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“Film can take the smallest detail, dramatise it, and present it with impact.”

“I am currently shooting a film on parasites. In one scene I have to isolate malaria in the blood. For this film to be any use for diagnostic or identification purposes what I see in the microscope has to be accurately produced on film.

Reproduced with perfect resolution and color rendition. The reds and blues on the screen must be the reds and blues of real life.

To achieve this you must know your film and trust it.

There are no pick up shots or second chances in micro-cinematography because Biology is constantly changing. With each different day there is different drama.

Only with Eastman color film can I achieve the absolute resolution and rendition needed to capture the smallest detail of that drama, and present it with everlasting impact.”

Dietmar Fill A.C.S.

Kodak Motion Picture Film
KODAK (Australasia) PTY. LTD.
The way Bill Gooley sees it, the lab is part of the crew

Bill, in all the time that we've been doing these ads, I suddenly realised I've never known exactly what your title is.

I wear two hats, one of them is Sales Manager for Colorfilm, the other one is Feature Liaison.

Meaning?
Meaning that before a film is shot I talk to the production company, the D.O.P., I read the script, get the shooting schedule and the phone numbers which I couldn't do without. So when they go to shoot the film, I know exactly what the D.O.P. is trying to achieve.

How does that level of involvement help when the film comes into the lab?
Well, I'm the one who screens the rushes every morning, the one who's in contact with the production office. And because I know what they're shooting, know the script, I can turn around and talk to the production secretary daily about things that may alarm somebody just walking in to see the rushes. They might say something was under-exposed, or blue, and I know it's not wrong. It's what the man wants. There's nothing worse than to get a message on location saying you've left your 85 filter off or you've under-exposed or overexposed a stop and a half or something. They tend to panic with that kind of thing.

Can you give me a specific instance of that happening?
Well, 'The Survivor'. Johnny Seale was the D.O.E. There are sections that are deliberately overexposed three stops. It would have caused a lot of panic if we hadn't known it was deliberate. It's real communication. You can't do without it.

How did you begin your career, Bill, how did you get involved in film?
I grew up in the 40's and 50's, when films were big and wonderful, I spent all my time at the pictures. Then I left school and went to work at P Gerrards. I left the industry a couple of times since then, but once it gets to you, you can't get out. I ended up at Filmcraft, which is now Colorfilm.

What have you worked as?
When I started off I used to go down the long developing tanks that were fifteen feet deep and scraped the sides clean. I did the whole bit, it was part of the life. I was on the dry end of a black and white processor, then I advanced up to driving it. Then later when color came in, they asked me if I wanted to go into that area, which of course I did, that was where the future was.

What was the first color film made in Australia?
By Australians or outside?

By Australians in Australia.
It becomes difficult, 'They're a Weird Mob' was processed here, but cut in England. There was 'Adam's Woman', processed here, cut in America. I guess 'The Hands of Cormack Joyce' which was one of the first films I was personally involved in, that was a film that was finished here. We cut the neg, made the prints, did all that here. So I guess it was the first color film finished in this country.

What should you look for in a laboratory?
 involvement as much as anything else. Most films are shot by producers and directors without much money, and they spend three years of their lives trying to get them off the ground. It's not just a film, it becomes a part of their lives. Unless you become personally involved, then it doesn't mean as much. Of course we're very lucky having people here like Roger Cowland, Maggie Cardin and Arthur Cambridge. And apart from them, we have a night shift here in this company that is remarkable. We can get negatives in here at 9, 10, 11 o'clock at night, process; take out n.g.s and they're ready for me to screen at 8 in the morning. Without that night shift, we couldn't do it. They're a very close group, they work from 11 at night to 7 in the morning, they choose to go on that shift.

How often does this work?
If you shoot six days a week, we work six days a week. We can give you reports on Thursday for what was shot on Friday. We usually have Sunday off. But while there's a shoot on, we work. That's the only way to survive. Nobody can afford to wait days for reports. And where people and machinery are involved, you'll always have problems. It's simple for us to say there's 100 feet gone down the drain. But if we tell them quickly, they can shoot it again more easily.

Do you think that producers care enough about the involvement of the laboratory when they're beginning to shoot a film?
Oh yes. The producers we've dealt with here know the importance of the lab. The producer must have confidence in everybody. I look at it this way, and I don't know whether other people see it like this, but I feel we are a part of the crew shooting that film.

What's going through Colorfilm at the moment?
'Gallipoli' is being shot. 'The Yankee Zephyr' is starting now, we have a film Don McAlpine's shooting in Manila called 'Don't Cry It's Only Thunder' for a Japanese American company.

You've been to Cannes twice. What sort of impact do the Australian films make on such a huge market place?
This year people were talking about Australian films. And they were looking at them as entertainment. Those people over there want to buy films, but you have to give entertainment. One of the things that gets me, of course, is that you look at all the products from all the countries coming up on the screen, and you realise without a shadow of a doubt that ours is as good as the majority, and that's very gratifying. The year before, when we took 'My Brilliant Career' to Cannes, that was just remarkable for me. Sitting in the Palais de Festival, and watching our film up there, hearing the audience applaud it. I'll never forget that.

Do you see the day when private enterprise takes over entirely from government subsidy for the industry, I mean with the entry of Stigwood Murdoch?
I think they should work together. Of course private enterprise will invest more and more heavily in films. But some films have to be made that won't make a profit. Private enterprise won't make them. But they have to be made.

Looking back over your involvement in the industry over the years, how do you feel about it?
The industry has been very good to me. It's been interesting, exciting. I've made tremendous friends, it's my life. I wouldn't want to do anything else. It's very gratifying to me, and I'm very grateful to the industry.

Finally, why Colorfilm?
Anybody with sense comes here. Apart from that, our technicians, our skills, our involvement. All these things make me look good. I don't print the stuff, I don't process it or neg match or make optics, it's all the people behind me. And they're experts, they're remarkable people, it's what ends up on that screen that's the main thing. That's what sells their films. That's what makes them make another film.

35 Missenden Road, Camperdown, Sydney, Australia. Telephone (02) 516 1066 Telex AA24545

Colorfilm
Leo Burnett 4.113 L
Agfa-Gevaert have just released a new color negative camera film, available in 16mm and 35mm, that will positively enhance the creation of any masterpiece. New Gevacolor 682 negative camera film.

This film passes even the toughest of tests with flying colours (if you’ll forgive the pun), reproducing skin tones to perfection.

And it doesn’t just offer a wide latitude that compensates for even the most severe exposure variations, but delivers such a fine grain that every frame can be appreciated as a work of art in itself.

Better still, this new film can be processed without any of the problems created by climatic conditions. And it’s compatible with the process employed by most major Australian laboratories.

So in summary, all we can say is that if you’ve got the creative know-how, and the will, we’ve got the way. New Gevacolor Type 682.

AGFA-GEVAERT LIMITED
Head Office, P.O. Box 48, Nunawading, VIC. 3131.
Melbourne 8788000, Sydney 8881444, Brisbane 3916833, Adelaide 425703, Perth 3615399.
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The New South Wales Film Corporation and the Feature Film Division of the F&TPAA pulled out all stops for the jointly-sponsored “Film Expo 80” at the Sebel Town House, from November 10 to 13. The speakers included many of the “stars” of the annual UCLA Entertainment Symposium.

In general, seminars tend to preach to the converted, or to provide, for those who don’t need to be taught, lessons they don’t want to know or advice they are not in a position to follow. The organizers of Film Expo can claim credit for a symposium that was relevant, informative and constructive — probably the most comprehensive seminar study conducted in Australia for 10 years.

Despite a relatively high entrance fee, the Expo attracted an average daily attendance of 140 to hear discussion on topics as wide-ranging as Mark Damon on territorial pre-sales, Massimo Ferrara on the Italian industry and Michael Fuchs on the American cable market.

David White, who with Edna Wilson deserves most of the credit for organizing the Expo, announced that the seminar will become a biennial event. Guest speakers were: Mike Medavoy (Orion Pictures), Barry Spikings (EMI), Harry Ulfand (The Ulfand Agency), Eric Weissmann (U.S. Attorney), Ashley Boone (Ladd Company), Barbara Boyle (New World Pictures), Arthur Abraham (Filmketeers Ltd), Klaus Helwig (Janus Film), Massimo Ferrara (Italian Attorney), Lois Luger (Avco Embassy), Rudy Petersdorf (formerly Universal and Warner Bros. now with the Australian Films Office), Sam Geifman (formerly Australian Films Office, now Independent Productions), Michael Fuchs (Home Box Office), Mark Damon (Producers Sales Organization) and Simon Osman (British Lawyer).

OPEN CHANNEL WORKSHOP

Bud Tingwell has just completed his fourth film and television acting workshop at the Open Channel, Melbourne. The workshop provides an opportunity for professional actresses to familiarize themselves with a variety of situations peculiar to performing before cameras.

Distinctions are made between distractions encountered during a television studio and film work, and the theatrical habit of using spotlights.

Tingwell is particularly concerned that actors achieve a good rapport on screen. Resorting to “naturalism” was generally found to be a good method of overcoming that timelessness state when actors stand high and dry, frozen in a bewildering blur of forgotten lines, and for maintaining a performance level, while battling with breaks in continuity and the confusions associated with shooting out of sync.

Workshops are held regularly at Open Channel, usually over a weekend, and cost $60. For information phone (03) 419 5111.

WARDROPE HEADS NEW OPERATION

Alan Wardrobe, former marketing and distribution director of the Australian Film Commission, will head a newly-formed film marketing and production company. The company, California Connection, will be internationally structured to provide producer support and representation. Services will range from straight-forward sales to all media and markets, to back-up marketing, such as merchandise development and exploitation, preparation of investment prospectuses, and blueprinting of marketing and distribution strategies, in Australia and overseas. Offices are being organized in Los Angeles, Tokyo, London, Frankfurt and Auckland.

Another side to California Connection will be production of feature films, the company acting in an executive producer capacity, at least in the initial projects.

The first feature, a futuristic adventure drama set in the midst of a fuel and power crisis with a breakdown of law and order, is now well advanced. Wardrobe says it will feature a mix of Australian and overseas talent, with the Australian input predominating.

Open Channel will also be an information section for maintenance of an “Australian input predominating.”

INDIAN FILM FESTIVAL

The Indian Film Festival of New Delhi will be held in January and February, 1981, at the National Museum. The Festival will have a competitive section of features and documentaries covering films of the past two years, excluding those already screened in competitions anywhere in the world. There will also be an information section for films screened in international film festivals for the past four years, excluding those already screened in India. The films will be available to the public at a nominal price.

F&TPAA PRESIDENT

Ray Beattie has been elected national president of the Film and Television Production Association of Australia (F&TPAA). Beattie, chief executive of Atlas Australia, succeeds Grahame Jennings who has been national president for the past five years.

The F&TPAA is the production industry’s national employer organization, and Beattie’s election comes at an important time for the Australian film and videotape production industry, Beattie said.

“With the proposed new tax incentives for investment in Australian films and production industry's on-going drive to expand our industry, Beattie said, "we've reached an exciting period."
television programs announced by the Prime Minister in his policy speech and recent Government initiatives to expand the nation's telecommunications services, including the introduction of pay television to Australia, have boosted producers' confidence in the long-term future of the industry.

"The continuing economic health of the industry in Australia is vital not only to the future of our members but to that of all the writers, directors, actors, technicians and musicians involved in the production of feature films, television programs, commercials, training films and documentaries. A unified approach by all independent producers is necessary to ensure that continuity."

THE JAN DAWSON AWARD

An annual award has been established in Britain to commemorate the work of the late Jan Dawson as a film critic, writer and program adviser, and in recognition of her contribution to the development of British independent filmmaking.

The announcement of the award was made at a memorial meeting for Jan Dawson, held in London on November 16. This was followed by a screening of Alexander Kluge's Strongman Ferdin­dand the English subtitles of which had been translated by Dawson. A program of films made with the assistance of the Women's Film Fund with the award should make cheques payable to the Jan Dawson Award, C/- R. Shah and Co. Ltd, 25 Newman St, London W.1.

AUSTRALIAN FILM INSTITUTE

Sue Murray, acting executive director of the Australian Film Institute, will leave late 1980. She has been primarily responsible for the organization of the Australian Film Awards.

MOVING PICTURES

A program of films made with the assistance of the Women's Film Fund will be released through the Australian Film Institute cinemas early in 1981. Opening on January 26 at the Opera House Cinema, Sydney, for a two-week season, the films will later play at the State Cinema in Hobart and the Longford in Melbourne.

Those wishing to donate to the award should make cheques payable to the Jan Dawson Award, C/- R. Shah and Co. Ltd, 25 Newman St, London W.1.

LAW AND THE FILM CULTURE

Just before the 1980 Federal election in October, Senator Susan Ryan released a document on the Australian Labor Party's commitment to an Australian film culture. Though the election result means that the paper's recommendations unlikely to be implemented for some time, several suggestions are of interest. A selection is printed below:

"In 1979 the AFC underwent a review of its activities in assisting the film industry. The review, Towards a More Effective Commission: The AFC in the 1980s, was carried out by Peat Marwick Mitchell, management consultants, with a view to recommending a strategy which would ensure commercial success for Australian films.

Both recommendations were that the AFC adopt a global strategy in its production and distribution activities, that the criterion for AFC funding be a film's potential to succeed in the international marketplace, and that films with AFC investment be planned and budgeted to earn 60 per cent of their net income from overseas sources from 1980/81. It was noted that this necessarily meant fewer but bigger films. Just how access to the global market is to be achieved was not made clear.

This global strategy seems to have been largely accepted by the AFC and the Government. The Australian Film Commission Amendment Act, passed in May, embodied some of the report's recommendations and included provision that the AFC may operate on a more commercial basis. The Government also supports the establishment of a commercially-viable Australian film industry, taking issue with the Peat Marwick Mitchell strategy for achieving it.

"Not every film is going to be a blockbuster and it is unrealistic to expect this. While we agree that, in general, films should be funded commensurate with their potential earnings, to set an arbitrary figure of 60 per cent overseas earnings for all AFC productions is unacceptable. Such a requirement completely rules out the production of low-budget feature films for the domestic market, thus excluding films that are worthwhile in themselves and provide a valuable training ground for producers and directors.

"To aim all productions at the international market puts at risk the Australian character of our films. Attempts to ensure that all Australian films have an international flavor, that characters speak in trans-Pacific accents and that issues covered are specifically Australian will ultimately destroy the unique character of Australian films.

"The Australian film industry cannot, at least in economic terms: its social and cultural benefits must also be considered. The facility for social and cultural development, the definition of a national identity and the projection of an Australian image overseas are important benefits of a local industry. Should a film be justified on these grounds in the same way as these benefits can also be subsidized to the arts.

"Recently, the Minister of Culture announced a film distribution and exhibition networks, which led to the collapse of the original Australian film industry, remains one of the biggest problems for the industry. While these chains remain effectively controlled by American film companies, there will be a predominance of American films shown in Australian cinemas, and a low level of investment in Australian production by exhibitors and distributors.

