Ozu

“What remains after seeing an Ozu film is the feeling that, if only for an hour or two, you have seen the goodness and beauty of everyday things and everyday people; you have had experiences indescribable because only cinema and not words can describe them; you have seen a few small, memorable, unforgettable actions, beautiful because sincere, and it is saddening too because you will see them no more, they are already gone.” Most of the titles in our season, which will be screened later this year, have never been seen in Australia before.

Camera Assistants’ Certificate Course

The Open (External) Program

The Open (External) Program of the Film and Television School in association with the Australian Cinematographers’ Society is conducting an intensive specialized trade course in the role of the camera assistant.

Applications are initially invited from those currently employed as camera assistants in film and television.

Periodic assessment will be held during the course to enable participants to qualify for the Camera Assistants Certificate.

Lectures will be held in the evenings or at weekends once a week.

Write with details of experience to:

The Australian Film and Television School

Camera Assistants’ Certificate Course

Open (External) Program

Every facet of the job will be covered in both film and video tape, theory and practice.

Write with details of experience to:

The Open (External) Program

The Australian Film and Television School

Camera Assistants’ Certificate Course

PO Box 126, North Ryde, NSW 2113

Phone enquiries: Howard Rubie or Jackie Eyre, 887 1666 extn. 356.
The Singer and the Dancer
Judith Arnold

Gillian Armstrong has been quoted as saying she will not make commercials for the women’s movement. In its most explicit sense, this is true of her latest work, The Singer and the Dancer, a film situated within the illusionist narrative cinematic tradition.

Adapted from a short story by Alan Marshall, it traces the encounter of two women — Mrs Bilson (Ruth Cracknell) and Charlie (Elizabeth Crosby).

Mrs Bilson is a country woman in her 60s, seeking refuge from the ruins of her damaged life. Haunted by memories of battered hoes and personal betrayal, she enacts, and thereby actualizes, a schizoid response — she pursues dualism. At home — the seat of all that is dark and limiting in her life — she creates a bulwark of silence and feigns senility against the figures of past repression. With the conspiratorial aid of a sympathetic, if not understanding, local doctor, she finds a measure of freedom through further deception. Armed with smokes and a racing guide, she escapes to the outer solitude of the bush, the paddocks and the sky. And it is here she has a chance encounter with Charlie (Elizabeth Crosby), a hopeful young woman who, with her reluctant boyfriend, has fled the parties and smog of Sydney (which nevertheless still reaches out through the crackled tones of a transistor).

Separated as they are by their life experiences in different eras and social worlds, their life lines are linked by their mutual need for mental space. As well, their communication is given resonance by the irony from which the film derives its title: that initially they can only define themselves by what they are not (i.e. a singer and a dancer), by the frustration of possibilities, by their lack of autonomy.

A focal point of the film is the depiction of the pain that the two women repeat patterns of behaviour, by their fragmentary realizations of the sources of oppression and their hesitant attempts to establish a dialogue independently of the spectre of their male counterparts. But the angry reflections of Mrs Bilson mesh perhaps too simplistically with the introduction of the other woman, the “bloody bitch” with painted lips. As Meaghan Morris pointed out (Cinema Papers No. 7) it is stereotypic to call such characters stereotypes, but in my view they do represent something more ideologically ingrained in our society and something which is presented, reflected and mediated by films. And we are still waiting for a critique of the negative cinematic images of women and their implications within a film by a woman. Though, in part, we have this with the empathetic relationship between Mrs Bilson and Charlie which is underpinned with quiet violence by the non-relationship between the widow and her daughter.

In Mrs Bilson, we are provided with a woman who controls the action and this in itself is a major achievement in a film, but at what cost? Because it highlights a contradiction: the madness and deception engendered to fulfill a woman’s role — “After I was married the only conversation I had in 30 years was with myself.” Mrs Bilson has spent much of her life in defensive silence, and the schizoid behavior she exhibits now is an extension and cruel exaggeration of her married life.

These women are presented as being trapped inside a culture, but the institution of marriage (and living together) is explored as the source of their passive and distorted lives, and as such offers insights into the institutions which shape human sexuality and need, and delineates them.

Contradictions between cinematic images and the spoken word resonate throughout, threatening to tear the film apart: what the women know of their condition, what caused it, and their looks of resignation and resentment. Also, the constant references to their men, the culture they carry around in their heads exploiting inside of them and their rage disipated by the emptiness of their situation.

Images appear which denote and reinforce the fragmented, dependent, closed-off world: a clothes-line, sagging with blank reminders of women’s work, recurs as an obstacle to vision and communication between women, breaking up their images of each other; the stones piled from a stream hang heavily in the doorway imprisoning those inside and re-forming the claustrophobia of urban living.

Feminist film critics have expressed concern at the negative images of women in current films and have stated their hope for films with more progressive or positive heroines. Others have voiced disquiet that such roles become prescriptive and suggest, as Julia Lesage has, that:

“We also need films that delineate women’s situations, women’s problems without showing the women characters as strong, liberated or rebellious … Such films could be realistic and not heroic and serve the function of raising consciousness, for they would at every point be set in the context of women’s oppression.” (Feminist Film Criticism, Women and Film, No. 5/6, 1974.)

But the problems associated with this approach are that reality is assumed to be something which can be discovered and reflected in film, and thus that films can reveal life as it is (unchanging) and, as such, support the status quo — i.e. “women’s oppression.”

This is not to be critical of this particular film — rather the contrary. What sets the Singer and the Dancer apart from the mainstream of films is that the limitations circumscribing Mrs Bilson and Charlie, the viewer is able to perceive the destructive quality of male dominated society and, coincidentally, the myth of romantic love. This also makes it necessary that one investigate the aesthetic structures and conventions by which films work and which are involved in the production of the image of women, and also to see the kind of struggle that can be set up within the formal working of a film between opposing conventions so as to reveal the ideological tensions normally revealed.” (Christine Gledhill, Realist Film Criticism and Hollywood.)

"The Mango Tree" is based on the popular novel of the same name by Ronald McKie. It concerns the growing up of a boy in a Queensland town during the early 1900s.

Director: Kevin Dobson
Producer: Michael Pate
Director of Photography: Brian Probyn
Editor: John Scott
Sound Recordist: Barry Brown
Screenplay: Michael Pate

Grandma Carr: Geraldine Fitzgerald
The Professor: Robert Helpmann
Jamie Carr: Christopher Pate
Preacher Jones: Gerard Kennedy
Maudie: Carol Burn
Joe Speight: Jonathan Hardy

Top Left: Joe Speight (Jonathan Hardy), Jamie and the Professor (Robert Helpmann).
Top Right: Grandma Carr (Geraldine Fitzgerald).
Above: Christopher Pate who plays Jamie Carr.
Left: Preacher Jones (Gerard Kennedy) and Maudie (Carol Burn).
Below: Almost the symbol of Australian filmmaking — the dirt-covered bitumen road. The Mango Tree.
GEORGE DREYFUS

Ivan Hutchinson

George Dreyfus is one of the small number of professional musicians working in Australia who manage to make a living by concentrating almost exclusively on composing. It is only in recent years, however, with the growth of locally-made television programs and films that this has become even remotely possible. Dreyfus' compositions range from chamber music to opera, and have been performed in many countries, but it is his work in films and television which concerns us here.

Dreyfus came to Australia with his parents before World War 2 and was educated at Melbourne High School, after which he spent what he described as a "disastrous" year at the Conservatorium of Music at Melbourne University. There he attempted to learn the bassoon, but claims that his enthusiasm far outshone his musical ability.

He left the Conservatorium in 1948, having failed to pass the exams, but continued his study of the bassoon. Two years later he joined the orchestra for the opera season of 1948 sponsored by J. C. Williamson. Staying on, Dreyfus then played for "South Pacific", "Annie Get Your Gun", "Oklahoma!" and the Ice Follies.