"An ALP Government would confer with state Attorneys-General and state film corporations in order to arrive at a co-operative Australia-wide strategy for regulating film exhibition and distribution.

"It would also conduct a thorough examination of the use of Commonwealth powers with respect to the film industry. There is a constitutional scope for Commonwealth action under the trade and commerce power s. 91(ii), the taxation power s. 91(ii) and the corporations power s. 91(ii)(x). It is necessary, a Labor Government would seek to use the powers conferred upon the Commonwealth in the Constitution to regulate film distribution and exhibition.

"Several weeks before a Federal election, the Government announced a new taxation scheme involving a 150 per cent write-off on investment expenditure, in the year of the expenditure.

"The new scheme is exceptionally generous and should give a boost to the industry. It is certainly heartening that the Government has seen fit to act to prevent the collapse of the film industry, a collapse which in itself precipitated.

"However, the see-sawing attitude of the Fraser Government has caused great instability in the film industry and investors once bitten will be cautious in future. There is nothing to suggest for instance that once the election is over, or once the Government realizes how much..."
revenue will be lost through the new scheme, that another 'crackdown' will not be instigated.

The ALP would seek to provide incentives that would ensure a stable source of private investment in films. Wherein the short term we recognize that attractive tax incentives may be necessary, in the long term, the restructuring of the distribution/exhibition system in Australia may obviate the need for such measures.

“The new emphasis on commercial values has affected all areas of the branch's activities . . . The ALP agrees that any move back to commercialize the Creative Development Branch (of the AFC) is shortsighted and would have a destructive effect on its ability to carry out its functions. Budget cuts imposed on the branch are also limiting its effectiveness.”

The National Library of Australia has acquired the private film collections of Harry E. Davidson, an internationally-known Melbourne collector who died in February. The collections -- one of 600 Australasian Gazette, Cinesound and Movietone newsreels; the other of about 1200 reels of feature films, shorts and documentaries -- constitute what was probably the biggest private holding of vintage 35mm films in Australia.

Most notable items in the collections are prints of Fritz Lang's 1926 silent feature, Metropolis; a famous German production of Faust by Friedrich Murnau; a 1944 sound feature, A Yank in Australia, directed in the 1920s; and footage from a 1915 Australian feature film with a World War I theme, A Hero of the Dardanelles.

The copy of Metropolis is an original tinted print, believed to contain footage not surviving in any copy held overseas.

The collections will be preserved in the Library's National Film Archive in Canberra and known as "The Harry Davidson Collection".

CUBAN FILM WEEK

Martha Ansara reports on the forthcoming Cuban Film Week:

A Cuban Film Week is to be presented by the Australian Film Institute, from January 17-23, at the Sydney Opera House and at the National Theatre in Melbourne, from January 27-31. Three representatives from the Cuban Film Institute (ICAIC) will be present for discussion and to meet their Australian counterparts. The films will be shown by the National Film Theatre in the other states during the following months.

Cuban Cinema

Cuban cinema did not exist before 1959. Before the revolution, Cuba was virtually a colony of the U.S., its cinemas dominated by Hollywood product.

Rather like Australia in the post-war period, Cuban participation in film production was limited to the provision of colorful locations for overseas companies employing locals in only the most menial positions. Unlike Australia, however, there was no government film unit and its only native film industry was the production of cheap pornography. ICAIC was established in the first weeks of Fidel Castro's new government.

While most of the filmmakers lacked experience, they rejected the idea of formal film training and took to the streets with their cameras, learning as they went. Within 10 years, Cuban cinema was attracting worldwide acclaim; while in Cuba itself, audiences addicted to North American formula films were being won over to their own cinema through the success of the innovative and political "Latin American Newsreels" of Santiago Alvarez.

Today, Cuban filmmakers still work with slim material resources -- a result of underdevelopment and the U.S. Blockade. Shooting ratios for feature dramas can be as low as 2:1; and while there is now one Arriflex BL at ICAIC, much of the equipment is more than 20 years old.

Nevertheless, necessity is the mother of invention and adversity seems to have fostered a sense of film making that is varied, adventurous and uniquely Cuban. While individual directors have a degree of creative freedom unknown to the Australian industry, members of ICAIC, like all cultural groups in Cuba, have a collective responsibility for the development of its art form and the interpretation of its history, culture and society; and films that are made are responsive to this function. Internationally, their films give one more information about Cuba than one can get, short of going there.

In striving to express the reality of living in a polarized and politicized -- culture, ICAIC has developed the practice of a new political cinema, where experiment is encouraged and dogmas are out of place.

Films for Australia

The selection for the Film Week draws from films of the past seven years which have not been shown in Australia. They will include features and shorts demonstrating the wide range of form and subject matter. Some of the features will be:

*Portrait of Teresa* (Pastor Vega, 1973). This film rocketed the island population of 9.5 million with its condemnation of the unequal position of women and the double standard. About 800,000 people packed the cinemas in the first six weeks of release, arguments over the film's contents still rage. Teresa, the protagonist, attempts to combine sole responsibility for the home with her factory job and involvement in a cultural group; her philandering husband falls apart.

*El Brigadista* (The Literacy Teacher, Octavio Cortazar, 1977). Popular in Cuba for its subject matter and its Hollywood style, the film follows the adventures of a young student participating in the literacy campaign of 1961 in the small town of Maniadero Chopito in the Zapata Swamp. Struggling against the resistance of the peasants to a city kid who is inexperienced and fearful of the bush, he becomes embroiled in local conflicts with U.S.-backed counter-revolutionaries.

*The Man from Maisinico* (Manuel Piriéz, 1972) is another film which makes use of Hollywood conventions. Based on a true story set in the visually-stunning Mexican desert, the film unravels the mystery of the death of Alberto Delgado sent by the revolution to manage a state farm in the 1964 struggles between the peasants and undercover counter-revolutionaries in their midst. It is a fast-paced action in the Clint Eastwood tradition.

*Globo* (Pastor Vega, 1975) deals with the counter-revolutionary problem in a different way. It is a gripping analysis of the struggle between the peasantry and the counter-revolution, and uniquely Cuban. While individual directors have a degree of creative freedom unknown to the Australian industry, members of ICAIC, like all cultural groups in Cuba, have a collective responsibility for the development of its art form and the interpretation of its history, culture and society; and films that are made are responsive to this function. Internationally, their films give one more information about Cuba than one can get, short of going there.

In striving to express the reality of living in a polarized and politicized -- culture, ICAIC has developed the practice of a new political cinema, where experiment is encouraged and dogmas are out of place.

Films for Australia

The selection for the Film Week draws from films of the past seven years which have not been shown in Australia. They will include features and shorts demonstrating the wide range of form and subject matter. Some of the features will be:

*Portrait of Teresa* (Pastor Vega, 1973). This film rocketed the island population of 9.5 million with its condemnation of the unequal position of women and the double standard. About 800,000 people packed the cinemas in the first six weeks of release, arguments over the film's contents still rage. Teresa, the protagonist, attempts to combine sole responsibility for the home with her factory job and involvement in a cultural group; her philandering husband falls apart.

*El Brigadista* (The Literacy Teacher, Octavio Cortazar, 1977). Popular in Cuba for its subject matter and its Hollywood style, the film follows the adventures of a young student participating in the literacy campaign of 1961 in the small town of Maniadero Chopito in the Zapata Swamp. Struggling against the resistance of the peasants to a city kid who is inexperienced and fearful of the bush, he becomes embroiled in local conflicts with U.S.-backed counter-revolutionaries.

*The Man from Maisinico* (Manuel Piriéz, 1972) is another film which makes use of Hollywood conventions. Based on a true story set in the visually-stunning Mexican desert, the film unravels the mystery of the death of Alberto Delgado sent by the revolution to manage a state farm in the 1964 struggles between the peasants and undercover counter-revolutionaries in their midst. It is a fast-paced action in the Clint Eastwood tradition.

*Globo* (Pastor Vega, 1975) deals with the counter-revolutionary problem in a different way. It is a gripping analysis of the struggle between the peasantry and the counter-revolution, and uniquely Cuban. While individual directors have a degree of creative freedom unknown to the Australian industry, members of ICAIC, like all cultural groups in Cuba, have a collective responsibility for the development of its art form and the interpretation of its history, culture and society; and films that are made are responsive to this function. Internationally, their films give one more information about Cuba than one can get, short of going there.
Sorrento

Scott Murray

The Incontri Internazionali del Cinema 1980, held in Sorrento, Italy, in October, was the first world film event devoted to Australian cinema. Primarily a way of making the Italian filmgoing public more aware of Australian films, it was a considerable success.

The Italian press wrote extensively, and favorably, on the films, and a sale of 10 films to an Italian distributor on the last day was a further indication of the Incontri's achievement. This was particularly so as the event is not a film market, and any film sales are incidental to the festivity of film.

Some 30 films were shown, from The Sentimental Bloke to Stir and Breaker Morant. Each was projected twice, once for critics and again for the public. The public was especially responsive to films that were clearly Australian, with an immaculately-dressed lady fetching a box of 10 films to an Italian distributor on the last day being a tangible sign of interest. Many of those present at the Incontri, the Australian participation at the recent Australian Film Festival in Naples, was the first world film event stressing because at least 70 per cent of any such multilingual event is spent trying to understand the language. This can be extremely frustrating, but, unlike, Australian ones — require a fair degree of self-motivation.

Mayoral receptions were followed by tours of Pompeii and the Amalfi Coast, and Capri by those who escaped the official schedule for a day and adopted a freer one of their own. The Italians do like a good appearance at their festivals, and the next morning's event at the Tavola Ronda was on pointe at the bottom asking for a hearty turnout at that day's luncheon. (For some Australians, the disparity of film-associated activities was a little bewildering. To the more experienced travellers at Cannes, it was to be expected. International film events — unlike, Australian ones — require a fair degree of self-motivation.

But even given that, many Australians did regret the lack of contact between themselves and the Italians. The efficient buses taking Australians from restaurant to press conference were like contamination-free caskets. They were isolated from a bizarrely different Italy.

The one major opportunity of meeting Australians was at the Tavola Ronda. Australians present were Stephen Wallace, Bob Lewin, John Heyer, Donald Crombie, Esben Storm and David Rie, the last standing. The Australians, Luigi Comencini, Pasquale Squitieri and Luigi Zampa.

Unfortunately, the Tavola Ronda was beset by translator problems and only saved by an Australian journalist who, when asked a day before if he knew what was Labor's film policy, parried with a sharp, "Yes.

Burstaff did say, however, that Australians were basically too tentative in their approach to subjects. Too often, even when they thought they existed in Australia was self-inflicted. This could be seen in the way Australian filmmakers didn't present controversial scripts to the funding bodies, generally arguing that such a proposition wouldn't be accepted. "But how do we know it won't be, unless we try?", Burstaff asked.

Of course, what Italians regard as stinging social criticism is not necessarily what Australians do. For example, when Bob Lewin, at another conference, was pointedly asked the appealing judicial system in New South Wales for keeping someone in remand for up to 12 months while every Italian he had burst into laughter. "Twelve months", explained the translator to a bemused Jowson, "Here it's at least five years."

With debate did sporadically surface, it was mostly over the Italian critics' equation of State Funding with ideological control over the Australian and state governments were putting so much money into Australian films, most of the Australians were convinced that only films espousing government ideals would get made. When some Australian replied with, "What about Stir?", the film's director, Stephen Wallace, said his film's more tokenism and that he doubted he would be allowed to make one like it again. The answer seemed to satisfy the Australians.

The Italian critics were also intrigued (if not disturbed) by what they saw as a lack of social comment in Australian films. This they felt also indicated government control.

Burstaff rebutted by denying any absence of social criticism, and cited several examples. This was quite a different response to Bruce Beresford, who, when asked a day before if he deliberately avoided social issues, answered only too happily, "Heavens, no."

Ladies and gentlemen, the Incontri was sponsored by the Tourism Office of Naples and the Campania Region, it was not surprising the Italian organizers were keen to expose its public's enthusiasm for the films, and a sale of 20 or so people, including filmmakers. In my, I reckon you need your head read!

Barry and Diane Humphries, Tim Burstall and friends, outside one of the Sorrento Incontri.

On the closing Saturday of the Incontri, many of the guests assembled for what turned out to be the "election" lunch. Being nine hours behind Eastern Australian Time, news of the polls was reaching the inquisitive in Sorrento by mid-morning. As the early indications suggested a Labor victory, those at the lunch — by and large Labor voters — sat down to watch what seemed a victory celebration. After a few cheers had been uttered, however, someone asked if anyone knew what Labor's film policy was. This they felt also indicated government control.

Burstaff rebutted by denying any absence of social criticism, and cited several examples. This was quite a different response to Bruce Beresford, who, when asked a day before if he deliberately avoided social issues, answered only too happily, "Heavens, no."

Ladies and gentlemen, the Incontri was sponsored by the Tourism Office of Naples and the Campania Region, it was not surprising the Italian organizers were keen to expose its public's enthusiasm for the films, and a sale of 20 or so people, including filmmakers. In my, I reckon you need your head read!

Donald Crombie then revealed that his investment contract on The Factor included a clause requiring a Liberal victory, and that the Labor swing was "And, kindly, to interest in the Italian press was the Australian funding system, whereby filmmakers and industry personnel were involved in the selection process. The Marist took particular offence at this, but, Burstall, rallying to the cause, came back nice and strong. "And if you think some fascist sitting at the top deciding what should be made is better than a panel of 20 or so people, including filmmakers, then regard to tax incentives. Errol Sullivan, chairman of the Film and Television Association of Australia, had allowed his smile to weaken slightly and said he hoped that all the recent lobbying on the Treasury, John Howard's new tax benefits favored those in the upper-income area — hardly a Labor-type policy.
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BOB ELLIS

Dear Sir,

Bob Ellis’ rampant sexuality does strange things to his mind. At no time was he offered a week in Wales with Julie Christie. Indeed, the thought of the stoat-like Ellis alone with Ms Christie is positively pornographic. I can assure you good readers that Ellis place was, as always, in the garret and if anyone was to spend time alone with the lady, that person was me.

Donald Crombie

DEAR URI.

Although we have never met or communicated directly, I read with interest your interview in the October-November issue of Cinema Papers.

While I must say that I admire the courage with which you express your views on the way in which our industry ought to be run, I note that at least in reference to my last three films several of your arguments are based on misinformation. I wish to set the record straight.

1. Your comments totally misrepresent my position and particularly my dealings with your organization on Roadgames. Although on this project we deliberately used our Australian staff in a “name-specific” capacity (to use your words), Roadgames is a film of “cultural exactitude” (again your words).

2. Our U.S. distribution advance, without which we could not have raised our budget, was conditional on casting international “names”. Unfortunately, no Australian actor is yet in this category and so, out of our cast of 10, we imported two. Though I am glad to understand that you had never heard of Stacy Keach, I assume his 30-odd film credits give him sufficient “distinction and merit” to escape the sniping that has engulfed me at my casting of Jamie Lee Curtis.