Dreyfus was doing some arranging and composing at this time but was predominantly an orchestral musician. This stint in the pit orchestra later proved invaluable experience because he learnt about orchestration the hard way and learnt it from observing the work of some of the finest American theatre-music arrangers.

Dreyfus then joined the Melbourne Symphony Orchestra, the ne plus ultra at that time of Victorians hoping to make a living out of performing orchestral music. He soon found that the "strict regimentation" was not at all to his liking. He was recognized as a bassoon player and successful at it but his unhappiness forced him into developing his talents as a composer.

In the early 1950s, Dreyfus left for Vienna and studied there for two years. On returning to Australia he began writing chamber music for himself and his friends, and gained some recognition. Then, Dorian

event, the money could not be raised and Tony Richardson did the story with less than exciting results.) Some of this music was scored and performed and, in addition, he wrote for his Expo music for Japan a "mock Australian" folk song (part "Click Go the Shears", part "Waltzing Matilda") which he scored for the Sydney Symphony.

Whether as a result of this obvious success or not, commissions have been coming since. He wrote the music for one of the finest of recent documentaries, Film Australia's A Steam Train Passes, the musical theme for This Day Tonight (Victorian edition) and for possibly the most successful, certainly the most prestigious, of all recent ABC television series, Power Without Glory.

But it was not until 1976 that Dreyfus moved into the feature film world, scoring both Let the Balloon Go and Break of Day. Dreyfus describes the latter as a "dream film" for the composer as the film is visually very strong with dialogue kept to a minimum. Music therefore plays an important part in the film, and in response to my question as to the type of music he felt the film had needed he replied: "Well I don't think I could have done music of the day the way John Barry did in The Day of the Locust where they just played, in my opinion, the old records. (Actually he did a little bit of scoring.) Then the other one with Liza Minnelli, Lucky Lady; fabulous arrangements — 1970s arrangements, superb sound, but I don't think we should have done that either, it would have been quite tasteless to have film music playing Roy Agnew's piano music. So what I've done is to write a love theme. Not Summer of '42, but I was essentially in a situation where I could write my own love theme."

Dreyfus would like to be in a position where he could concentrate on one film score a year. He is adamant about having control over the sound of his music and he has no desire to let others orchestrate his musical ideas ("I don't think the money's good enough for me to split it, you see"). And he feels very strongly that composers should stick to the music they do best. Amplifying this last statement, he feels that before accepting an assignment, he would like to have his music heard by those making the film, the director or the producer; if they should be "sure whom they're getting and also sure of whether there is plenty of evidence of ability and style."

--Soundtracks--

R.G. FILM SERVICES
(Processing 16mm color and black and white.)
and
JOHN PHILLIPS SOUND
(16/35mm sound recording, 8 track Rock and Roll mixing and transfers.)
are both at 482c Glenhuntly Rd., Elsternwick.
For top quality at the right price phone, (03) 53 3053

FILM REVIEW
INFORMATION SERVICE
The George Lugg Library welcomes enquiries on local and overseas films. On request, photostat copies of synopses, articles and reviews will be forwarded. Please detail specific information required and send S.A.E. plus One Dollar search fee for three enquiries to:
The George Lugg Library
P.O. Box 357
Carlton South
Vic. 3053
The Library is operated with assistance from the Australian Film Commission.

Cinema Papers, July — 85
A book to provide in one format much of the central work, both well known and little known, and within a variety of perspectives - written on the interconnections of film and society.

A comprehensive book designed both to introduce students to the sociology of film and present New Approaches to Film Study to Anyone With a Critical Interest in the Cinema.

Publication: May, 1977

Recommended Retail Price: $17.95

**DISCUSSES**
- Mimetic Cinema: The Reflection of Horror
- Cinema's Function: Grierson and Documentary Idea
- Cinema as a Social System: The Pattern of Hollywood
- Cinema and Social Control: The John Wayne Syndrome
- Films of Conflict: From Eisenstein to the Retro-Style Reaction
- Cinema Auteurs: Western Structures

The Australian Film and Television School

**Publications available 1977**

**Technical Monographs**

**Research and Survey Unit Monographs**

**Research and Survey Unit Monographs**

**Annual Reports**

**Newsletters**

**Sweat Shirts**

**T-Shirts**

**Available Soon**

Rod Hobden: Labelling of film cans.

Australian Film and Television School Handbook 1977。

Alan Rosenthal: International contract law for filmmakers.

**Limited Edition only!!**

**Performing Arts Year Book of Australia 1976**

*a SHOWCASE publication*

$20.00 postage paid in Australia.

from SHOWCASE Publications Pty. Ltd., P.O. Box 141, Spit Junction, N.S.W. 2088.

**SPACE AGE BOOKS**

**CINEMA BOOKS**

Just out!

CONFLICT AND CONTROL IN THE CINEMA: A Reader in Film and Society. Edited by John Tulloch. Hc $35.00; pb $17.95

A LIST OF OTHER FILM TITLES AND MOVIE SOUND TRACKS AVAILABLE WILL BE SENT ON REQUEST

305-307 SWANSTON STREET, MELBOURNE, 3000

OPEN 7 DAYS A WEEK
On December 20, 1895, a select French audience saw the world’s first films. Among the technical marvels was an image of a steam train slowly pulling into a station and apparently coming out of the screen towards the audience. The story goes that many ducked their heads in fright. Soon they were asking themselves: “How did Monsieur Lumière do that?”

Today’s audiences, faced with the stunning visual tricks and super-realistic illusions of the new breed of disaster films, science fiction epics, and fantasy spectacles, are asking similar questions. They want to know the intimate secrets of the new magician’s art. In response, a new literary genre has been born. The era of The Making Of... series of books has begun. When one surveys the recent additions to this growing family, it becomes clear that in terms of educational and historical value they differ remarkably.

One of the earliest and most important in this series is Jerome Agel’s The Making of Kubrick’s 2001, which was published in 1970. Agel was an established author and editor who had conceived such works as Marshall McLuhan’s The Medium is the Massage and Buckminster Fuller’s I Seem To Be A Verb. He is not a film historian, but a highly-skilled organizer of literary materials. The Making of Kubrick’s 2001 is evidence of these skills.

For the film historian it is a valuable collection of first-class research material. In this compilation the reader will find every relevant piece of information on the film and its sources: the short story by Arthur C. Clarke that became the basis, 15 years later, for the $10.5 million film 2001: interviews with experts on space, theology, chemistry, biology, and astronomy that Kubrick had intended to use in a prologue to the film; a potted biography of Kubrick from The New Yorker made while 2001 was still in production; 96 pages of photographic stills taken from the film as well as its production; a fragment of the shooting script; 45 letters of public praise and criticism; reviews of the film, the music, the novel; the complete Playboy interview; and most informatively, a list of the firms who contributed valuable material and technical information — such as the large-scale photographs of moon craters Tycho and Clavius from the Department of Astronomy, University of Manchester — without which the film could not have been made.

Perhaps the most useful part of the book from the point of view of “How was it done?” are the photos and their captions: the rotating ‘treadmill’ which was used to supply a first-draft screenplay version of his novel. Later, Carl Gottlieb was called in to do a thorough re-write of Benchley’s script.

The book gives a good insight into the intrigues and politics of large-scale commercial filmmaking with its ruthlessness and emphasis on investment profit. For readers not familiar with such production handbooks as William Bayer’s informative Breaking Through, Selling Out, Dropping Dead, and Other Notes on Filmmaking (Dell, 1975), such revelations can be alarming. But Gottlieb relieves the strain with a generous sprinkling of anecdotage.