3. I was the joint producer, as well as the director, of Pat and I believe your charge that the Australian Film Commission has “lost a leg and an arm” from their investment in the film borders on libel. Tony Ginnane’s company holds the copyright in Pat and the AFC believes it will show a healthy profit from their point of view.

4. I am in favor of the production of two types of films in Australia:

(i) films aimed at the entire world market, with production values tailored to compete with the world’s best; and

(ii) films aimed primarily at the Australian audience which, of necessity, would either be of lower budget or heavily subsidized.

I do not believe that either type of film need exclude the other as part of the process from the outset), I suggest that your views bear no relation to the general criticism of the internationalization of our industry, I should like to question your use of the term “cultural exactitude” as relating to the sorts of films you believe we should be making.

Lawrence D. (for DENNY) Lawrence

Further to this last point, and to your general criticism of the internationalization of our industry, I should like to clarify my position clearly. I would also like to question your use of the term “cultural exactitude” as relating to the sorts of films you believe we should be making.

I am in favor of the production of two types of films in Australia:

(i) films aimed at the entire world market, with production values tailored to compete with the world’s best; and

(ii) films aimed primarily at the Australian audience which, of necessity, would either be of lower budget or heavily subsidized.

Although I believe that these two categories are not very far away from your own. I do not believe that either type of film need exclude the other as the case may seem to you.

I further confuse this issue by arguing about “cultural exactitude”. For while you try to describe it as relating to specific aspects of Australian culture, you define it in relation to the broader context of My Brilliant Career "touching the lives and experiences of Ameri-
Dear Sir,

Once again, I feel, Australian independent cinema is faced with good box-office possibilities, and now almost impossible to re-use with any success. Once the single screen cinemas had become above average supporting features. For example, the receipts for Frontment increased when Caddie was added to its remaining city box office. I have found in my own cinema, and therefore from my own experience, that Getting There benefited from being Caddie as support. Eliza Fraser was helped, however, the Show Man (separately they failed, but together they worked). Death on the Nile Summerfield rather than okay with 39 Steps, and The Fij Holden could have gotten more of the last-minute support of Life of Brian. We had repeated success with our efforts, and didn't reach the suburbs and inner country with the same effect as in the city.

Who are these directors? How could they be so ignorant or careless? (or both I think) to the needs of the cinema these films were intended for? This isn't the U.S. and we don't have the population to sustain international experience directing a major scene on Roadgames after their leading lady is in the cast. I had read an article about our little set-to, which can only be emulated from our offices or members of your organization (this sort of insensitivity is infectious and our directors are now following suit).

I have worked overseas and not encountered any of the problems of American cinema - I certainly don't believe our industry can afford it. We may need to export it, but we can't afford to be insular.

I have been told that it is harder for you to make films here than it is in Sydney, but I can only assume that you have not been challenged and it can't be any harder to make films here. For example, that the lender is not left out. I can only assume that you have not been challenged.

Richard Franklin

LETTERS

TELEVISION SALES
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INCOME TAX

The Quadra

Continued from p. 408

taform. It combines fiction, documentary footage and analytic graphics in a film that captures the rough realities of life for the Kumeyaay Indians of southern California. The film weaves together the lives of a young Kumeyaay family with that of a white man who becomes their friend and ally. It highlights the cultural diversity and resilience of the Kumeyaay people, while also reflecting on the broader issues of indigenous rights and environmental justice.

The film producer, author and advertising executive Phil Adams has formed a film production company with media businessman Kerry Packer and lawyer Greg Tully. Called Antipode Productions, the company will develop at least 12 projects, often involving new talent.
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At the 1980 Australian Film Awards Hard Knocks won the Jury Prize and Tracy Mann the Best Actress award. Only weeks later the film opened commercially in Melbourne, its release backed by a major advertising campaign for its soundtrack album. And, with an ongoing arrangement with Andromeda Productions recently finalized, things seem to be running well for director Don McLennan and director of photography-editor Zbigniew (Peter) Friedrich. But such has not always been the case, as both reveal in the following interview conducted by Rod Bishop.

**How did your next film come about?**

**Don:** I was still manager at the Playbox theatre when Peter was making Apostle and I applied for money to make a film about King Island, where I grew up. But that fell on its arse at the assessment. They said to me, "Well this is all about sexuality. It is more about sexuality than homosexuality." Originally, I was going to make it about a man. But I didn't really know much about that, so I made it about a man. I was trying to get across the idea that it doesn't matter whether you are a homosexual or heterosexual, for males or females. The same problems still arise, no matter what the issues.

**Peter:** Don't commit yourself on that one.

**Don:** I am not committing myself to anything. I've had that one laid on me a couple of times and, at the recent Australian Film Awards in Sydney, some bastard came up to me and said, "I heard you are bisexual." I thought, "What the fuck have I done?"

At the 1980 Australian Film Awards Hard Knocks won the Jury Prize and Tracy Mann the Best Actress award. Only weeks later the film opened commercially in Melbourne, its release backed by a major advertising campaign for its soundtrack album. And, with an ongoing arrangement with Andromeda Productions recently finalized, things seem to be running well for director Don McLennan and director of photography-editor Zbigniew (Peter) Friedrich. But such has not always been the case, as both reveal in the following interview conducted by Rod Bishop.

**How did your next film come about?**

**Don:** I was still manager at the Playbox theatre when Peter was making Apostle and I applied for money to make a film about King Island, where I grew up. But that fell on its arse at the assessment. They said to me, "Well this is all about sexuality. It is more about sexuality than homosexuality." Originally, I was going to make it about a man. But I didn't really know much about that, so I made it about a man. I was trying to get across the idea that it doesn't matter whether you are a homosexual or heterosexual, for males or females. The same problems still arise, no matter what the issues.

**Peter:** Don't commit yourself on that one.

**Don:** I am not committing myself to anything. I've had that one laid on me a couple of times and, at the recent Australian Film Awards in Sydney, some bastard came up to me and said, "I heard you are bisexual." I thought, "What the fuck have I done?"

**But the central character is gay...**

**Don:** True. He was somebody doubting whether he is homosexual or heterosexual. It is more about sexuality than homosexuality.

**Peter:** If you do it with me as producer, you can raise the rest of the money. I reckoned I could raise the rest of the money and I don't know if you can do it either.

**How did your next film come about?**
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**Don:** I am not committing myself to anything. I've had that one laid on me a couple of times and, at the recent Australian Film Awards in Sydney, some bastard came up to me and said, "I heard you are bisexual." I thought, "What the fuck have I done?"

**Peter:** Don't commit yourself on that one.

**Don:** I am not committing myself to anything. I've had that one laid on me a couple of times and, at the recent Australian Film Awards in Sydney, some bastard came up to me and said, "I heard you are bisexual." I thought, "What the fuck have I done?"

**Hard Knocks**

**Did you ever have any intention of making a 50-minute film?**

**Don:** No, never. I had to say I was going to make a 50-minute film. I had resigned myself to the fact that I was never going to be allowed to direct a feature unless I took matters into my own hands. If I went in to the assessment thinking, "Oh well, that's it." Nothing was going to happen. But I got a very favorable assessment I thought I'd persevere with it. I went in the second time and an assessor, who shall remain nameless, said, "Look, you can't make it for the money you've asked for." I still maintain to this day that we could, but I got this line: "If you can't raise the rest of the money you are not going to get any money out of us." I couldn't raise the sort of money they were talking about, which was another $12,000 to $15,000. Where was I going to get bread like that?

I left the assessment and, about 10 minutes after I had gone, the same assessor came up and said, "I reckon I can raise the rest of the money if you do it with me as producer." I said, "Oh yeah", and just left it at that. I never did get the money.

I had realized by this stage that the assessors weren't going to let me do the King Island film as a feature. They wanted me to do a 50-minute film. It was that old bullshit idea that one had to do a 30-minute film, then a 50-minute film and then a 70-minute film, before doing a feature. So I thought, "What am I going to do a 50-minute film about?" That's how Hard Knocks got made.
lied my way through the assessment.

The whole 50-minute idea is stupid. Firstly, nobody wants to show the thing if it is only 50 minutes. Secondly, it is going to be on 16mm, which means you have only the Longford or the Co-op as venues. Village, Hoyts or Greater Union — our illustrious leaders in the industry — aren’t going to show the thing.

Thirdly, arbitrary lengths don’t achieve much. I have always wanted to direct feature length films, not because I want to be a feature director, but because it takes that long to say something. A film should be the length the subject dictates, rather than assessors saying, “Make a 50-minute film”, or, “You have to find something that fits into 50 minutes.” The whole line of thinking behind that is ratshit.

The Creative Development Branch has to accept some of the blame. They had an ideal opportunity three or four years ago to change this when people could have made feature-length 16mm films for around $50,000. But they never allowed that; they always pushed that 50-minute thing.

The argument they used was the old money one: “If we give someone $60,000, that is only $60,000 to one film, whereas we could give two people $30,000 and they can make two 50-minute features.” But they are the last people who should be saying that sort of thing, when they spend half a million dollars on one feature film anyway. They don’t think like that at the Project Officer. Hilton and I just don’t think like that at the Creative Development Branch. There’s something not quite right. I believe they actively discouraged feature-length films, although publicly they will deny it. They will say no one came up with a feature-length project but then they didn’t fund many feature-length applications. And everyone wanted money to make a film, no matter how long.

How did you get away with making a 90-minute film on a 50-minute budget?

Don: Eddie Moses was the project officer. Hilton and I just took the 90-minute script in and said: “This is the script, we are going to start shooting in two months.” Eddie read the script and said, “Fine”. Nobody murmured; nobody said a word. Yet the script was obviously feature length. They had it for at least a month, so we didn’t exactly do it behind their backs; we gave them a chance.

Where did you get the idea for the film?

Don: I had been thinking about doing a film on someone who is on the outside, and that led me to the classic situation of the guy who gets out of jail and tries to assimilate back into society. Then I started wondering, “What if it’s a girl?”

So, I started a draft about a girl who has been in the can, and who gets a job as a housekeeper for some guy. His wife has left and they become involved. Then I saw this article about a girl who had been in Winlaton and ended up doing some modelling. I talked to her and then went to Winlaton to see the people there.

The script evolved from that, though the only connection between that girl and the one in the film is the bit about her becoming a model. The rest of the material is fictitious.

The script was written by you and Hilton Bonner . . .

Don: Yes, although it is really a mish-mash of a whole lot of things. Peter virtually wrote the scene in the restaurant with the cop, for example. I was having trouble with it, so I went to see Peter. We had a few beers and it just came in about half an hour.

Other scenes, like the guy at the piano, were basically Hilton’s. But I wrote a lot of scenes, like the one between Debbie, Tracy and Sam, where they have the argument in the flat. So, it was really a mish-

ASSESSORS’ COMMENTS

These comments were supplied by Don McLennan, not the AFC.

1. The film is flawed. It is too long and would benefit from further editing. The performance of Sam is generally good, though suffers from the unevenness of the film. The scenes between her and her father are bad and should be cut. The two police and the model agency owner are heavy stereotypes well within the one dimensional. The credit side is that it moves well, the dialogue is good and the portrait of young delinquents is accurate. There are some excellent cameos (Munch, his stuttering girl, the “partner” and Raeiene). The milieu they move in is well documented. The tragedy is that the applicant has ambitions beyond his brief and budget and the film suffers. I feel there could have been an excellent 50 mins film within the material.

The applicant seems unaware of the moral delinquency he has perpetrated in spending his funds on shooting. He seems to believe he’s done the right thing and expects to be funded to completion. I think it is vital that producer/directors be taught to stay on budget, particularly if they aspire to higher budget films where substantial sums are raised from the private sector. I recommend that this project be funded only to tape to enable applicant to seek funds from other sources.

2. I found the script most enjoyable. Need to see double head.

I was very disappointed with this film. I found the characters generally two-dimensional and the acting overall uneven to the point where it seriously interfered with my appreciation of the film. There are some good moments, especially from Sam after she is out of the reform home, and the general structure, etc., is okay, but I don’t think it holds as a feature, and I think it’s quite unsaleable in that form. A 50 mins version might be interesting. I think the applicant has abused his grant by extending the film and the final product does not warrant the spending of further large sums of money.

3. Great script. Really moves well, interesting situation. See double head.

Was quite disheartened to see Sam had failed to realize its potential through a series of rapidly cut scenes which did not develop Sam and had her through bad times and good with insight, but looked at her from the outside only. I found this lack of development impeded any deep response to Sam’s situation, a counter-productive effect. I felt that the filmmaker was more concerned to beat the system than attune himself to his material.
mash, though I wrote the final draft by myself. I think, in the long run, it was basically a 50-50 job between Hilton and myself.

Once we had the script finalized, we said, "Okay, how much is it going to cost us?" And, to make a long story short, I think we had $30,000 to start shooting.

Peter: We were $5,000 short. We knew, about a week before going to cost us," And, to make a long story short, I think we had $30,000 to start shooting.

Peter: We were $5,000 short. We knew, about a week before shooting, that we couldn't finish the last two weeks. But eventually the $5000 was raised and we managed to pay everybody and have the stock processed.

Don: I had to get a $1000 advance off my Bankcard, which allowed us to get the last lot of workprint out of the lab.

So you had enough money to get the film to double-head. What happened after that?

Don: I phoned Lachie Shaw at the Creative Development Branch after we had finished shooting, because I still had $3000 to come, as a contingency. I said, "We've finished shooting the film, and it is a bit longer than you thought it was going to be." Naturally he said, "Well, how did that all happen?"

Don: I phoned Lachie Shaw at the Creative Development Branch after we had finished shooting, because I still had $3000 to come, as a contingency. I said, "We've finished shooting the film, and it is a bit longer than you thought it was going to be." Naturally he said, "Well, how did that all happen?"

Don: Only about two months. Of course, that version changed quite a bit. We would take it down to the Longford cinema, have a look and then go back and re-cut it. Peter changed the structure around quite a bit: I virtually watched and learned. It was a great experience, because not only was Peter the editor, he was also the cameraman. He knew the shots as well as I did.

People in the industry are mainly against one person performing both roles but I think it is fantastic. The old cry of "objectivity" is always raised, but that's their problem. Just because it mightn't work for them, doesn't mean it won't work. I think it worked very well on Hard Knocks. Peter cut for performance—not photography. I even had a battle keeping some things in, although now I can see what he was on about.

The whole process took about nine months. Then we went back to the Australian Film Commission. We asked if they could finish it on 16mm and, alternatively, the money to finish it on 35mm. It was rejected outright.

Who were the assessors?

Don: Don Crombie, Ron Saunders and someone from Sydney, whose name I can't remember. Ron Saunders was a great assessor: he didn't say a word the whole time: just sat there. The

SHAW AND CROMBIE REPLY

Lachie Shaw, director of the Creative Development Branch of the AFC, and Don Crombie were both invited to respond to the remarks of McLennan and Friedrich.