How do you get a plastic shark skin to look like the real thing? Answer: Get Joe and Ward, the special effects men, to stand, two paint-brushes in hands, applying $30 per gallon special paint with one hand, and type 40 sandblasting sand with the other.

What is necessary to support a shark at sea? Answer: Coils of pneumatic hose, welding tanks, torches, ropes, generators, structural steel, ballast tanks, copper, iron, steel, electrical and pneumatic motors, hydraulic rams.

Are there any problems with true-to-life sharks? Answer: “A 1500-lb great white can bite through car plumbing, flatten things with his tail, generally create more fuss than an army of beer-crazed Australian abalone divers.”

This is a world away from the scientific precision and historical accuracy of the Kubrick book. But there are some useful hints for the budding young authors wishing to get their books into film.

Peter Benchley began in June 1971 when he delivered a four-page outline of his proposed novel to Doubleday in New York. This led to a contract for the first four chapters of the book, to be ready 10 months later, for a fee of $1000. Then came a period of "revisions, rewrites, deadlines and rewrites" culminating in the final draft for the complete novel and a further $6500 to cover the cost of the year’s work. At this point, Peter Benchley had only $600 left in his bank account. However, when Doubleday sold the paperback rights to Bantam for $557,000 things improved, and finally Universal Studios acquired Benchley’s property for a reported $120,000. For the money, Benchley was also required to supply a first-draft screenplay version of his novel. Later, Carl Gottlieb was called in to do a thorough re-write of Benchley’s script.

In mid-1973 a second paperback appeared dealing with the making of Spielberg’s film. This volume, we are told in the Introduction, “may well be as indispensable as a libretto at the Metropolitan Opera.” Unfortunately the reverse is the case.

Edith Blake’s On Location on Martha’s Vineyard: The Making of the Movie ‘Jaws’ is eminently dispensable. Certainly, Mrs Blake does tantalize the reader’s imagination with her evocative vocabulary (a “slobber-gorgeous” old inn; the Islanders stopping to “spectate” when the filming was on), but the relevance of her text leaves much to be desired. Who really cares that Nurse Helen Jackson is “lucky to get a stove, much less blenders and nutcrackers” in her rented house on School St., or that “Commodore and Mrs James A. Farrell Jr. steamed for Edgartown for the first time aboard their new boat Koala for the day they passed the race set.” More importantly, who are Steve and Carol Gottlieb who, we are told, wrote the script?

When one looks at the illustrations of the mechanism of the artificial shark one is surprised how such a makeshift sort of mechanical monster could have ever fooled a cinema audience. Instead of a specially contraption operated by pulleys and wires, could have ever fooled a cinema audience.

This cannot be said for that more recent mythical monster, King Kong. Here the special effects, art and technology are both complex and sophisticated. On the screen the 40-ft (13 m) high version of Kong moves and articulates his legs, arms and fingers, while the face of the smaller version is able to express convincingly the subtle emotions of anger, joy, disgust, compassion and love. To understand the mechanism of this remarkable feat, the how-it-was-done literature is surprisingly informative.

From a technical point of view, the most valuable source of information is the special issue of American Cinematographer (January, 1977) devoted to the film. Of particular interest are the pages of colored sketches by designer Carlo Rambaldi of the facial expressions required to convey a wide range of emotions. Actor Rick Baker was supplied with six separate head masks each capable of seven different expressions, giving a total of 42 combinations of all special-lighting effects then added life to the contact-lens covered eyes while the skin surface of the mask was manipulated by external operators.

The 13 m version of the beast is equally remarkable, a feat of mechanical engineering. Sketches show the duralumin skeleton which was covered with plastic and 2000 horses’ tails for fur. Inside were 52 hydraulic valves which could be proportionately operated so as to permit a wide range of movement by the panel of operators. But this was child’s play compared with the problems of eliminating halo effects (‘fringing’) when trying to make matte shots superimposing Jessica Lange’s flora against King Kong’s dense black peit of horses’ tails. Yellow filters and video monitors helped solve this problem.

The story on the making of King Kong is provided by Bruce Bahrenburg in his paperback, The Creation of Dino de Laurentiis’ King Kong (Star, 1976). Bahrenburg was the publicity man on the film and his book has a strong biographical slant, although technical information is not lacking. The emphasis on the personalities of the film’s stars and makers is close to the established literary genre of books about films, but it does shed light on the problems produced by strong personalities working in close contact over an extended period of time. Even more important are the sociological tit-bits Bahrenburg provides — such as the extras on a Hollywood set, the public relation tricks used to persuade an unpaid crowd to turn up for the World Trade Centre in New York, and so on.

At first appearance, The Girl in the Hairy Paw: King Kong at Myth, Movie and Monster, by Brehm and Garner, has the edge over Geduld, might be thought of as a fun-book for comic lovers, for the cover is pure pop art and inside one finds reproductions from the pages of Mad Magazine and cartoons from Punch. But these first impressions are misleading for The Girl in the Hairy Paw is...
a small masterpiece of scholarship by Professors Gottseman and Geduld that should be on the bookshelves of every serious Kongophile. The two editors have had ample experience in preparing scholarly editions: one thinks of Harry Geduld's Film-makers On Filmmaking (1967) and of their combined researches which led to Sergei Eisenstein and Upton Sinclair: The Making and Unmaking of Que Viva Mexico! (Indiana University Press, 1970).

The Girl in the Hairy Paw has an almost encyclopedic range of facts, figures and visuals from the 1933 classic version of King Kong, in spite of a few minor lapses in taste (such as Kenneth Bernard's contribution "How Big is Kong's Penis?"). The tone is generally informative.

The Introduction provides a potted lesson in Greek mythology and history (the Cupid and Psyche story) and then follows a rapid survey of literary references to apes starting with The Arabian Nights and ending with The Ruling Class (1972) which includes a monster gorilla in a fantasy sequence. Then follow articles on the origin of the film, a reprint from Cahiers du Cinema, descriptions of the special effects units and last but not least, a wealth of visual material, ranging from stills from the film, cartoons, photographs of the even advertising done in their graphic design by the Kong legions. It's a collector's item.

Growing Up in Hollywood by Robert Parrish

William Collins

Recommended price: $12.50

Cecil Holmes

In the honey hives of Hollywood there are the queen bees and the drones and the workers. Bob Parrish, clearly not a man with a very thieving or ambitious, has been content to remain in the last category.

He began life as a child actor blowing a pea shooter at Charlie Chaplin in City Lights and worked as an extra for many years; then moved sideways into the cutting room where he has been ever since — a few feet away, take out a dirty handkerchief, wipe his mouth and return to the film. He was no great shakes as a dapper, heroic figure, but he was an important man in the guild and everyone wondered what he thought. He was no master of the art of film-making.

"For the applause for Stevens stopped, there was silence for a moment and Ford raised his hand. A stagewriter was there and everyone had to identify themselves for the record. Ford stood up and faced the stagewriter. 'My name is John Ford,' he said, 'I make Westerns.' He paused for a moment to let this piece of news sink in. 'I don't think there is anyone in this room who knows more about what the American public wants than Cecil B. De Mille — and he certainly knows how to give it to them. In that respect I admire him." Then he looked straight at De Mille, who was across the room from him... "But I don't like you C.B. I don't like what you stand for and I don't like what you do...""

Robert Mitchum by John Belton


Tom Ryan

The Pyramid Illustrated History of the Movies is a series of books mainly focusing on the developments and changes in the history of film-making. They serve the function of 'comparisons to criticism', charting the course of the cinema and the gradual progression of the 'person's face' more effectively than any of the numerous single-volume pseudo-encyclopedias.

When a critic of the stature of John Belton chooses to contribute to this series, then it is certain that the book will be a pleasure in store. Mitchum's language is clear, unpretentious and well suited for such a task.

Unfortunately, his insights are not what a publisher is necessarily concerned to promote. Clearly, then, Belton is even less at home in The Encyclopedia of the Movies than was he in The Hollywood Professionals series, in which he abbreviates a brief, summary of what Mitchum's personality and presence have given to the film: "Mitchum's languor, carelessness and romantic vulnerability transform Ford out of the past into a romantic tragedy, whose moral scheme excludes any possibility of the hero's redemption. (p.47)

So the book is neither one of those pontificating artistic dissertations devised by someone who has never smelt a whiff of acetate in their lives, nor a sycophantic apologia. Banks and Zanuck work well as intelligent generalization, but always leave one dissatisfied.

Books of the Quarter

Compiled by J. H. Reid

Actors and Actresses


"Ol dai Havjland" by Judith M. Keen. New York, 1976. $3.95


"The Quotations of W. C. Fields" compiled by Ed. New York, 1976. $3.95

"Long Live the King: A Biography of Clark Gable" by Ly Tonsblum. New York, 1976. $15.95


"Hollywood is a Four Letter Town" by James Bawon, Chicago, 1976. $12.95


"Investigation Hollywood" by Fred Otash. Chatham, 1976. $13.95

"The Laurel and Hardy Scrapbook" by Jack Benny. New York, 1975. $12.95


"The Secret Happiness of Marilyn Monroe" by James E. Dougherty. Chicago, 1976. $19.95


"The Films of Alfred Hitchcock: Fifty Years of His Motion Pictures" by Donald Spada. New York, 1976. $24.95

"The Films of Alfred Hitchcock" by Robert A. Harris and Michael S. Lasky. Secaucus. 1976. $19.95

"San Peckinpah: Master of Violence" by Max Evans. Omnibus. 1972. $6.95

Broadcasting

"The Golden Years of Broadcasting: A Celebration of the First 50 Years of Radio and TV on NBC" by Robert Campbell. New York. 1976. $22.45


Directors

"Mel Brooks: The Irresistible Funnymen" by Bill Adler and Jeffrey Feninn. Chicago, 1976. $2.95

"The Story of Bob Hope" by Margaret Hein. New York. 1976. $3.95


"Screening Alfred Hitchcock: Fifty Years of His Motion Pictures" by Donald Spada. New York. 1976. $24.95

"The Films of Alfred Hitchcock" by Robert A. Harris and Michael S. Lasky. Secaucus. 1976. $19.95

History

"Sounding Time" by Lilian Hellman. Boston. 1976. $10.95

"The Inverted Kitch" by Curtis F. Brown. New York, 1975. $15.95


"The Unreliability of Thermometers" by James Horowitz. New York. 1976. $12.95

"The Western: From Silents to the Seventeen" by George M. and William K. Young. New York. 1977. $8.95

Theory


"Toward a Film Humanism: Theology Through Film" by Neil F. Hurley. New York, 1979. $3.95

"The World Viewed: Reflections on the Ontology of Film" by Stanley Cavell. New York. 1971. $2.95
Dear Sir,
Since 1968 I have been researching the life and career of the late French actress, Renee Adoree (1898-1933), who was popular in American silent films. I have been trying to locate individuals who knew her personally and who would be willing to share their recollections of her with me. I would appreciate any such contact through the address below.

Randye B. Cohen
451 W. Lake Drive
Plantation, Florida U.S.A. 33324

Dear Sir,
Readers of the "New Zealand Report" in the April 1977 Cinema Papers (p. 355) may have been surprised, as I was, at David Lascelles sweeping statement that: "Sleeping Dogs will be the sixth full-length feature to be made in this country." In order that such an inaccuracy is not perpetuated, readers should note the following list of New Zealand made feature films:

1916 A Maori Maid's Love — Raymond Longford
1916 Mutiny of the Bounty — Longford
1921 The Birth of New Zealand — Directed by Rudall Hayward
1922 My Lady of the Cave — directed by Rudall Hayward
1925 Rewi's Last Stand — Hayward
1925 Under the Southern Cross (Taranga) — Universal
1926 Hei Tiki — Alexander Markey
1927 Down on the Farm — Lee Hill and Jack Welsh
1928 The Te Kooti Trail — Hayward
1929 Rewi’s Last Stand — Hayward
1930 One Hundred Crowded Years — Government Centennial feature
1935 Journey for Three — National Film Unit
1942 Pacific Films Broken Barrier
1948 Runaway (1964) and Don’t Let It Get You (1965) are already mentioned by Mr. Lascelles. While there are probably omissions, the list shows that there have been more than six features made in New Zealand.

Clive Sowry
Wellington
New Zealand

On August 8, 1969, Charles Manson remarked to one of his followers . . . "People are going to be slaughtered, they'll be lying on their lawns dead." Twenty-four hours later his prediction had begun to be fulfilled.
During that August, Sharon Tate — the pregnant actress — and at least eight others were murdered in brutally savage and bizarre circumstances.
At the subsequent trial of Manson and some members of his "family" Vincent Bugliosi, whose brilliant and meticulous investigation and prosecution is the subject of this book, revealed the link between Manson's murderous thinking and the then current Beatles' song 'Helter Skelter', whose lyrics prompted Manson to order out his followers, many of them young girls, to butcher without mercy.

by Vincent Bugliosi

628 Pages. 16 Plates. $3.50 Recommended Retail Price. Published by Penguin Books Australia Ltd
LOUIS MALLE

Continued from P. 14

Several times I have changed my mind on Fellini, though I admire and respect him. At the same time there is something in Fellini that I basically don't like. It is something to do with a kind of showmanship; he finally manages to please the audience in a way that I don't like.

There is an element of corruption in Fellini. But at the same time I am ready to accept that he is probably the best filmmaker alive.

I have also changed my mind several times about Truffaut. I go film by film and sometimes I even change my mind about a film after I've seen it several times. For instance, when I first saw Taxi Driver I was quite intrigued by it, though basically I didn't like it. Still I was intrigued enough to go again and then I found what I liked about it and what I didn't.

Basically I don't like the script; I don't like Scorsese and I don't like his vision. What I do like is Scorsese's work and Robert de Niro. I think his performance is remarkable, combining the advantages of being an actor with the feeling that he is not an actor. But I see the exploitation behind Taxi Driver, and the way it tries to satisfy the audience in a cheap sort of way.

My favorite films are those by Bresson and Bunuel. I have known Bunuel for a long time and his son has been my assistant. We are very close and I have spent a lot of time with Bunuel in Mexico. I find his films fascinating, but I am also very critical of some. I do not like his last two for instance. I think he has probably reached the point where making a film is not essential to him. He is 77 now and should stop — but he doesn't. He probably thinks that if he stops he will get bored and maybe die. And he once said that he would like to die on the set.

One of the problems we filmmakers have is that we don't last. It is so difficult to make a film; it takes too much energy. I had a cameraman who once told me that while a film only takes three months to make, a director ages three years. It is a sad and stupid thing, but since so much money is involved you have to spend most of your energies getting the film together.

I am going to start shooting in March and I will start exhausted, whereas I should be fresh. The studio should prepare me like a fighter, give me a massage and get me in the best possible shape because it is so essential. But it is not the way it works — shooting is usually your holiday because it is the only time they leave you alone.

You take somebody like Bob Aldrich. I was so impressed by his early films like Kiss Me Deadly. They were so good, but then people like him start compromising because there is so much money involved. I am one of those directors who for various reasons have had to compromise very little. But it's a fight and you get tired and finally you succumb — especially here.

You are not having a good experience...

No I am having a good experience. It is just that the machine here is heavier than anywhere else, because the money aspect is much more important. Also, in Europe directors are stars, whereas here they think of them as necessary, difficult beings who have to be controlled. They are probably right — there is a lot of money involved and it's their money.