1. Lachie Shaw

The main point is that if you start off with a concept for a 40-50 minute film, it is probably going to stay that way. You might put in some extra bits here and there, but it does not become a feature unless you change the basic thinking.

Don has chosen to publish the final comments from our assessment panel. I think those comments are right on the ball. I deplore the remarks about Donald Crombie, Eddie Moses and others.

I think that Cinema Papers errs in the belief that the person giving an interview takes the main responsibility for what is published. The editors have the greater and the final responsibility.

2. Don Crombie

This brings to me the first knowledge that I'm not likely to be invited to the McLennans' home for a Christmas sherry. It also reveals a lot about Don. He was aware of the finite nature of the fund, and that had his documentary application succeeded it would have been at the expense of another filmmaker's project. His admission that he lied to his previous assessors and his evident pleasure (unsuccessfully) attempting to screw the system exposes him as lacking professional morality.

As to his comments about the assessment, I'm pleased of not having Don's gift of recalling year-old conversations verbatim. But I stand by my written assessment printed here (Assessment 1). I am amused that Don favored the allegedly mute Ron Saunders. I trust that next time he flunks an assessment, Lachie Shaw will presume the divine right to continuing support.

Don: Don Crombie, Ron Saunders and someone from Sydney, whose name I can't remember. Ron Saunders was a great assessor: he didn't say a word the whole time: just sat there. The
woman thought that Tracy looked so cute with her short haircut up against the brick wall that it could have been a Vogue shot. That was the assessment process.

Don Crombie said, “Oh I love this actor. I would like to see more of him”, and “Oh, the fat man’s a bit overdone, isn’t he?” Then he said, “Why is it this long, instead of 50 minutes?” Things went from bad to worse, though I must say I came away thinking we would get some money. I was devastated when they rejected it.

Did you feel you were rejected because they didn’t like the film, or because you had been a bad boy?

Don: Because I had been a bad boy, I am convinced of it. I don’t think they rejected it because they didn’t think it worked as a 90-minute film. But then, they could have. I don’t know. You never get to find out those things from the assessors, and I can only guess. One of the things they said was, “We wanted you to make a 50-minute film, and unless you cut it back to 50 minutes, don’t even bother re-applying, because we won’t consider an application.”

So, we sat around for a couple of months. I started talking to the Victorian Film Commission about it, but before anything eventuated in that area, Andromeda appeared on the scene.

How did you contact Andromeda?

Don: I had met Trevor Lucas in a pub at a reception for a film he had produced, called Beg, Steal or Borrow. He rang me a couple of weeks later and said, “Are you still looking for some money to finish your film?” When I said, “Yes”, he suggested we have lunch and talk about it. It took four or five weeks before Andromeda said, “Okay”.

Did they pay for the entire film?

Don: Yes, Andromeda bought the film off us and put up the money to finish it. They own the copyright, but we have a percentage of profits, as does Tracy.

Andromeda gave us the money to pay the AFC back — the entire $33,000. That was probably the first time the Creative Development Branch ever got its money back. They didn’t lose a cent and, on top of that, the film ended up being feature length.

Andromeda appeared, we re-instated footage to make an 85-minute film.

Don: There is some distorted belief that you can cut things back to 50 minutes if you want to. Perhaps you can with some films, but if a film is shot to a certain length, you can’t. Two of the top editors in Australia said the film wouldn’t work at 50 minutes. They both agreed with our cut. So, you wonder when people like Don Crombie, who is supposedly a very experienced director, can look at the film and honestly tell you it can be cut back to 50 minutes. You can only assume a couple of things from that: that the guy’s an idiot, or he is trying to make mischief.

You mean he was being condescending . . .

Don: He was playing the line of the establishment which, in this case, is the AFC, saying it has to be 50 minutes. I am damn sure that when the assessors met in Sydney to consider the application, Lachie Shaw said his two bob’s worth about it being a longer film than it should have been. I bet that had a lot of bearing on what the assessors decided. I would love them to tell me differently.

I think the problem was that suddenly they had a film on their hands that had escaped the system. It was a rogue film they had not given approval to.

Continued on p. 505
On the last day of the Adelaide Film Festival the State Government initiated a law protecting historic shipwrecks, so maybe there's some hope for the Festival yet. But let's make it clear: saying that the 21st Adelaide Film Festival was not a disaster would be like pointing out that the Titanic had lifeboats.

Moreover, it didn't just sink, it was attacked by the biggest iceberg the state Titanic had lifeboats. The pleasant new venue in freshly-landscaped Hindmarsh Square looked forlorn. The courteous staff of the Academy Cinema was as bewildered as the Keystone Cops sent to seize the fifth film at the wrong screening. And the Festival organizers, preoccupied with their running battle with Attorney-General, K. T. Griffin, watched disheartened as films failed to turn up, were recalled for viewing by the Commonwealth Attorney-General, or arrived surrealistically with dialogue in Japanese and sub-titled in Portuguese.

The net result: four cancelled sessions, two films prevented from being shown, five resignations from the Festival board, and a bewildered public staying away in their hundreds.

It had all begun promisingly, with almost 40 Australian premieres lined up, and films from Britain, the U.S., Asia, and Western and Eastern Europe. A Young Festival, a Television Section and a Director's Retrospective had been carefully selected to complement the main body of films, all passed as usual by the Commonwealth Censor on the conditions established for film festivals in this country. Then, disaster struck.

Without notifying the Board, the Chief Censor, Lady Duckmant, informed Griffin that Melvin Van Peebles' Sweet Sweetback's Baadasssss Song might contravene the child pornography laws. Griffin, with a screenwriter worthy of the Ayatollah Khomeiny, duly concluded that it did.

Griffin had seen only the opening of the film, in which a young black boy of about 12 and a black woman of about 20 simulate sex together (with not a genital in sight, incidentally). But that was enough to alert him to other "filth" as well. Why, one film was even quite discriminately sub-titled in Portuguese.
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strongly-crafted film from the Dutch Het Werkteater. A dedicated ensemble and two-handed performances by Helmut Woudehoven and Frank Groothoff give it rare naturalistic power.

As a film about people confronting out of the blue the nearness of their own deaths, it also showed great compassion and rationalisation, resisting the temptation to present hospital staff as ogres, or uncomfortable visitors as callous. Instead, strangely enough, it is touching as well as enormously funny.

If Opname recalls a stage play in its limited mise-en-scene and camera angles, it does so to the advantage of our concentration on the actors and the script. And both are excellent.

Robbe de Hert's De witte van sicheh climaxes with one of those lugubrious kermesses which the Belgians have taken dourly to their hearts ever since Breughel. A grim film, despite its attachment to painterly landscapes and careful creation of period, it exposes the mean- ness of spirit of its dreary and spiteful characters.

De Hert is not particularly strong on narrative, losing himself in some unpur- sued byways. His epilogue points out that there will always be boys like Whitey, who will simply not fit into any society designed for them.

Sweden's Linus, like a lot of Vigot Sjoman's films, starts out with a fine sense of period mise-en-scène and atm-osphere, and ends in the same metaphysical mess that bedevils most novels turned by their fond authors into films shot by themselves.

Finland's Korpinpaikka (The Raven's Dance), directed by Markku Lemmusalkio, begins with a beautifully still documentary account of the land- scape and animals of the frozen north. In composition and telephoto it often creates a poetry reminiscent of Japanese ink drawings. And if its human story (that of bureaucracy gradually encroaching on those who live in balance with this world) fails to come through, it only reveals more clearly the director-cameraman's obsession with meditation and sublime emptiness.

From France, Le coup de tete was an unexpected little winner. It concerns a star soccer player malgre lui, engagingly played by Patrick Dewaere, and droily directed by Jean-Jacques Annaud. Though it skates at times over some pretty precarious ice, it is touching as well as enormously funny.

Nikos Panayatopoulos' Melodrama?, shot in the empty, sombre Corfu.

Jean-Jacques Annaud's Le coup de tete, which "skates over some pretty precarious sexist ice".

The Youth Festival consisted of films at least two years old, including John Carpenter's Dark Star and John Dugan's Mouth to Mouth, which have already been widely seen elsewhere.

The tribute to Joseph Mankiewicz was an attempt to imitate the retrospectives of larger festivals. It concentrated, for reasons of economy (you can get most of the films from the National Library), on his output between 1946 and 1950. There is no doubt that he was a brilliant scriptwriter, one of the greatest American wits and, in All About Eve at any rate, a highly intelligent director in full control of some of Hollywood's most difficult stars.

If a section like this is to become a feature of future Festivals, it must, as in Edinburgh, either be accompanied by seminars, or by the presence of the director in question. Edinburgh can afford Douglas Sirk, Sam Fuller and Roger Corman. Adelaide might very wisely select an Australian director.
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Australian Cinema

It was good, though, to see the experimental side of Australian film represented, with Mike Clark's bitter ac- count of heterosexual nihilism in Shift. Dave Woodgate's collectively felt Cubbies and Philippe Mora's Trouble in Molopos.

A team to be watched consists of Richard Michalak and Marc Rosenberg, who respectively directed and scripted the very professional and funny Gary's...
Once again, it was revealed not only what an excellent medium film is for biographies, but how much the result depends on the personality of the subject. Harry Rasky's Arthur Miller on Home Ground is the latest in a series of Canadian biocinema, and promised well as a portrait of one of the great American liberals. But how to merge all that sounds with its ponderous existentialism and home-grown boy complaisance. Rather than telling us anything deep about the man, Rasky allows Miller to do a beautiful snow job on himself.

As he intones various great scenes from the Opus, what comes over is the dreadfully inflated quality of his philosophical prose, like a group of people with heroic goals can understand readings from the Bible and Jean-Paul Sartre.

Miller is also less than honest about Marilyn Monroe. You can see what a disaster they must have been for each other: the guilty, remorselessly articulated film and the pretentious American sex icon with the tied-up tongue, for whom the mere consciousness of her sexuality and her politics, a great example of a woman who so expressed the historical consciousness of a city that she became Mamma Roma herself.

The film shines with Magnani’s beauty, the dark baroque beauty of Rome at night, and is a worthy tribute to her spirit, intelligence and honesty.

**The U.S.**

Marshall Brickman's Simon reveals how bland his scriptwriting would be without (his collaborator, Manhattan), to give it that combination of visual austerity and quirky delivery of dialogue which individualizes the latter films. Simon, about a quixotic college lecturer persuaded by a group of Pentagon brainwashers that he is an alien, comes across as smooth whimsical satire, whatever hard edges it develops in its plot.

One of the great delights was Young Un, an astonishing first feature by Victor Nunez, using as cast and crew various students and teachers from Florida University. If ever proof was needed that the academic and the practical can lend strength and intelligence to each other, this film is it. With its muscular script, and fine camerawork by Nunez himself, and its authentic score, it combines a brilliant central performance by Dana Frees.

Young Un revitalizes the American prohibition film as radically as Robert Altman. Its sense of mood, pace and location, and its powerful and evocative photographic style, make it one of the best films to come out of the U.S. in years.

A neglected section of the Festival revealed, to an audience of about 10 people, how high is the quality of the sort of American television one never sees here. Robert Geller’s acclaimed series of short stories by James Thurber, Willa Cather, John Updike and Ernest Gaines provided a Sunday morning of sheer bliss.

The Cather story, Paul’s Case, directed by Lamont Johnson, was especially impressive, with a tracking camera, cutting pace and mise-en-scène worthy of Luchino Visconti.

**Where to Now?**

Finally, in a class of their own, must go Ken Loach’s The Gamekeeper and Jean-Luc Godard’s Sauve qui peut la vie (Slow Motion). With The Gamekeeper, Loach keeps up his collaboration with writer Barry Hines to produce a film so perfect that it seems to have achieved the near impossible. In The Gamekeeper, Loach creates a moral vision of an England where both nature and culture have been the care and product of the people.

The film’s conclusion is a game-hunt worthy of Renior. George and the villagers act as shooters and beaters for the returned Duke. While George’s wife Mary is “helping out” in the kitchen of the Big House, and George is paid off with a patronizing and discreetly slipped handful of notes. His Grace and cronies, males and females, guzzle it up over their dead birds. George returns to his cottage alone.

As the final titles come up over a slow zoom on to his frozen pie and chips waiting on the kitchen table, it is impossible to represent the magnitude of this film.

The Gamekeeper was well supported by another British feature by film school graduate Bill Forsyth. By the time it was screened, That Sinking Feeling might well have described the state of mind of the Festival organizers. Instead, it turned out to be a very funny farce from Scotland about a group of hapless would-be thieves, whose treasured targets are stainless steel sinks.

The acquisition of Godard’s Sauve qui peut would have done credit to any international Festival, and might have been acknowledged as such in anybody’s language. But not, apparently, to the godly of Adelaide. One of the board members on the other side of the censorship battle, together with his lady wife, was constrained to walk out of the screening because of the “disgusting language” which he could read in the sub-titles.

This brings one back to the question: where now the Adelaide Festival? If people like the above-mentioned have their way, we will be seeing films, as he promised, “fit for the average suburbanite.” For the insulted and injured Claudine Thordihet, who has sought to raise the standards of this Festival to world level, such board-members must make work impossible. From them and from the reactionary State Government, she and the people of Adelaide might expect an apology from the determined and ongoing president, George Anderson, one expects action.

**Adelaide Film Festival**

Salman Peerzada as Hussain, with his baby son, in Jamil Dehlavi’s The Blood of Hussain.

**Asian Cinema**

Hong Kong’s The Legend of the Mountain, directed by Hu Ch’ien-hu and King Hu, purports to be an elegant and romantic film about magic. It is, in fact, an interminable 186 minutes of mind-numbing silliness, with verbal and performance codes based on the Western, and notions of magic derived from kung-fu and a liberal use of colored smoke-pots. In comparison with Kenji Mizoguchi’s realizations of similar mediaeval stories, it looked what it was: vulgar and half-witted. Any Taoists in the audience failed to take advantage of their powers of flight and feil gently to sleep instead.

Indra’s Once Upon a Time had also caught the kung-fu bug, and had lots of scorning and herocics. It at least had its narrative with flair, and its locations with economy.

It is significant that again the best film from this area, Jamil Dehlavi’s The Blood of Hussain, is also the most political. Made in 1977, it uncannily foretold the military coup in Pakistan which took place one month after shooting was completed.

With splendid photography by Walter Lassally and some nasty caricatures of corrupt officials by Pakistani and European actors, it achieves an unusual mixture of western-style documentary and dramatic narrative with Shite-ity myth, its director now lives (of necessity) in London.

Shohei Imamura’s Sukeshu sura-ware ni ari (Vengeance is Mine) was another deeply disturbing film from Japan. Reminiscent of Nagisa Oshima’s assault on the clash of ancient values and modern over-capitalism, its sinister camera, cutting pace and mise-en-scene was well supported at the Adelaide Film Festival. As a compilation film becomes virtually a dossier of British and American films of recent years, its narrative with flair, and its locations with economy.