If I were to make another film here I would make it on a smaller budget and do it independently, which is more the way I am used to working. I have always been financially responsible for my films because I have been my own producer. In France, if your budget is under five million francs ($1 million) you are more or less safe, whereas the budget on this film is $2.6 million, which is not much for the U.S. today.

You are working here and so is Claude Lelouch. Is this a trend among French directors?

I don't know. I don't particularly want to be in France for the next few years as I think this part of the world is more interesting. It will probably be different again in three years, but Europe is very dull at the moment. I wouldn't mind making one or two more films in the U.S., but I don't intend to become an American. I keep my things in France and I like going back there to work.

I am here because I am curious about this country and have always wanted to make a film here. As well, my character is so erratic and I go from film to film with nobody understanding the progression.

Supposedly it is a very broken line. But it is mostly because I am following my curiosity. It took me to India, it stopped me making fiction for a while and it made me explore many different directions. I am trying to live my work and let my work be influenced by changes in my life. That is why I think I have progressed.

I would be extremely worried if I started repeating myself, not that I think that is wrong. I admire Truffaut, for instance, for the two or three different films he remakes constantly. I think that is admirable in a way. But I couldn't do it myself.

I like to at least pretend that I am progressing, that I am changing for the better.

I think the past is the past, and I try to live the present as intensely as possible. And that is why after every two or three films I have to go back to documentaries because there one has the immediate gratification of being able to catch the moment as it comes. That is what is truly fascinating.

---

FILMOGRAPHY

As Assistant Director
1956 Un Condamne a Mort S'est Echappe (A Man Escaped)
1958 Les Amants (The Lovers)
1960 Zazie Dans Le Metro
1961 Le Feu Follet (A Time to Live and a Time to Die)
1965 Viva Maria
1966 Le Voleur
1967 Histoires Extraordinaires d'apres Edgar Allan Poe — William Wilson episode
1967 Calcutta — documentary
1968 Phantom India — seven-part documentary
1972 Humain, trop Humain — documentary
1973 Place de la Republique — documentary
1972 Le Souffle au Coeur (Murmur of the Heart)
1974 Lacombe Lucien
1975 Black Moon

OVERSEAS DISTRIBUTION

We are seeking the rights to 16mm color film for overseas distribution. Our main interest lies in suitable product for non-theatrical release. If you have recently produced material available please contact us.

Dudley Gordon and Company
35 Darlinghural Road, Kings Cross, N.S.W. 2011,
Cables: JUNRA Telephone: (02) 358 2130

TRACKS

there's more to life than riding waves...
John Power
Continued from P.25

The auteur theory is only applicable if you are author of the film, i.e. you are the director and screenwriter and have had a big hand in the production aspects of the casting, the cutting and the distribution. I can never be expected to be called the author of The Picture Show Man.

Yes, but the auteur theory is more concerned with the qualities a director brings to films after filming. Now the characteristics of John Power could be the high-standard of acting generally exhibited in his films, or the gentleness of touch, etc...

That is a matter of style, not of being the author. You can’t help but put your trade mark on a film. In most films you can see the director, even if the story may not be his.

What I was leading up to before was that most Australian films are characterized by the lack of character development over the course of the film...

Couldn’t agree with you more.

Why do you think this is the case? Is it inexperience, is it this confidence we were talking about, or is it a lack in the acting profession?

I think Australia is blessed with a lot of good actors, many of whom have not yet been directed well. Part of this is because a lot of people seem to be making first films and haven’t yet had a chance to learn their trade. Directing actors isn’t just a natural gift, you need experience, and that comes only in time.

You can’t expect a man or woman who has not directed before to be perfect with actors. It’s a dazzling business; one day you are nobody and then suddenly there are 50 people sitting around saying, “What do we do now?” The last thing most directors think about is how to handle the actors because they have been too busy getting the film together.

The beauty about the old Hollywood studio system was that the studio bore the brunt of the production problems. So a first-time director would, therefore, only be nervous about his own work. I think once directors have had a chance, they soon apply their trade and if they keep on doing it for long enough, they will gain in confidence and expertise.

Do you think someone like a production manager should take on the responsibility of running a set instead of the director?

No, I don’t. A director has to be involved in the mechanics of making the film. I want to know what set-up we are doing next because I am very conscious of the need to keep actors at a certain level. I want to know for instance whether the actor I am using will be needed in the next set-up. If we are to have a long hard day together I want to know, so I can handle it. A director in fact has to run the set.

And be involved in financial considerations...

No, I think it’s best a director is not involved. I am, of course, speaking personally. Obviously people like Fred Schepisi are very good at it. I admire Fred enormously; I think he is probably the best director in Australia. I think The Devil’s Playground is certainly the best directed, best produced, best written film I’ve seen in this country. I don’t think it’s one of my 10 greats of all time, but it’s a superb film.

Now Fred might be very good at running the finances, but other directors, I don’t think I am a great financier and don’t try to; though I am always conscious of how much things are going to cost. You must, otherwise you may take two days to make a good film and be unable to make an overseas sale.

Is there anything on the horizon at the moment?

No, I have got over the trauma of the Broken Hill thing which really flattened me. I had a writer’s block after that for a while, and I am just trying to think of something else. Now I want to write a contemporary story set in the city. I have the idea, but I am having a bit of trouble getting it started.

Personally, I think the answer might lie in Australia making modest, urban dramas.

What would you describe as a modest budget?

Between $150,000 to $250,000. On these sorts of budgets, I think you can get your money back in the country. But on $600,000 film you have to make an overseas sale. I really believe in regional films.

There seems to be a block about making such films. Do you see any reason for this?

I think it has to do with a great commercial existence in the Australian feature industry. I think people are much more conservative than you might think, and subconsciously they think it is safer to follow rather than to show leadership. Yesterday there’s television today, features are yesterday. They are scared of contemporary issues, and I think that is one reason Australian feature films have so little passion.

It’s hard to be passionate about yesterday. Australians feel as deeply as others; it just has to do with that awkward Anglo-Saxon inability or reluctance to reveal feeling.

NEW ZEALAND REPORT

David Lascelles

John Power’s Old Man’s Story, Endeavour’s and Pacific’s Indira Gandhi, the National Film Unit’s Land of Birds and environmental films are among the highlights at New Zealand For the Fun of It, co-produced by Endeavour, Pacific and an American company.

A New Zealand-Soviet film venture about provides a high-standard of acting, this has been deferred because of the changing status of sports and politics, athletics and nationalism. We have noted the companies of Gospino Films, and Pacific Films have agreed to review the $1 million production for the New Zealand Film Unit in Auckland this year or September of this year to decide whether to proceed or not with the film.

DISTRIBUTION

Film distributors met with the secretary of the Department of Internal Affairs, Sir John O’Dwyer, recently to discuss the New Cinematograph Films Act. A row has been brewing over what distributors see as a Government paper work and inconvenience resulting from the new regulations. The distributors are concerned that the Act requires them to provide a copy of the censor’s certificate of approval for each film every time it is screened in a cinema. A copy of the certificate is usually shown to the audience before the film. Under the new regulations, the certificate must be “displayed in a conspicuous position in the lobby or entrance of the premises at all times while the premises are open to the public”. It became a problem when there are 10 or more prints of the same film; this means the distributor has to get extra copies of the certificate to send out with each print, and this involves delays which could be vital in some cases.

A distributor who attended the meeting took another look at the regulations if the new system proved difficult.

CENSORSHIP

Last year the late Doug McIntosh, then Chief Film Censor, restored all cuts made in Sailor Who Fell from Grace with the Sea. The decision was hailed as a courageous move. In March of this year, a month before the new Cinematograph Films Act came into force, the late Doug McIntosh, then Chief Film Censor, M. B. Tunnicliff, restored cuts made in the first reel of Shout at the Devil. The film, which was not considered controversial, they showed some natives hanging from trees. A distributor of a film like this to the Chief Film Censor he could ask for a certain certificate. The censor usually agrees, although in doing a hatchet job the final print could end up like The Scarlet Buccaneer. The distributor of this film wanted a certificate which would make it suitable for an audience of all ages, with bigger returns at the box-office. The film, however, failed at the box-office.

FILM ARCHIVES

A film archives committee has now been set up (Cinema Papers, April 1977). It will be a body of archive specialists and it will distribute and record held by different bodies, and also decide on archive material. The committee will deal with New Zealand and foreign films that qualify for retention by N.C.A. The committee will also be outlined by the company include options on commercial film. The committee, headed by Peter Kierreb-Odene has drawn up plans for a new film of a centre with a large city. Wellington. Each copy of the film is expected to seat around 600 people.

The work of seven New Zealand film production companies has been shown at the Cannes Television Film Fair recently. Pacific Films, the National Film Unit, and the other five companies, Emirates Television Production, TV 1, South Pacific Television, and Bletta offered more than 50 single films and series on the world market. The titles included TV 1’s Mynihar and The God Boy, the Bletta series, Pacific’s Tangata Whenua.

Gibson’s Old Man’s Story, Endeavour’s and Pacific’s Indira Gandhi, the National Film Unit’s Land of Birds and environmental films are among the highlights at New Zealand For the Fun of It, co-produced by Endeavour, Pacific and an American company.

A New Zealand-Soviet film venture about provides a high-standard of acting, this has been deferred because of the changing status of sports and politics, athletics and nationalism. We have noted the companies of Gospino Films, and Pacific Films have agreed to review the $1 million production for the New Zealand Film Unit in Auckland this year or September of this year to decide whether to proceed or not with the film.
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Film distributors met with the secretary of the Department of Internal Affairs, Sir John O’Dwyer, recently to discuss the New Cinematograph Films Act. A row has been brewing over what distributors see as a Government paper work and inconvenience resulting from the new regulations. The distributors are concerned that the Act requires them to provide a copy of the censor’s certificate of approval for each film every time it is screened in a cinema. A copy of the certificate is usually shown to the audience before the film. Under the new regulations, the certificate must be “displayed in a conspicuous position in the lobby or entrance of the premises at all times while the premises are open to the public”. It became a problem when there are 10 or more prints of the same film; this means the distributor has to get extra copies of the certificate to send out with each print, and this involves delays which could be vital in some cases. A distributor who attended the meeting took another look at the regulations if the new system proved difficult.
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Last year the late Doug McIntosh, then Chief Film Censor, restored all cuts made in Sailor Who Fell from Grace with the Sea. The decision was hailed as a courageous move. In March of this year, a month before the new Cinematograph Films Act came into force, the late Doug McIntosh, then Chief Film Censor, M. B. Tunnicliff, restored cuts made in the first reel of Shout at the Devil. The film, which was not considered controversial, they showed some natives hanging from trees. A distributor of a film like this to the Chief Film Censor he could ask for a certain certificate. The censor usually agrees, although in doing a hatchet job the final print could end up like The Scarlet Buccaneer. The distributor of this film wanted a certificate which would make it suitable for an audience of all ages, with bigger returns at the box-office. The film, however, failed at the box-office.

FILM ARCHIVES

A film archives committee has now been set up (Cinema Papers, April 1977). It will be a body of archive specialists and it will distribute and record held by different bodies, and also decide on archive material. The committee will deal with New Zealand and foreign films that qualify for retention by N.C.A. The committee will also be outlined by the company include options on commercial film. The committee, headed by Peter Kierreb-Odene has drawn up plans for a new film of a centre with a large city. Wellington. Each copy of the film is expected to seat around 600 people.

The work of seven New Zealand film production companies has been shown at the Cannes Television Film Fair recently. Pacific Films, the National Film Unit, and the other five companies, Emirates Television Production, TV 1, South Pacific Television, and Bletta offered more than 50 single films and series on the world market. The titles included TV 1’s Mynihar and The God Boy, the Bletta series, Pacific’s Tangata Whenua.

Gibson’s Old Man’s Story, Endeavour’s and Pacific’s Indira Gandhi, the National Film Unit’s Land of Birds and environmental films are among the highlights at New Zealand For the Fun of It, co-produced by Endeavour, Pacific and an American company.
FILM CENSORSHIP LISTINGS

8. The Producer shall have and is hereby granted the non-exclusive right, during the term of the Cinematograph Film or for a period or aggregate period of two (2) years after expiration thereof, to exploit the Cinematograph Film or a part thereof, and if by reason of mental, physical or other disability, the Director shall be incapacitated for an unlimited period, to exploit the Cinematograph Film or any part thereof in the manner agreed upon.

9. The Director shall be entitled to a royalty of ten (10) per cent on the Studio's after tax net profits from the exploitation of the Cinematograph Film or the sale of rights therein, based on the gross proceeds of sale of exploitation rights, in addition to导演's normal remuneration under this Agreement. The royalty shall be computed and paid in accordance with the provisions of Section 8 above.

10. The Director shall have the non-exclusive right to produce, cut, edit, subtract from, add to, and replace or substitute therein, and to make and manipulate copies, still photographs, and motion pictures of the Cinematograph Film or any part thereof, that the Director shall have rights under this Agreement.

11. The Director shall be entitled to use the Director's name in connection with the Cinematograph Film on such labels or inscriptions as the Director shall designate, unless the Director shall otherwise notify the Company in writing. The Director shall have the right to receive and retain for himself such salary or compensation as the Director and the Company shall mutually agree.

12. The Director shall have the non-exclusive right, during the term of the Cinematograph Film or for a period or aggregate period of two (2) years after expiration thereof, to perform the Cinematograph Film at public exhibitions and theatrical performances, and to submit the Cinematograph Film to a jury for consideration for awards in connection therewith. The Director shall have the right to receive and retain for himself such royalty on such performances and awards as the Director and the Company shall mutually agree.

13. If by reason of mental, physical or other disability the Director shall be incapacitated for an unlimited period, the Director shall have the right to designate a successor to perform the Cinematograph Film at public exhibitions and theatrical performances, and to submit the Cinematograph Film to a jury for consideration for awards in connection therewith.

14. The Director shall have the right, exclusive of any right assigned by the Producer, to make and exhibit the Cinematograph Film, to submit it for prizes and awards, and to exhibit and exhibit it in exhibitions of photographs, motion pictures, and sound recordings. The Director shall have the right to receive and retain for himself such royalty on such performances and awards as the Director and the Company shall mutually agree.

15. The Director shall have the right, exclusive of any right assigned by the Producer, to exhibit the Cinematograph Film to the public in a live performance, and to exhibit the Cinematograph Film to the public in connection with the cinematograph film motion picture.
APPLIED MEDIA STUDIES

The Victorian Education Department, through the Audio Visual Education Centre, has set up an Applied Media Studies course to provide curriculum aid for media teachers and students (at primary and secondary levels) in film appreciation, filmmaking, video, photography and radio. This aid is provided by correspondence courses and seminars, and the production and publication of teaching aids. The course aims to familiarize the television industry and government bodies, especially in the television industry and government bodies, with the work of the associate director, John Lunn, Video Television Unit, for media teachers and their students. What is happening in educational media is given to the audience, and the Programme Committee is developing an Audio Visual Centre, which includes the State Film and Television School organizing its Video One program, and the International Federation of Film Archives, whose membership covers 36 countries. The Victorian Education Department, through the Audio Visual Education Centre, has set up an Applied Media Studies course to provide curriculum aid for media teachers and students (at primary and secondary levels) in film appreciation, filmmaking, video, photography and radio. This aid is provided by correspondence courses and seminars, and the production and publication of teaching aids. The course aims to familiarize the television industry and government bodies, especially in the television industry and government bodies, with the work of the associate director, John Lunn, Video Television Unit, for media teachers and their students. What is happening in educational media is given to the audience, and the Programme Committee is developing an Audio Visual Centre, which includes the State Film and Television School organizing its Video One program, and the International Federation of Film Archives, whose membership covers 36 countries.