It is significant that again the best film from this area, Jamil Dehlavi’s The Blood of Hussain, is also the most political. Made in 1977, it uncannily foretold the military coup in Pakistan which took place one month after shooting was completed.

With splendid photography by Walter Lassally and some nasty caricatures of corrupt officials by Pakistani and European actors, it achieves an unusual mixture of western-style documentary and dramatic narrative with Shite-ity myth, its director now lives (of necessity) in London.

Shohei Imamura’s Sukeshu sura-ware ni ari (Vengeance is Mine) was another deeply disturbing film from Japan. Reminiscent of Nagisa Oshima’s assault on the clash of ancient values and modern over-capitalism, its sinister camera, cutting pace and mise-en-scene was well supported at the Adelaide Film Festival.
Stephen Crofts

One wonders what Breaker Morant would have "been" (i.e., what it would have been constructed as) had Jack Thompson not won that Cannes Award as Best Supporting Actor. For that European seal of approval seems to have it set up as the Australian film of the 1980s, the crowning glory of the 1970s' film renaissance, the celluloid proof of the industry's "maturity". The audience has been raised by Handcock's line: "A slice off a cut loaf's never missed." Breaker Morant's exclusion of women in any terms, other than the sexist, helps consolidate the film's "Australian" values of mateship and manliness. Breaker Morant's other repression is historical. The film represents three groups engaged in fighting the Boer War: the Boers, the British and their irregulars, the Bushveldt Carbineers. Yet the Boers, like the North Vietnamese in every Western fictional film about Vietnam, are in effect absent from Breaker Morant. They may be glimpsed, but any view-

"Eighty Years On, The Culture Still Cringes"

point they may have — political, economic, ideological or even moral — is simply never made available. When they are shown, they are always bearded, scruffy and shifty-looking. Only once is a Boer fighter ever heard to speak, and then in Dutch, denying having shot Captain Hunt (Terence Donovan). This marginalizing of the Boers facilitates the rewriting of history in terms of a morality play.

The Boers once removed from the stage of history, Breaker Morant structures audience sympathies along very clear lines. While aligning one against the Kitchener, it does not side one with the Boers, but with a counter-terrorist and largely Australian fragment of the British Army. The audience is invited to hate Kitchener's lies, hypocrisy and political opportunism from the standpoint of the men who become scapegoats for those politics. Our heroes are honest, forthright, courageous, manly and stoic as they are betrayed by the British high command they have so loyally served. Especially when reinforced by the irreverence and ockerism of Handcock, these traits add up to something very close to the Australian self-image, to the "Australian character", to the "manliness, comradeship and sardonic dignity" noted by Bob Ellis (Nation Review, October 1980).

There are three problems with heroizing such characteristics. First, the obvious sexism. Second, this is a negatively-defined identity, constituted in terms of its opposition to the British Imperials. Third, the promotion of the underdog, of the Aussie battler, brings the "Australian character" perilously close to gallows humor. These are the traits which enlist sympathy for our heroes, which ensure a good laugh at corrupt authority, but which do nothing to challenge the real bases of that authority. This is close to the philosophy of "She'll be right, mate." To heroize the three lieutenants' doomed defiance is to make a jingoistic virtue out of a set of characteristics whose effect is to perpetuate the ruling order. Heroizing, after all, is predicated on identification with characters, and when these characters are shot or imprisoned the film can offer nothing more than a pointlessly diffuse elegy. End of Film. Identification denies any consideration of alternatives and precludes analysis of situations in any terms, other than those the narrative sets for them. The film's marginalizing of the Boers has
political-cultural implications which argue a different conception of Australianness. Breaker Morant overlooks the political-cultural similarities between the Boer in South Africa and the Australian in Australia. Both cultures were colonized (imperialized for the Boers) by the British; both live with the aftermath of that oppression; both are in the Southern hemisphere; both are Eurocentric; both are—if differently—racist. A comparison between these two cultures, or just the sympathetic representation of the Boers for Australians, could be highly instructive. Instead of examining or even broaching such issues, however, Breaker Morant in effect invites one to view its representations of the Boer War from the political-cultural standpoint of the imperialists. Even if the film does quibble over their morality in the occasional show trial, it barely questions their right to be in South Africa; it mentions British concentration camps and their killing of civilians, women and children only in passing; it never shows, let alone analyses, what imperialism means for the everyday life of its victims. The film’s nearest approach to this last issue is the travesty of Our Ladies in Waiting for our ocker hero, Handcock. Our heroes may bitterly resent their treatment by the British, but insofar as they accept war as a job and articulate no critique of the imperialism they are fighting and dying for, they endorse the political-cultural values of the British.

But by what token can one, now, identify with that imperialist culture when Australians have themselves been colonized by the British? Does Federation, to which of course the film alludes, allow Australians suddenly to cast off their colonial mantle? Or does Australia’s gentle genocide of the Aboriginal qualify it for the Henry Kissinger Award for Services to Humanity? In view of the film’s subplot of cultural displacements, it is no mere irony that one of its paragons of the “Australian character” is an expatriate Briton, Morant.

Breaker Morant’s denial of the Boers as any valid historical force is vital (or, more accurately, deadly) for the film’s conceptions of justice. The shooting of Boer prisoners or civilians “suspected” of being Boer sympathizers is an issue, first and foremost, insofar as it affects the drama between irregular soldier and British high command, not as it affects the Boers (or others) they may kill. The questions are then two: Were our heroes right to follow orders? and: Were the British wrong to deny having issued those orders?

Given the film’s simpleness—compare Paths of Glory or King and Country—the moral surface of these questions is barely scratched and more than ample time left for righteous indignation. And this in turn pre-empts any serious consideration of the justice of shooting Boer prisoners or suspects, which is surely the major issue touched in the film. But the film’s morality tale gives no understanding whatever of how the next My Lai might be stopped. Such crucial issues of 20th Century warfare are safely tidied away as asides by the black-and-white moralism of the courtroom drama, a genre, moreover, which guarantees precise narrative resolution and a strong narrative drive towards that end: how can one imagine alternative (hi)stories when the film glides so irresistibly towards its foregone conclusion?

The justice theme is mythicized out of history by the predominant idealization of Morant and by the individualist justification of his shooting the Boer, Visser (Michael Procanin), along lines identical to the revenge moralities of many a Western: Visser is suspected of killing Morant’s close friend Hunt, to whose sister Morant is engaged. The execution epitomizes the procedures by which story supplants history: instead of shots of the dying Boer, Morant is seen suffering his righteous fury in having him killed. Similarly, the impact of Handcock’s killing of the German missionary, Reverend Hesse (Bruno Knez), is cushioned by the elegant introductory long-shots, by the comfortably composed dead Hesse and by the narrative context of killing as sexual hors d’oeuvre.

In the face of such personalized urgency, as that of Morant or Handcock, there is little room for logical argument, historical accuracy or political analysis. In the context of so heavily predestined a narrative, any alternative action to such killings is unthinkable. With justice so manifestly on Morant’s side, how could one ever see him as the prototype of Lieutenant William Calley? How, then, does Breaker Morant manage such votes for the warmongers, while appearing to be so pacifist and Australian? What, in other words, underlies the film’s cultural displacements? The problem concerns Australian cultural identity. Bob Ellis is symptomatic of the problem when he writes: “It’s not the Poms who should be kept out of our industry. They have a cultural displacement. They are a part of our society—as are the Greeks, the Italians and the Chinese. It’s the Americans who are not us and never will be.” (Nation Review, October 1980.) The assertions are engaging. But one might ask by what “historical right” Ellis can assimilate the British into his multicultural vision and exclude the Americans. This amounts to saying that British colonialism is okay, but American imperialism is not, while for Australia the latter is the recent counterpart of the former. In between—if we are to believe the likes of Ellis—must lie a history of institutionalized amnesia.

Breaker Morant, like Ellis, contributes to that amnesia. The film tells nothing of the history by which Australia, having been effectively denied an indigenous white cultural identity by British colonization, has failed to come to terms with that experience and now still suffers from cultural cringe. The marginalization of the Boers in the film makes it difficult even to see the need to construct that history. The film’s anti-Pom jokes give no more access to that history than does the film’s inability to concede any anti-imperialism in Kitchener’sefulf account about witnesses unfavorable to his machinations behind the show trial: I dersay it’s too late to send them [after all its others] to India.

Lastly, two caveats. It might be objected that it is the preserve of art (Breaker Morant appears to be deemed art, rather than entertainment) to create fiction, that it is the right of the artist to project his or her own “vision” of the world. I don’t, obviously, deny Bruce Beresford—if he be the lone artist concerned—the right to his views; I merely suggest that in Australia in 1980—I write, moreover, on the day of Ronald Reagan’s election success—there are more progressive comments to be made about the Boers, about Australia, about war. It might equally be objected that art can serve to relieve one of the drudgery of everyday reality, that one should not seek to know in art the unpleasant facts of life. I don’t, obviously, deny people the right to such views; but I do suggest that such views bury the head in artistic sand and deny the possibility of even thinking that society might be improvable. To maintain that Breaker Morant does not affect people’s ideas about war and about Australia is like pretending that children don’t want to see more television violence. What has then to be asked is: Why is this the situation? and then: How might it be changed? ★

Cinema Papers, December-January—421
Samuel Fuller’s is a cinema which tells stories only to abandon them. One takes from his 20 films a memory of faces, images, sounds and actions, brutally and beautifully juxtaposed in a strategic subversion of narrative coherence.

His characters exist as if in a comic book, stripped of their personal histories and thus of any psychological density, existing forever in a present tense, sketches, outlines, figures glimpsed and frozen in the moment of seeing, archetypes. They represent the struggle to stay alive, a battle waged according to a code whose only rule is survival, on a battleground which has no space for the death-in-life of social obedience.

They are characters whose existence depends on Fuller’s creative play, and the course of their time on the screen represents a defiance against the inevitable death of “The End”. They smoke cigars (like Fuller), they are journalists (like Fuller), they are novelists (like Fuller), they are soldiers (like Fuller) . . . Their place within the films that own them is dwarfed by the absurdities that surround them, a legacy of the rubble of humanity. Their war is against the image of the exploiter, the sign of whose power is the uniform, The Big Red One if you like, constantly resurrected from the debris of death. Their enemies are not the ones in the sights of their rifles, but the ones in whose name they fight for their lives.

Though they are Fuller, they do not see what his films show us. They can open doors on the horrors of the world, but they are shut off from the sight of the ideology that controls their minds and surrenders their arms and legs to the service of “Right”.

To move through a Samuel Fuller film is to move through a minefield. A stream of sequences teases the audience with the possibility of The Story, charging it with well-learned expectations, only to explode them before its eyes. The business deal is detonated into fragments, the illusion is shattered, and cinema is restored.

It is a cinema whose images refuse to see in the forms of realism, declaring their fascination with that which is camouflaged by a facade of order: an underworld of passions forever on the brink of madness, a corridor lined with the faces of men and women twisted by the insanity which is the history of the world.
There are many recurring concerns in your work, including your novel from "I Shot Jesse James" onwards. For example, you seem always to have heroes and heroines (the heroines of films like "China Gate" and "Naked Kiss") who live on the border-line of, or outside, the law and middle-class morality . . .

I think they make the best characters in any film or story — anyone that is involved in what we call the lower depths, whether it is Dostoyevsky with The Idiot, Jean Valjean in Les Miserables, the Count of Monte Cristo or anyone who has been double-crossed by society. For some reason, these melodramatic characters seem to last, and have proven that they ensure much more interest, as far as the reader, and today the viewer, is concerned, than the typical, saintly do-gooder.

Are you deliberately confronting your audience by making them empathize with these characters?

No. I am only concerned that these people, whom I call "Gutter People", have their own code of honor. Even though I may not agree with them, they have a code that interests me.

I met quite a few when I was a reporter. I found out that their way of thinking and living, ironically enough, had more solidity, as far as the unity of their camaraderie, than the saintly people. They are thieves, pimps and whores, and are very "low" people, but they stick together in a way that the churches would like to have people in their congregations unite, though they never do. They do not secretly try to oulive each other, or live on lies — and we do.

I would rather tell the story of a whore than a sweet girl who comes to the city and meets a young good-looking man, marries him and raises children. I don't see anything dramatic about that. It may be dramatic to other writers, but I could not write that kind of copy.

This seems to tie in with the element of madness that recurs in your films. One often finds oneself inside asylums (in films like "Shock Corridor" and "The Big Red One"), but that madness is also linked with these characters who are the outsiders, who function on the periphery of society . . .

As far as I am concerned, we are one big wonderful asylum, though we always shake our heads and say, "Tsk... tsk...", when we see anyone who is abnormal, or sick mentally.

I have covered some insane asylums in my day, and the true story I wanted to tell, I couldn't tell. At the beginning of Shock Corridor, for example, I wanted to show naked men and women chained together on benches in a long corridor, sitting in their own filth as the journalist passed them, on entering the asylum. The Hollywood censor board refused me permission. I produced photographs, from several mental hospitals, showing this was no fabrication, and still they said no. So I said, "The hell with it."

I wanted to do a story of the maltreatment of patients — the insane people — by the sane people, where the same people are really acting insane. They have nothing but contempt and impatience for anyone who is sick.

When a man breaks his arm or his leg, or has some kind of physical sickness, we say, "Isn't that too bad?" We don't shy away from them. Yet we don't want to have anything to do with people who are mentally sick. It is just like talking about corpses. People turn away; they don't like it. I think we should try to help.

Almost as a counterpoint, there is the repeated intrusion of children into the action of your films. That seems to be a device that Sam Peckinpah uses too, perhaps influenced by your work . . .

Yes, and I love his films. You know, he called me — I've never met him — and offered to do 2nd unit on The Big Red One. I thought it was a good idea, but it didn't come off. I would have loved it.

Anyway, whatever has happened with adults will reflect on children. Wherever I went in the war, I saw many children, and they always stayed in the back of my mind. There is something that gets to me about a child trying to emulate an adult. It is unfortunate for them that they grow up and become the same kind of sons-of-bitches, and they presume to pass judgment on a new generation of children. I laugh when I think of it.

But in "Shark" — and I know it is a film you are not happy with — there is a very positive relationship between the child called Runt, and Kane played by Burt Reynolds . . .

I thought it would be interesting to show an adult thief and a child thief working together. I wanted to show, very clearly, the attitude of the adult thief, where, instead of inviting the boy not to steal, he tells him the important thing is not to be caught. That to me is an editorial about how a lot of people raise children.

I have had the experience of seeing that in life. I have talked to young hoodlums, who told me when they were kids, that they were brought up by other hoodlums, who never tried to differentiate between right and wrong, because it would be ridiculous for them to even think at that level. All they try to do is control their means of thievery, so that they won't be caught. I thought that was pretty funny.

In your films, there are very often characters who are named Griff ("The Baron of Arizona", "House of Bamboo", "Forty Guns", "The Naked Kiss" and "The Big Red One"). Is there a story there?