SYDNEY FILMMAKERS' CO-OPERATIVE

After the conclusion over the transfer of the Film, Radio and Television Board to the Australian Film Commission, the Sydney Film-makers Cooperative was formed to close in November, and December last year, and in January this year. The Centre has had a great success. Many thought the co-op had closed, but in fact the Centre has continued.

The Centre opened in February and has been running strongly, with programs on African, rural social action films, new women's films, and the ABC series "The Sibyl" and a video festival. The new national program is "The Great Australian Film" which includes works planned for the Greater Union Award films. Phil Noyce's "Breaking of the Drought" and "The Sibyl" are already included. The Centre has had discussions with Crawford Productions on the educational viability of a co-op for the Sibyl.

For further information, contact: Applied Media Studies, 109 Oxford Street, Sydney. A co-op for the Sibyl is being set up.

ARCHIVE ASSOCIATION

For half of its two-year existence, the association has been an observer member of the International Federation of Film Archives, FIAF, whose membership is a supreme international union of film archivists and related organizations. An Australian member is the National Film Collection of the National Library. However, as a prerequisite for observer status, the Archive Association has agreed to develop an audiovisual archive that supports the National Film Collection's film archival activity. The problem is to find a co-ordinator for this activity.

Phil Noyce, the Australian director, has been in London for some time. In some quarters, mass media studies are developing into the third wave of the mass media. The co-ops are a clear indication. More schools are showing films for film study, and more teachers are using the film as a teaching tool. In radio production, and into mass media studies. The co-op is to encourage film archivists to produce more films, and contracts for distribution allow 50 per cent of rental income to be returned to filmmaker members only. Contracts with the larger bodies have been refused and arrangements are being sought with individual newsreel producers. The new national program is "The Great Australian Film" which includes works planned for the Greater Union Award films. Phil Noyce's "Breaking of the Drought" and "The Sibyl" are already included. The Centre has had discussions with Crawford Productions on the educational viability of a co-op for the Sibyl.
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Phil Noyce, the Australian director, has been in London for some time. In some quarters, mass media studies are developing into the third wave of the mass media. The co-ops are a clear indication. More schools are showing films for film study, and more teachers are using the film as a teaching tool. In radio production, and into mass media studies. The co-op is to encourage film archivists to produce more films, and contracts for distribution allow 50 per cent of rental income to be returned to filmmaker members only. Contracts with the larger bodies have been refused and arrangements are being sought with individual newsreel producers. The new national program is "The Great Australian Film" which includes works planned for the Greater Union Award films. Phil Noyce's "Breaking of the Drought" and "The Sibyl" are already included. The Centre has had discussions with Crawford Productions on the educational viability of a co-op for the Sibyl.

For further information, contact: Applied Media Studies, 109 Oxford Street, Sydney. A co-op for the Sibyl is being set up.
Shortly before the opening night, it was learned that Reg Perry, son of Joseph Perry, and one of the last living links with the Limelight Department (he appeared in Soldiers of the Cross as a boy) — would come to Canberra for both performances.

With everything falling nicely into place, there was an unexpected crisis — a national airline strike — 36 hours before the opening. Frantic arrangements were made for the interstate participants to come by car from Sydney and Melbourne, though Reg Perry’s attendance would be impossible unless the strike was called off in time. They would have no time for an adequate orchestral or technical rehearsal, and the presentation would have to go on without the benefit of a dry run. Consequently, no one involved could tell how well the pieces would fit together on opening night. But an enthusiastic audience apparently thought it worked quite well. And Reg Perry did make it — arriving at the airport almost exactly on cue to fill his allotted place in the program.

**Paul Cox**

Continued from P. 19

Yes, it is a very big change in style. Before that I used people as vehicles to express something very general; like in The Journey, which is about the potential of the mind, the sadness, the wastage, the learned to speak, you realize that a about. And finally when you have to put aside the past.

I have sat through its dramatic potential of its subject and few could emotionally affect an audience and it remains a compelling visual and aural experience.

For Booth’s audiences, many of whom would never before have seen film, it would have been unforgettable. It took full advantage of the dramatic potential of its subject and few could have sat through its 2 1/2 hours unaffected.

The Perpetua story — slides and music in synchronization — was a memorable conclusion to the program: the music, heavy with pathos and foreboding, perfectly complementing the visuals showing Perpetua’s arrest, imprisonment, trial and final death in the arena.

Soldiers of the Cross has dated, and to palates sated with the cinematic grandeur of latter day epics it will appear simple and naive; it was made for a kind of audience which does not exist today, and what remains of it no longer moves.

Yet, remarkably, it has not lost its power to emotionally affect an audience and it remains a compelling visual and aural experience.

It was a good start for a permanent Australian film industry.

---

**Paul Cox Filography**

1965 Matuta 23 min. Color 16mm
1966 Time Past 10 min. B/W 16mm
1968 Skin Deep 16mm
1969 Marcel 5 min. B/W 16mm
1969 Symphony 12 min. B/W 16mm
1970 Meta 5 min. Color 16mm
1970 Calcutta 30 min. Color 16mm — documentary
1971 Phyllis 35 min. Color 16mm
1972 The Journey 52 min. Color 16mm
1975 Inland 10 min. Color 16mm
1975 All Set Backstage 22 min. Color 16mm — documentary
1976 Illuminations 4 min. Color 16mm
1976 We’re All Alone My Dear 21 min. Color 16mm — documentary
1977 Inside Looking Out 90 min. Color 35mm

---
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NEW PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

FILM SOUNDTRACK AUSTRALIA

Bruce McNaughton, well-known Melbourne cameraman and director of commercials, has just opened Australia's newest film sound complex, Film Soundtrack Australia, situated at 107 Queensbridge St, South Melbourne, is Melbourne's largest and most advanced set-up and offers the following facilities:

- Transfers: 35mm three track, 35mm single track, 17.5mm and 16mm reproductions of master material are available, with equalization if required. The company offers 25 and 17.5mm at a flat frequency response from 30Hz to 16kHz, and for 16mm at least 35Hz to 16kHz.
- Post-synching: both rock-and-roll and loop recording are available. The recording theatre is a very professional one, though there is an extra "ugly noise" room for those who might have difficulty matching sound recorded in adverse conditions. 3 track recording of post-synch dialogue or effects is standard.
- Sound mixing: by early July, 20 film reproducers will have been installed to mix 35mm and 16mm, or any combination of these in sync with an image of the film.

THE NATIONAL FILM INFORMATION SERVICE

The Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences and Academy Foundation (California) operate the National Film Information Service. This service was established to offer access, by mail, to the extensive research holdings of the Academy's Margaret Herrick Library. Students, scholars, historians, teachers and film programmers everywhere may make use of this unique service.

AMPEX EDM-1

The world's first PAL version of the Ampex EDM-1 automatic electronic editing system has been purchased by the Perth television station, STW 9.

- The Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences and Academy Foundation (California) operate the National Film Information Service. This service was established to offer access, by mail, to the extensive research holdings of the Academy's Margaret Herrick Library. Students, scholars, historians, teachers and film programmers everywhere may make use of this unique service.
- The EDM-1 introduced Computer Assisted time code editing — now accepted practice in the U.S. to Australian television production. It features a switcher designed for computer control. The Ampex machine will control, by time address, video and audio inputs from as many as eight recorders simultaneously. It will store special effects in its large memory and will "learn" a program producer's touch by using the push buttons and faders.