No, it's just that I write a lot of stories and I get sick and tired of trying to change the names. Once I was writing two stories at the same time, and the character of one appeared in the other book. I got all confused, so I said, "Whenever I can, I'll use the same name."

It's easier for me to write that way; there's no real Griff. But I will have to stop it now because I have done it too often. It's just mental laziness on my part.

In your films, there is a lot of physical violence, which might be connected with the fact that you have made Westerns, gangster films and war films. But you have said that you prefer "emotional violence", and you talk about "the bullets of emotion" . . .

Frankly, I don't cotton too much to physical violence, even though I use it a lot. It is good for films, and it is good for many melodramas. That has been proven as far as theatre ticket-buyers are concerned. They like action, but I prefer emotional action.

A really emotionally violent situation, for me, is in an old film I love, written by Noel Coward and directed by David Lean, called Brief Encounter, with Trevor Howard and Celia Johnson. It has more violence in it — emotional violence, which to me is pure violence — than an automobile chase, or a horse chase or a fight in a saloon.

There is the violence inside a woman who is about to cheat on her husband, and the violence inside a man who is about to cheat on his wife. They are doing something they not only believe to be wrong, but something they both reject, even though they are accepting it at the same time. That to me is pure violence, and only once in a thousand times do I find that in a film.

In "Pierrot le fou" you say: "The
film is like a battle-ground. Love, hate, action, violence, death. In one word, emotion."

Yes. That encompasses everything, because that is all we can write or talk about. Even in the American presidential race, there was a violence towards the end, when they began to mud-sling each other. You don't have to be violent with your fist; a voice can do it just as well. One word can cut the hell out of your heart. That to me is violence.

The one aspect of your career you haven't really made a film about is filmmaking. Do you have any plans for such a project?

No, but if I ever did approach a story about Hollywood, I would do it about the censors. It would rip the hell out of them, and expose them for what they are: parasites, frauds and hypocrites. I would do a

the censorship office in Hollywood as an entree to selling scripts. That to me is a pretty good reflection of what the hell they represent.

In 1964 you wrote: "An artist's hell will always be paved with the skulls of critics and the bones of censors." You politely avoided mentioning critics in your tirade against censors. Do you still feel the same way?

Yes. They have to make a living, but what is wrong generally is the way they use films. If they can write anything that will enlighten someone who's done a book or a poem or a play, or made a film, I think that is worthwhile.

George Bernard Shaw used to be a critic. When he became a playwright he wrote a goddamn article about critics — and he tore them apart.

On the other hand, I have read some wonderful critiques by writers whose essays are a hell of a lot better than what they were writing about. I would rather have them shoot what they wrote, than shoot what they were covering.

But there are those critics who just want to get their own literary guns off, who want to prove they sleep with the Thesaurus and the dictionary. I suppose there is

nothing really wrong in all that, whereas I have little patience with the critics who rip off publicity sheets or brochures on a film. They are not the major critics usually, but they take the goddamn copy out of the brochure and write it as if they were writing a review. That's an example of taking money under very false pretenses.

Ever since I first read that essay, I have felt, "Hell, that's a bit ungrateful to those French critics-cum-censors who have always been very respectful of your work." Jean-Luc Godard, for example, dedicated "Made in USA" to you and Nicholas Ray. . . .

I talked to some of them recently in France and we discussed what you just brought up. I think any man who wants to be a critic and review films must also love films and want to make them. That is perfectly logical and I am encouraging that. A number of ex-critics have become writers and directors in the U.S., and it has happened on a grander scale in Europe, specifically in France, Italy and even in Britain.

I am very fond of Peter Wollen, for example. I met him in a bar in Edinburgh, in 1969. He had ideas, and I said, "Write them." I was delighted to hear that he did. He and another man wrote a story called The Passenger, for Michelangelo Antonioni. That makes me very happy. He did something about it.

François Truffaut and a few other Frenchmen were working in publicity departments and they wrote reviews. But their love for cinema was sincere, because what they wanted to do was to make a film; it was not just a job.

I have tremendous respect for a number of critics and writers. To me, a man like Cyril Connolly, or Edmund Wilson, can cover anything.

The other reviewers in Cologne and Berlin were very upset with my review. They only wrote about whether they liked the film. I didn't give a damn about that. I wrote about the cleverness of using Tartuffe, a man with one hand under a girl's skirt and the other holding a bible. I just loved it. I think the critics were scared of something different.

I assume from the fact that you accepted parts in films made by Godard, Luc Moullet and Wim Wenders that you admire their work. . . .

Yes, very much. Wenders called me again recently and said, "Would you do a walk-on for my new film Hammett?" And I said, "Certainly." I really enjoyed it. It's not finished, but so far I am still in it.

You also acted alongside Nicholas Ray in "An American Friend." . . .

I have known him a bit for a long time, but we didn't really work together. Wenders was making a film about him in New York, and he called me and he was crying. He was all choked up and said, "Nick Ray died."

It seems to me that your stories seem less concerned with psychologically complex characters, and
more with the complexities of situations. You seem to deal with groups rather than individuals, the groups being defined by some common goal or set of rules. Are you consciously working against the idea of the 'individual' in your films?

Yes. I am highly conscious of the way society can break up certain people into types. I am curious about whether the same thing happens among animals. I want to know if there is a lion who is a thief, a lion who is a marauder, and a lion who is very gentle.

It is strange that society has catalogued people to such a point that now, as we are moving towards another century, we still pin-point everyone as black and white, as...
Scott Murray reports on the issue of whether foreign directors should be allowed to work in Australia. Other opinions have been sought for future issues, in particular Pom Oliver and Errol Sullivan, and Gillian Armstrong. Oliver and Sullivan declined comment in this issue, saying they preferred to wait until the film and the finance of Hoodwink were finalized.

If Equity’s actions over the use of foreign actors in Australian films has been the big industry issue for several months, it has recently had to take a back seat to the related dispute over the use of foreign directors. The film in the hot seat is _Hoodwink_, produced by Errol Sullivan and Pom Oliver of CB Films.

Originally, Sullivan and Oliver approached four Australian directors, and the agents for several others, but all declined to do the film. The decision was then made to go with Claude Whatham, a British director of four features ( _That’ll Be The Day, Swallows and Amazons, All Creatures Great and Small_ and _Sweet William_ ) and several television series (e.g., _Reckless R_ ).

The producers approached the relevant union, the Australian Theatrical and Amusement Employees’ Association, on July 16 for permission to employ Whatham and on October 8 for approval to sign a contract with him. After some discussion, with Claude Whatham as chairman, meetings of directors were then held in Sydney, Melbourne and Sorrento, Italy, where several Australian filmmakers were attending the Encouter.

Two motions were put to the meetings:
(1) Australian films with a majority of government funding must have an Australian director; and
(2) _Hoodwink_ must meet these requirements.

In a letter to Sydney Morning Herald, James Stimpson, interim secretary of the ATAEA, wrote:  
“`The union is satisfied CB Films have made effective efforts to sign a suitable Australian director. We are satisfied Claude Whatham’s employment is justified.’”

However, no doubt invigorated by the perversity of Equity’s recent actions, a group of directors hurriedly set about forming the Australian Feature Film Directors Association, with Gill Armstrong as chairman. Meetings of directors were then held in Sydney, Melbourne and Sorrento, Italy, where several Australian filmmakers were attending the Encounter.

Two motions were put to the meetings:
(a) that has been made wholly or substantially in Australia, and that, in the opinion of the Commission, has a significant Australian content; or
(b) that has been made wholly or substantially in Australia, and that, in the opinion of the Commission, will have significant Australian content; or
(c) that has been, or is to be, made in pursuance of an agreement or arrangement entered into between the government of Australia or an authority of Australia and the government of another country or an authority of the government of another country.

Therefore, in view of the above, the AFC was established with the responsibility of promoting all-Australian films is incorrect. Had that been the Government’s intentions, such wording would have been drafted into the legislation. This is clearly evidenced in the argument of some directors that while no American directors should be allowed to work in Australia, Australian directors should be allowed to work in the U.S.

The other curious aspect about many recent discussions is the willingness of people to defend an inconsistent stand, saying such tactics are justified because Australia is a small, defenceless industry. This is clearly evidenced in the argument of some directors that while no American directors should be allowed to work in Australia, Australian directors should be allowed to work in the U.S.

This double twist of logic has interesting parallels with the attempts by some American gay groups to stop _Cruising_ being made. When one Romero was asked why he was attempting to deny William Friedkin right of free speech, he replied:  
“It’s absurd to argue the First Amendment in this case, because it presumes equality. There is no equality as long as we haven’t the power or the economic base that Hollywood has to make films on the scale of _Cruising_.”

The obvious answer to that, as pointed out by gay activist Edward Guthmann in _Cineaste_, is:  
“How can one honorably defend the First Amendment without recognizing it as absolute. What justifies any group, however malign, to claim themselves exempt from Constitutional imperatives?”

One objection to giving any group of Australian filmmakers the right to take hypocritical stands which, in the attempt to secure personal gains, deprives the liberty of others to make creative choices. Surely it is time for self-interest to be overcome by a concerted effort to preserve the inalienable right of people to pursue artistic integrity, as they see fit. As John Rechy points out in his article on _Cruising_ in _The Village Voice_, evoking the words of Thomas Paine:  
“He who would make himself a tyrant must guard even his enemy against opposition . . . if he violates his duty, he establishes a precedent that will reach himself.”
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TWENTY YEARS OF RICHARD LESTER

Neil Sinyard

Variety is the keynote of Richard Lester's two decades of filmmaking. His output comprises musicals, comedies, a musical comedy, war films, historical romances, a modern romance, adventures both ancient and modern, political thrillers and a western. Some of his works have been immediately acclaimed as among the most likeable and enduring of modern films (looking back with melancholy admiration on A Hard Day's Night Richard Corliss, commented: "We have aged and it hasn't." Others (How I Won The War, Cuba) have a forbidding, eccentric obliqueness which seems to delay proper recognition of their expressive skill:

With their sensitive, witty perception of contemporary anxieties, films such as The Knack, Petulia and Juggernaut show Lester to be one of the sharpest chroniclers of our own times. But he is also one of the current cinema's most ambitious time-travellers, surveying, for example, mediaeval Britain in Robin and Marian, the France of Louis XIII in the Musketeers films and the American West of the 19th Century in Butch and Sundance: The Early Days. His modern perspective combines with his historical enthusiasm to forge a link between past and present, recognizing a common refrain of injustice, inequality and confusion and reflecting too that people throughout the ages have responded to adversity with similar kinds of stoical humor.

A further connecting thread across this diversity of genre, style and period in Lester is the coherence of his vision of society and the consistent intelligence with which this vision has been expressed.

At the heart of this impressive body of work lies a paradox. Lester is an entertainer, a comedian, who, as Jules Feiffer once remarked, has "a way of making a film your friend." But he has also made some of the most pessimistic, intellectually-taxing films of the modern cinema. He wants to entertain an audience, but — and this might be the same thing in Lester's work — he also wants to provoke them, to make them think.

Although invariably approached as the products of a knockabout farceur with modest satirical aspirations, Lester's films often offer a searing misanthropy, the director's compassion for the bruised individual momentarily stilled as he stands aghast at human callousness and insensitivity. From the way in which his characters are often passionately devoted to an ideal and the way in which some films seem consciously to build towards a central image of romantic love (The Knack, Robin and Marian), one senses a romantic strain in Lester that is awaiting full expression. Yet he is vexed by the problem of how to express this romanticism without looking foolish in a world where sensation has taken the place of feeling. So his films always seem to end in a more melancholy vein than was anticipated at the start, as if the romantic idealist has been overtaken by the rational realist.

In Cuba, a shot of Alexandra (Brooke Adams), standing by the hero's bed, looks momentarily as if filmed through a soft, atmospheric gauze, only for the material between us and the heroine to be revealed as a severely practical mosquito net. There is invariably a sting to Lester's romanticism. The temperament, then, is elusive but seems darker and more complex than is traditionally associated with him, or what one might have anticipated from the works of the early 1960s with which Lester rose meteorically to cinematic prominence.

The phenomena which particularly launched Lester's career were, of course, his two films with the Beatles, A Hard Day's Night and Help! He seems to have been chosen for these films for two main reasons: the facility he had already displayed in shooting musical numbers in It's Trad, Dad!, and the Goon-like surrealistic humor evinced in his classic short, The Running, Jumping and Standing Still Film, which, as it happened, was one of the Beatles' favorite films.

In retrospect, the approach taken with A Hard Day's Night is significant in mapping out various aspects of Lester's style and future concerns. What he does is to move behind the facade of the Beatles, not so much in terms of their characters but in terms of their situation. What he discovers is power without freedom: four people with an astounding effect on audiences and yet whose life is confined within cars and rooms; a potency which paradoxically has produced a claustrophobia so acute that one of them has to plan an escape as if from a prison, and their only relief is a quickly-snatched game in a field.

The theme of power without freedom is elaborated on a much larger scale in Lester's masterpiece, Petulia, in which he senses that America's image of itself as an ideal of superpower democracy is a conviction which is beginning to wilt under the pressure of rapid and confusing social change.

Another theme which emerged from A Hard Day's Night was a fascination with figures of legend and the kind of situations this legendary status engenders. A number of Lester's films have people who are, or are about to be, trapped by their own images and discover that the success or security or ideal that they have striven for has suddenly gone sour. Ringo walks out on his situation for a while in A Hard Day's Night; Robin Hood becomes disillusioned with the king to whom he has devoted his life in Robin and Marian; and, at the end of Butch and Sundance, when Sundance shouts out, "We're gonna be famous!", the film does not simply stop but freezes, marking the moment indelibly as the end of their freedom.

This concern with the limitations of legend can be seen to relate to several other aspects of Lester's work. There is, as we have observed, his interest in history. It relates also to his frequent observation of the split between appearance and reality, the signals which his characters transmit to others rarely being an accurate reflection of what they feel themselves about their situation. (Archie and his wife Polo might be a
“marvellous-looking couple” in *Petulia*, but the surface is deceptive, Archie being about to walk out on this marital materialism and comfort because he wants “to feel something.”

The complications of charisma also reflect Lester’s interest in the processes by which legends are created, which in his work takes the form of a meditation on film myths and the mechanisms and meanings of the media.

Lester’s films occasionally antagonize people because they are often reflections or satires on film genres and hence often disappoint expectations. His films display a certain irreverent attitude to movie conventions. *How I Won The War* trains its satirical weaponry not only on the obscenity of war but on the obscenity of war films, and indeed on the hypocrisy of anti-war films like Stanley Kubrick’s *Paths of Glory* which, in Lester’s view, far from being pacifist, merely advocates a way of killing people more humanely. “Let’s have the show right here!” shouts John Lennon mockingly in *A Hard Day’s Night*, spontaneously sending up the artificiality of the traditional movie musical which is further undermined by the film’s “documentary” style.

The Beatles’ films finally introduced another theme which has surfaced more than once in Lester: the generation gap. Treated humorously in *The Knack*, with adults offering a disgruntled running commentary on the antics of the four young principals, it has been expressed more ferociously in other films when the elders seem to see such youthful behaviour as devaluing the sacrifices made by them as parents. “I fought the war for your sort”, claims the man on the train in *A Hard Day’s Night* when being annoyed by the Beatles. Lester clearly prefers the social attitudes of the young in films such as *It’s Trad, Dad!* and *The Knack*, and this early observation of the conflict between generations has been extended into a more general inquiry into authority, his films examining the trappings of power and various subversive attempts to undermine or displace it.

Lester’s anti-authoritarianism is seen in his frequent, incisive indictments of various forms of educational, religious or political indoctrination, and in the way in which his films sometimes convey an anarchic spirit, both formally, in their disregard for the orthodoxies of narrative realism, and thematically (his attitude to the terrorist in *Juggernaut*, for example, being strikingly more sympathetic than his attitude to the politician).

This sense of anarchy and conflict serves to reinforce a point made by Joseph McBride in a brief but perceptive survey of Lester’s career in the 1975 *International Film Guide* that the image of battle runs through most of Lester’s work, perhaps surprising in a man most instantly associated with comedy. Obviously there is a strong streak of violence in all slapstick humor.

Lester’s preoccupation with violence reflects his vision of society as an irrational, fearful force in which the fate of the individual is precarious. His world is not one in which heroes prosper, for, as we have seen, even the potential of the famous is illusory. By surrounding his central character with a number of other characters of more or less equal significance, by placing him against a busy and closely-observed social background, and by questioning the efficacy of many of his actions, Lester diminishes the prominence of the conventional screen hero and offers a radical revision of his power and prowess.

Even in the *Muskeeters* films, it is striking how d’Artagnan becomes progressively less in control of a series of events which culminate in tragedies he attempted to prevent. Robin and Marian is specifically about the death of heroism and heroism. Major Dapes (Sean Connery) in *Cuba* behaves like a 20th Century Musketeer, displaying a kind of gentlemanly courtesy learnt from old skirmishes and old films that looks absurd and incongruous, in terms of his own mercenary values and in the theatre of modern warfare.

Lester’s offbeat approach to the usual heroic stereotype is most apparent in *Royal Flash*, in the discrepancy between the account offered by the headmaster at Rugby of Flashman’s legendary valor at Afghanistan and the catalogue of ignominious surrender we actually see. The close-up adulation of the camera to introduce the coward Flashman contrasts vividly with the modest first appearance of a genuinely brave man, the bomb-disposal expert, Fallon (Richard Harris), in *Juggernaut*, who is framed slightly off-centre and visually dominated by the bright red background. The contrasting visual presentation pinpoints the imperfect perception of both societies of what true heroism is, as well as the way in which the values of a society are implied in the people it values.

In *Royal Flash*, its blind admiration of a charlatan like Flashman becomes symptomatic of the hypocrisy at the heart of Victorian via the television screens, *Petulia* is centrally about the theme of domestic violence. Archie (George C. Scott) returns to his apartment and switches Vietnam off the television screen, only to find *Petulia* (Julie Christie) at his feet, beaten almost to death by her husband. “Only a crazy man hits a woman,” says the husband (Richard Chamberlain) later, “or a coward.”

The alignment between violence, madness and cowardice links *Petulia* directly with Lester’s preceding film, *How I Won The War*. It is a remarkable connection, since it implies the same potential in peace-time as in war-time for casual, uncontrollable violence.
Lester's interest in social complexes rather than psychological complexities clearly has an effect on his style. There is a feeling in Lester of pushing the expressiveness of film to the limits, of crowding images and soundtrack to bursting point. "I like to stretch film, as I know it, to the utmost," he once said, "to pack into it as much as possible on as many different levels as possible."

As well as the exuberant, burgeoning visual imagery, there are mutterings over the soundtrack which become tiny particles of additional wit, information and atmosphere cracking across the film's surface. These mutterings enrich and deliberately deflect attention, leading the audience away from the main figures as Lester seeks to intensify awareness of events and a society happening outside the film's immediate field of vision.

As well as his impatience with the limitations of the film frame, the attention to decor and period detail gives a sense of Lester's dissatisfaction that film only operates on a visual and auditory level; he would, one feels, also like to give his work a sense of smell.

The emphasis on social totalities, rather than individual fortunes, also accounts for the narrative dislocations, since Lester's films are about interaction and collision more than linear development. What he relays is not plot but a sort of pointillism of accumulated social detail—an infinity of colored dots that combine to form a complete picture. There is also a creative counterpoint in Lester's films between content and context. For example, while the quartet are performing the "Everybody ought to have a maid" routine in _A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum_ (with degrees of enthusiasm that vary according to their social status), the background is occupied by dowdy and ugly domestic drudges doing soul-destroying jobs. The tension between foreground and background not only undercuts the song but reinforces the main theme of the film: that _nobody_ ought to have a maid, or slave.

In fact, tension is a key concept in Lester; one rarely comes across serenity, harmony or relaxation in his work. Often focusing on societies in stages of crucial transition or imminent breakdown, Lester's style flares with a sense of crisis and excitement. There is a restless and nervous energy that take the form of packed images, fractured narratives, free leaps in time and space, perhaps reflecting Lester's feeling of civilisation's instability and that, to adapt T.S. Eliot, these are "fragments shored against his ruins".

Comparisons with Eliot might seem a little grandiose for a director who has worked with Helen Shapiro and Acker Bilk. But it is not too fanciful to spy a link between _The Waste Land_ and _The Bed-Sitting Room_, both imagistic works of American emigres similarly responding to a London recently devastated by war, and with Eliot's lines matchlessly projecting the atmosphere of Lester's film, of a world made up of "a heap of broken images" where "the sun beats and the dead tree gives no shelter".

My feeling is that the esteem in which Lester is held by other directors is partly to do with his brilliant assimilation not simply of modern media techniques, but of modernist tendencies in the arts. In Lester's work one can see a variety of influences drawn from advertising, television, the strip cartoon, pop art, the cinema, as well as methods that echo some of the key tendencies in modern literature (experimentation with time, narrative and point of view) and modern art (a Cubist sense of fragmentation, abstraction and multiple interrelated perspectives; a Surrealist
Cuba

Clockwise from top right: a trainload of Cuban soldiers is surprised by a Fidelista attack; Major Dapes (Sean Connery), centre. Gutman (Jack Weston) and Alexandra (Brooke Adams) are detained by Castro's forces; General Bello (Martin Balsam) and Dapes discuss plans to kill Fidelistas. Juan (Chris Sarandon), the playboy, and his wife Alexandra; Juan gives his mistress (Lorraine McKee) one of his wife's heirlooms as a gift; trapped between soldiers and revolutionaries, Gutman and Dapes try to find their way back to safety.

delight in anarchy, adventurism and fantasy, with the normal as inexplicable and the inexplicable as the norm).

The method is flexible enough to engage directly with social and political issues of the present day by alluding to the methods of the media through which these issues are generally conveyed. It is also imaginative enough to transform the usual modes of communication in a way that reflects a sense of inner crisis.

The film which most comprehensively contains these diverse aspects of Lester is Petulia, which is probably the most advanced example of Lester's cinematic syntax and the film in which his social perception is allied to an uncommon psychological depth. A good primer for an understanding of the method of Petulia would be Virginia Woolf's famous essay, "Modern Fiction", with its call for a new kind of fiction constructed on psychology as much as on plot, and developing not only from a linear narrative about a character in society but from a process which faithfully reflects the mind in action. Both film and essay seek a different way of representing reality and a form of art which can give the impression of the randomness of life without sacrificing aesthetic construction and control.

Petulia remains Lester's major achievement of the 1960s, although one could also advance the claims of How I Won The War, whose structural and verbal richness seems to acquire a fresh stature on each viewing, and also The Knack, which, even away from its contemporary stylistic flourishes, remains a remarkably perceptive critique of power relationships and consumerist society. The 1970s' work has been less generously celebrated, although Juggernaut expounds a brilliant moral and political allegory in which the suspense format gives especial urgency to the issues involved, and Robin and Marian impressively underpins wit and action with a tone of gnarled romanticism and an array of evocative imagery.

But Lester's most striking film of the last decade is Cuba, summarizing in dazzling cinematic imagery his current thoughts on romance, revolution and Hollywood fictions.
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**Best Boy** won a 1980 Academy Award in the category of Feature Documentary. It has been screened at various film festivals around the world (including Toronto, New York, Cannes, Sydney and Melbourne), winning almost unanimous praise and providing a focal point for much enthusiastic discussion.

Directed by Ira Wohl, the film's title character is Wohl's 52-year-old cousin, Philly, who is mentally retarded and who has lived all his life in the care of his elderly parents. The family home is, for him, a place where he is both loved and repressed. **Best Boy** presents a record of Philly's growth as a human being, there and beyond, as he gradually gains access to a wider world. It also examines the effect of his development upon his parents, in particular his mother.

It is in this balancing of sympathies between a commitment to Philly's growth and a regret for his mother's sense of loss that the film becomes so intensely moving (though it should be said that it is also often engagingly funny). Its emotional power is largely the product of this dramatic structure, and while its form is certainly that of the documentary it nonetheless has much in common with the "family melodrama" from *Broken Blossoms* to *Kramer Vs Kramer*. Yet, as a document of the events which occurred over the three years of Wohl's direct involvement in the developments within this family, it raises issues which are quite alien to the fictional worlds of those films. The most immediate of these is the effect of the presence of the camera on the course of these developments, a moral question discussed in this interview.

Ira Wohl has spent most of his 35 years in New York. His earliest film experience was as an editor for Orson Welles on *Don Quixote* (which is still unfinished), after which he produced a number of short films (including one on The Band and another for John Lennon).

For the past five years he has been engaged as producer-director-editor for the award-winning children's television series *Big Blue Marble*. **Best Boy**, his "labor of love", was made during these years.

The interview was originally broadcast on 3RRR-FM.
What made you work in documentary film?

It wasn't a desire, it was an accident. The first film I made, Implosion, was not a documentary, it was a film of one of my dreams. I'd had recurring dreams like it for a long time. I thought that for my first film I should do something fairly important to me, so I filmed that dream. There was a guy running around in his pyjamas all over the place trying to find a telephone, and trying to make contact with somebody — anybody and he never quite managed to do it.

My second film was, I suppose, a documentary. It is called Mary. I lived in an apartment building and there was an old woman there. I used to see her in the street and talk to her. Nobody paid much attention to her.

I just liked the way she expressed herself. So, I decided to do a film with her; just talking to her about whatever: the past, the present, the future. Everybody said to me, "Well, what's special about this woman? What did she do that's special?" For me, the thing that was special was that nothing was special; she was just a woman.

It started from there. I would get interested in something from reality and then I would decide I wanted to do a film about it. And that's how it happened.

So, "Ira Wohl, documentary filmmaker" isn't a label you attach to yourself?

No, and I hate the word "documentary". It sends people streaming in the opposite direction from the box-office. It implies that they are going to have to suffer through some horrible 'learning experience'. Best Boy is not like that.

But it does take the form of a documentary, in the style of a diary of three years of your life, as well as of the lives of your aunt and uncle and their son. What was the initial impetus for it?

First of all, it didn't start out to be a film. It just started with me wanting to do something for my cousin. The film was an afterthought. I had always taken Philly pretty much for granted, the way the rest of the family did, as being somebody who was retarded, I never paid much attention to him. Then one particular incident turned it around for me.

There was a family dinner and we were all sitting around the table. A meal was being served and Philly was talking about something which was obviously very important to him; I don't know what it was; I don't think anybody did.

An aunt was serving the food. She suddenly turned to Philly and said, "Okay, Philly, that's enough. Shut up." I wasn't even looking in his direction, but the remark stunned me. I don't think she intended to be nasty, but was just frustrated about whatever she was doing. I then looked at Philly. I saw that he was hurt, although I knew he would never express it verbally.

I looked around the table and realized that nobody else noticed anything. I looked back at Philly and said to myself, for the first time maybe, "There's a person here whom I have never really thought about."

I saw that my aunt and uncle were getting old, and I began to wonder what would happen to Philly after they'd gone. I decided that I was going to try and see if there was something I could do for him, so he could become more independent and get some respect from people around him.

I did some research and was told that the first step would be psychological and neurological examinations. It was only about a week before I arranged the first of those. Then I woke up one morning, and it occurred to me that it might be something interesting to film. It was that simple. I got a crew very quickly, and it started from there: a step at a time, all along the way.

The experience you have described seems implicit in the scene where one meets Philly for the first time. He is never allowed to finish a sentence. "Well, what's special about this family?" For me, the thing that was special was that nothing was special; she was just a woman.

I decided that I was going to try and see if there was something I could do for him, so he could become more independent and get some respect from people around him. I did some research and was told that the first step would be psychological and neurological examinations. It was only about a week before I arranged the first of those. Then I woke up one morning, and it occurred to me that it might be something interesting to film. It was that simple. I got a crew very quickly, and it started from there: a step at a time, all along the way.

The experience you have described seems implicit in the scene where one meets Philly for the first time. He is never allowed to finish a sentence. "Well, what's special about this family?" For me, the thing that was special was that nothing was special; she was just a woman.

I decided that I was going to try and see if there was something I could do for him, so he could become more independent and get some respect from people around him. I did some research and was told that the first step would be psychological and neurological examinations. It was only about a week before I arranged the first of those. Then I woke up one morning, and it occurred to me that it might be something interesting to film. It was that simple. I got a crew very quickly, and it started from there: a step at a time, all along the way.

The film seems to work on an audience in a way that is usually connected with melodrama. Its emotional movement is towards Philly's release at the end. Did you consider working against that, perhaps by putting sequences in a different order?

No, the situation of this family was ongoing. It started before I was born, and I saw myself as coming into it and trying to pick the best moments that would tell a story. I always had that in mind, in the shooting and the editing. My goal was always to tell a story, to stick to the spine of the story and tell it as neatly and as cleanly as I could.

Was there any particular reason for shooting so much of the film in tight close-ups?

No particular reason. I think a lot of the credit for the way the film looks has to go to Tom McDonough, the cameraman, who did a fabulous job.

You will have noticed that people who make documentaries are reluctant to call themselves directors. They prefer to call themselves filmmakers. When you make a dramatic film, you know what is possible. You say, "Let's put the camera here", and you tell that actor, "Move like this, move like that." But with a documentary, people tend to do that too. However, he moves from there to a much bigger space, geographically as well as emotionally. Was that a conscious structure that you imposed on the film, or did that just happen?

I really didn't have any preconceptions, I didn't know where the film would go, which is why, I think, there is a sense in which the audience discovers the film the way I discovered it as I was making it. Even though it is a "documentary", it has a very strong narrative line, and I think of it as a kind of novel, one in which the pages are being written as you turn them. I hoped for that, but I didn't know what would happen with Philly.