How did a seasoned professional actor like Ray Milland react to being directed by a young, relatively unknown Australian? We had written a part for him in the film — I had the co-operation of everybody.

Ray Milland, in particular, was wonderful. He had previously been involved in something like 108 films and was absolutely professional. When he walked on the set the lighting-cameraman wouldn't have to tell him where the key-light was, he knew instinctively. Of course, he had directed several of his own films, and therefore had both knowledge and confidence.

Did this experience with comedy help with "Steptoe and Son Ride Again"?

It certainly did. Frankie Howerd taught me the importance of economy and timing in a comedy, especially with silent visual gags of the Buster Keaton type. I also found that editing a comedy sequence is quite different to editing a drama sequence. In a comedy, the performance is everything, and a good joke can be ruined by cutting.

With Steptoe and Son Ride Again I had to overcome the problem of making a television script work satisfactorily as a film. I soon found that each dramatic form — TV and cinema — has its own particular structure and content, and a lot of rewriting was necessary, but it finally worked and the film made a lot of money.

How are the returns on "To The Devil ... A Daughter"?

Very good indeed. It's broken box-office records in Britain.

Your next film, "Eddie and the Breakthrough", is set in Australia. Will it be Australian?

It's a very international film. For a start, the money will be coming from the U.S. and will run to some $2 million. The on-line producers are British and Australian, with Pat Lovell looking after the Australian end. The leading male characters are American, Italian and Australian. We had written a part for Sterling Hayden, for he was extremely good in Bertolucci's 1900, but I think the part will be going to Lee Marvin, who has always wanted to make a film in Australia.

What is "Eddie and the Breakthrough" all about?

It's basically about big American mining interests coming to the opal fields near Coober Pedy and destroying the hopes and aspirations of a bunch of rugged individuals working there. They are small-time opal miners, including a wide range of nationalities, Italian, Greek, Polish, Yugoslav and Australian. These men are there to seek a new way of life, when the bulldozers come in and destroy their dreams. It leads to a lot of conflict.

The film is really a character-study of four men in extreme physical and mental circumstances, an action-adventure story in the same genre as The Treasure of the Sierra Madre.

Is it going to be a film with a lot of Australian character to it, like "Sunday Too Far Away"?

I hope to give Eddie and the Breakthrough a universal quality, with an Australian flavor. I have based much of the script on my own experience of the opal fields — I worked at Coober Pedy for six months before I went to Britain. The Italian character is a mixture of an Italian I met in a Carlton bistro years ago and an Italo-American named Dean Benedetti, a cratical fan of jazz musician Charlie Parker. The original title of the film was going to be Eddie and the Lucky Salt Peanut, after Parker's tune, "Salt Peanuts".

This new film will be quite a change from the world of horror and mayhem . . .

Don't worry, it will have lots of dramatic moments in it. For a number of years I have been aiming at writing and directing a film based largely on my own ideas and experience — Eddie and the Breakthrough will be such a film. My previous films can be seen as a kind of apprenticeship towards that end.

FILMOGRAPHY

1966 Walkabout to Cornwall (Feature documentary)
1967 Britain Around The World (17 docu­
1968 The Angry Young Man (Television series — two episodes directed by Peter Sykes)
Fred Schepisi
Interview with the director and writer of the award-winning *The Devil's Playground*.

The Last Wave
A report of the making of Peter Weir's new film, *The Last Wave*.

Melbourne and Sydney Film Festivals
Comprehensive reviews of the major films of both festivals.

Pierre Rissient
Interview with famous French publicist and filmmaker Pierre Rissient.

Also:
Guide to the Australian Film Producer: Part Seven
Reviews of the latest foreign and overseas features
A look at the neglected Australian television series, "Luke's Kingdom"
A history of American film periodicals (part of a series which will include, in later issues, British, European and Australian magazines)
Part 2 of the Australian Directors' Checklist

FOR FILM MAKERS
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).

FOR FILM GOERS
Imaginative programming in intimate, friendly surroundings at our Lygon St Cinema — the widest ranging and most consistent outlet for Australian independent films PLUS Late Shows Fridays and Saturdays of often neglected overseas product.

FOR FILM USERS
Melbourne's most exciting and extensive range of short films. Over 700 titles from the educational to the esoteric — adolescence, animation, anthropology, art, childhood, community action, environment, experimental, fantasy, history, humour, lifestyles, politics, sexuality, sport, travel ....
(RING FOR A CATALOGUE)

TRAVELodge

If you've got a conference we've got the location.

Exotic Tahiti, Tokyo, Savu Savu, Auckland.
Indigenous Port Macquarie, Darwin, Albury, Geelong, Canberra, Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide and Brisbane.

We've also got the information, ring Sue-Ellen Doherty (Sydney) 31 0388 for complete information on Travelodge's facilities and our professional approach to conferences throughout South Pacific and Australia.
BACK ISSUES

- Copy(ies) of Number 1 at $3.50*
- Copy(ies) of Number 2 at $3.00*
- Copy(ies) of Number 3 at $2.75*
- Copy(ies) of Number 5 at $2.75*
- Copy(ies) of Number 9 at $2.50*
- Copy(ies) of Number 10 at $2.50*
- Copy(ies) of Number 11 at $2.50*
- Copy(ies) of Number 12 at $2.50*
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Cinema Papers Pty. Ltd. 143 Therry Street, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia 3000
BOUND VOLUMES
ORDER VOLUME 3 NOW!
(numbers 9-12) 1976-1977
Handsomely 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.

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

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

ORDER FORM

BOUND VOLUMES
Please send me  □ copies of Volume 3 (numbers 9-12) at $21 per volume.
Enclosed cheque/postal order for $______
(for overseas rates see below)

EASY BINDER
Please send me  □ copies of Cinema Papers' easy binder at $10 per copy.
Enclosed cheque/postal order for $______
(available Australia only)

BINDING SERVICE
Please have the enclosed copies bound in black with gold embossed lettering at $13 per volume.
Enclosed cheque/postal order for $______
(available Australia only)

NAME ...........................................................................
ADDRESS ....................................................................
...................................................Postcode ...................
TO PLACE AN ORDER FILL IN THE FORM

OVERSEAS RATES (including postage)


(C) Back issues (per copy). Surface (all zones): add $A0.80. Air: Zone 1 — add $A2.80; Zone 2 — add $A3.50; Zone 3 — add $A4.20; Zone 4 — add $A4.90; Zone 5 — add $A5.25.

NB (1) All remittances in Australian dollars only
(2) Surface Air Lifted available to U.K., German Federal Republic, Greece, Italy and U.S.: (a) Subscriptions — $A18.40 (per year); (b) per bound volume — $A26.80. (c) Back issues — add $A2.60 per copy.
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’; ‘Eliza Frazer’; ‘Wake in Fright’; ‘ABC of Love and Sex’; ‘Solo’; ‘The Picture Show Man’; ‘High Roll’; ‘Raw Deal’; ‘The Devil’s Playground’; and many others.

Why not add your name to our list of satisfied clients?

ADAIR INSURANCE BROKING GROUP
Australian International Brokers

SYDNEY
DAVID SOLOMON
Adair Insurances
Pty. Ltd.
Box 3884 GPO
27 8741

MELBOURNE
WAYNE LEWIS
Adair Insurances (Vic)
Pty. Ltd.
Box 74B GPO
63 6947

ALSO AT:
SHEPPARTON
WANGARATTA
BRISBANE
Australia’s favourite premium beer.

CARLTON
Crown Lager