In a sense, I was taking a chance. I thought that at the most I was wasting some film, some time and some money, but I hoped that if things did happen with Philly, we would have a chance to be there as they happened, rather than needing some narrator to explain what had already happened. In that way we could let the film have its own dramatic construction.

I hoped he would become independent and, I think, I probably imagined that, at the end of things, maybe he would get to move out of his house. There was no specific design, but I probably saw it going that way at the end.
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"1980 marks the beginning of the Edinburgh Film Festival's fourth period. The first period lasted for just over twenty years and had been dedicated to the continuation of a pre-war notion of art cinema formulated in the 1930s, primarily as an attempt to work of left independent filmmakers. With the triumph of social democracy after the war and the pervasive rhetoric about the welfare state, this civil service type of realism ossified into a rigidly dogmatistic form of humanism that immobilized film culture in this country well into the 1960s. The joyless, relentlessly puritanical and moralistic approach to cinema proved difficult to dislodge because of its ability to combine a populist rhetoric with the defence of an aristocratic cult of personal taste (breeding).

The second period was inaugurated in 1969 by a small group of cinephiles, which included Lynda Myles, when they organized a Sam Fuller retrospective and accompanied this with the publication of a series of essays. The book not only aggressive­ly celebrated the pleasures of popular cinema (as it was called then), it also showed that classic Hollywood cinema offered an ideal terrain upon which the literary approach to cinema could be challenged by counterposing the need to understand how film texts are structured. What was at stake in this shift was the politicization of the desire for cinema, the harnessing of cinephilia to an oppositional culture.

These are the opening words of an article, "The Edinburgh Film Festival and the Cinema of Joseph H. Lewis", by Paul Willemen and they relate to much of what Edinburgh signifies to those British filmmakers, critics and cinephiles who attend. The Festival is a melting pot for those in Britain interested in the cinema. As a result, the many program strands are there not just for any quality of any one film, but as indications of what future direction the British cinema, and the analysis of cinema, might take. This role, as Paul Willemen points out, has been developed largely under the eight-year directorship of Lynda Myles and whether the momentum is to be continued with either director will remain unknown for a little time yet.

Myself is taking up an appointment with the Pacific Film Archive and this year she put together a "Director's Choice" section which clearly indicates the range of new concerns over which she presided. (The films were Imitation of Life, Radio On, Dance Girl Dance, Riddles of the Sphinx, Thriller, Pickup on South Street, Pursued, American Friend and Mean Streets.)

But just as it explores the nether regions of American cinema and on the opportunity to discuss films with their makers. These are still the New York-based independents and the discovery of lost traditions and/or minor contribu­tions. With the battles allegedly won ("Auteurism was one, now dated, form of this productive mobilization of the desire for cinema": Willemen), this year's Festival could pay homage to Joseph H. Lewis, some 25 years after his last film appeared, in what would seem to be a blatantly conscious effort to reveal what Willemen calls "the desire for cinema, or, more familiarly, cinephilia". Thus the view is put that:

"When cinephilia disappears Lewis' films will cease to have any function, their specificity will vanish along with the spectator's inability to acknowledge a desire for cinema, the associational, politically irresponsible joy of looking.

But Joseph H. Lewis it was, including reverent looks at quite a number of his most indistinguishable B-westerns (or was that the point?). Still this was only the most formal aspect of the desire for cinema and nothing could be further from the bloodless formularic work (which, of course not all his films were) than the collection of several programs of films loosely grouped under the title "Super-8 Films from New York".

Here the technology and techniques are deficient, but the enthusiasm and appreciation of his work.

Simon (Alan Arkin) is brought back to consciousness, after being submerged in water for 200 hours, by some think-tank scientists (right). Marshall Brickman's Simon.

Putting aside the question of whether there is life after punk, there was substantial new work from Yvonne Rainer, James Benning, Viet Nuyen, Mark Rapaport, Eric Mitchell, Les Blank, Joel de Mott and two collectives which both produced original short films.

Rainer's Working Title: Journeys From Berlin (1971) is a film of labyrinthine structural complexity which has been fortunate to receive the benefit of an excellent review by Jan Dawson in Sight and Sound (Summer, 1980). This series of free-associative journeys from the topic of terrorism is hardly suitable for further comment when viewed only once in a festival context, and it is to be hoped that the film receives wider distribution.

James Benning, a mathematicalian turned filmmaker (previous films include 8½ x 11 and 11 x 14), showed his film Grand Opera which turned out to be quite the best film tossed up by the avant-garde in a long time. Again the technique was associative, starting with what turned out to be the final shot of the film, for which it seems with tantilized anticipation. Benning claims that the film tells the story of his life, the way he perceives history, and signifies the end of his concerns with structurism. What made it grip were its leaps from subject to subject, its witty devotion to mathematical formulae and the suspension induced by the constant repetition of the description of its ending.

Less successful work came from Mark Rapaport and Eric Mitchell. Rapaport's Impostors is not as conclusively complete as his earlier The Scenic Route, possibly because his script is too long-winded and ineffective. The deteriorates into plain loudness in the effort to develop the hysteric humor for which the elaborate plot calls. Mitchell's Underground USA is a sub-Morrissey film turning once again, like a homing pigeon, to what appears to be the source of all film goodness for this particular strata.

Sunset Boulevard: Billy Wilder was actually present in Annie Trosko's interview/documentary, Portrait of a 60% Perfect Man, in which French critic Michel Ciment throws Wilder a succession of Dorothy Dix questions and reveals that great directors are not necessarily great interviewers. However, all is not lost in this most bastard of all genres, the film about a film, for Joel de Mott's Demon Lover Diary is possibly the best example ever to emerge. The fact that here we are not observing well-ordered sets, the solution of insoluble technical problems or witty repartee from those involved, but poverty, nervous breakdown and attempted murder, undoubtedly has a lot to do with the film's interest.

The attempts to make Demon Lover may have been the most amateur, pathetic and tragic of all time, and this diary unfolds a compendium of richly detailed human ambition, misery and stupidity (the star's contribution to the
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budget was the $8000 he received for deliberately chopping off his finger and (failing an industrial accident). What starts as funny and ironic is finally crushingly sad, for here the desire for cinema has become madness.

The two short films in this section were Sigfried Freud's Dora, a superb structural film about Freud and I, a work. The Monster Club, directed by veteran Roy Ward Baker; a bigger budget crime film, The Long Good Friday, directed by John Macken, and by Franco Rosso's Babydon, about which the highest hopes were held. Babylon is a smoothly-constructed, realistic piece about life among young blacks in Britain. Directed with some efficiency and with yet another pounding score that will be sold as an album, it seems rather too-obviously derivative of The Harder They Come. And once the lashings of exotic atmosphere are put into the background, the film turns rather too far towards being just another routine melodrama complete with its misunderstood-boy-on-the-run plot. Its problem was that as these elements were introduced, the exotic quality of the lives on display is minimized and the grip is lost. Here too the insistently similar music starts to call.

Even more dubious is effectiveness is The Long Good Friday, and any appreciation of this film tended to be obscured by the debate instituted by its producer and its basis in class. If it has a fault, and some objected to this aspect far more than I did, it is in its overly schematic presentation of the differences between the two upper-middle-class brothers who form the chief suspects as well as the major dialectic.

The other independent works will find it harder to surface. Amy is the third part of Peter Wollen and Laura Mulvey's trilogy of works. This one, however, is much more a thumbnail sketch than the previous films about feminism and representation (Riddles of the Sphinx and Penthisilea), for, having been denied the amount of assistance they requested from the production board, Wollen and Mulvey raised enough for a short film from a local arts group and were able to make this little film on Amy Johnson. Its concern is with the public image of Amy "in relation to Amy's feminity and the realities of her life following her downward path from heroic aviatrix to female celebrity."

Exchange and Divide, by Margaret Dickson (feminist), during the last few months of her life, refuses the traditional way of "looking" at history and gets caught in a complex, layered pattern of reverberations. History and 'her' story becomes a network of resonances. One life/voice impresses in another.

Beyond this, the film is not just about Tristan and the melancholy young woman's searching for her, it is "about" history and the processes of how history is made and recorded. It is, of course, also about women, their neglect in history and the processes of recording history. Alemann's avowed aim was to question the nature of historical reconstruction itself. One can only hope that this is one film that will rise from the ruck of 16mm independent filmmaking. For my own taste, I much preferred this vibrant and involving film to the more and obviously work of Chantal Akerman, whose rhythms this film bears some resemblance.

Kieran Hickey's Criminal Conversation is the second part of a planned trilogy exploring the reality of sexuality in Ireland. One of his earlier films, Faithful Departed, A Child's Voice and Exposure, did lightly bite at this one pursues the notions related to sexuality, the consumption of alcohol and truth begun in Exposure. It is a chamber piece for four actors that looks a little too like a television play, however. Its sense of precariously shifting relationships is remarkably well-judged and well-acted. Hickey is now on the verge of a full-length feature and one hopes that it will successfully complete the planned trilogy and round out this group portrait of one country's sexual proclivities.

Le Stuccoeur, directed by Mary Stephenson, is an intriguing and softly grained look at a woman's role in a slightly bizarre menage-a-trois. Its feminine viewpoint gives it some originality and the overly glamorous lives led by the group, especially at a satirically filmed party whose inhabitants wear only shades of white, makes for interest. Its chief fault would seem to lie in some fairly leaden camerawork and editing, particularly in those sequences involving the heroine's dance rehearsals where the music and movement are quite awry.

Lastly to one of the hot films of this year's festival circuit, Jacques Bral's Exterieur, Nuit, described by some as a 16mm classic. It is nothing of the kind and looks to me very much like a sub-Eustachian film with a cologne of Scorsese thrown in. Relentlessly shot with a grainy medium-shot, telephoto lens, this is utterly charming and qualifies only for having a score whose soundtrack album will probably sell well.

### Three Oddities and One Disappointment

One of Edinburgh's basic attractions is its happy desire to take films straight from the lab, and two films this year were claimed by their directors to be going through a projector for the first time. Most exciting was Claudia Alemann's Blind Spot, made, after all funding sources dried up, by Alemann agreeing to guarantee the debts. The program notes on the film set it out in part as follows (I can't do any better): 'In Blind Spot a woman historian fascinated by the diary kept by Flora Tristan (a 19th Century utopian socialist), during the last few months of her life, refutes the traditional way of 'looking' at history and gets caught in a complex, layered pattern of reverberations. History and 'her' story becomes a network of resonances. One life/voice impresses in another. Beyond this, the film is not just about Tristan and the melancholy young woman's searching for her, it is "about" history and the processes of how history is made and recorded. It is, of course, also about women, their neglect in history and the processes of recording history. Alemann's avowed aim was to question the nature of historical reconstruction itself. One can only hope that this is one film that will rise from the ruck of 16mm independent filmmaking. For my own taste, I much preferred this vibrant and involving film to the more and obvious work of Chantal Akerman, whose rhythms this film bears some resemblance. Kieran Hickey's Criminal Conversation is the second part of a planned trilogy exploring the reality of sexuality in Ireland. One of his earlier films, Faithful Departed, A Child's Voice and Exposure, did lightly bite at this one pursues the notions related to sexuality, the consumption of alcohol and truth begun in Exposure. It is a chamber piece for four actors that looks a little too like a television play, however. Its sense of precariously shifting relationships is remarkably well-judged and well-acted. Hickey is now on the verge of a full-length feature and one hopes that it will successfully complete the planned trilogy and round out this group portrait of one country's sexual proclivities. Le Stuccoeur, directed by Mary Stephenson, is an intriguing and softly grained look at a woman's role in a slightly bizarre menage-a-trois. Its feminine viewpoint gives it some originality and the overly glamorous lives led by the group, especially at a satirically filmed party whose inhabitants wear only shades of white, makes for interest. Its chief fault would seem to lie in some fairly leaden camerawork and editing, particularly in those sequences involving the heroine's dance rehearsals where the music and movement are quite awry. Lastly to one of the hot films of this year's festival circuit, Jacques Bral's Exterieur, Nuit, described by some as a 16mm classic. It is nothing of the kind and looks to me very much like a sub-Eustachian film with a cologne of Scorsese thrown in. Relentlessly shot with a grainy medium-shot, telephoto lens, this is utterly charming and qualifies only for having a score whose soundtrack album will probably sell well.

### Australian Entry

Australia was represented by Stl. Dir. Dirt Cheap, The Girl Who Met Simone de Beauvoir in Paris and Yap... or How Did You Know We'd Like TV. ★
Discussion about Australia’s difficulties as a small film producing country inevitably invites comparisons with the Canadian film industry. Both countries have a shared history of British colonization, and both have, in the past two decades, become increasingly dependent on, and influenced by, the U.S. This cultural and economic tinturing has affected not only the films produced, but the very structures of the two industries.

Being closer to the U.S., trends in Canada often prefigure those in Australia. Canada’s attempt to divest itself of American influence in the 1960s and establish an independent, nationalistic industry has been mirrored by a similar drive in Australia in the 1970s. The role of government investment, the ploys by unions to determine industry policies, the enormous pros and cons of tax incentive schemes and the fierce desire by several groups to keep their industries free of outside influences are issues common to both countries.

While many are aware of the obvious parallels between the Australian and Canadian industries, however, few seem to have attempted an analysis of the causes behind Canada’s recent renaissance. One knows the statistics: eight films in 1977 to 70 films in 1979; and $6 million in 1977 to $150 million in 1979: but what really happened? And, if there are lessons to be learned by Australians, what are they?

Mark Stiles interviews Michael McCabe, head of the Canadian Film Development Corporation during the upsurge in production, Martin Knelman, film critic, Bob Barclay, president of the Directors’ Guild of Canada, Tom Hedley, a scriptwriter, and Alan King, a filmmaker, in an attempt to find out.
Michael McCabe was appointed executive director of the Canadian Film Development Corporation in June 1978. Nearly two years later, in May 1980, McCabe resigned. His policies, as much as his departure, are still hotly debated.

Whatever the verdict, there is no doubt McCabe was an extremely influential force in the resurgence of film production in Canada, and in fostering an image for the CFDC. Here he speaks to Mark Stiles.
The CFDC still invests in small films, particularly those where new producers or directors are involved. This new talent has to get a chance and if it isn’t able to attract the financing, the CFDC is prepared to go in as an investor.

As for bridge financing — i.e., bridging the costs to the point where the producers have the main budget from investors who are going to take advantage of the tax shelter — the strategy is that we get our money into a film and then out with a profit quickly so that we can put it into another film. This has meant that in 1978 with a budget of roughly $4 million we put out about $7.5 million; in 1979, we put out about $12 million.

We put between $100,000 and $500,000 into a film, and get interest at 14 to 15 per cent. We also charge a placement fee that covers our administrative cost; that varies from film to film. And we retain somewhere between 1 and 5 profit points in a film, even after our money is out.

There also seems to have been a change from funding individual films to funding producers . . .

Yes. The aim is to try to build up some ongoing production houses with stable financing, production and marketing systems. The hope at the beginning of 1978 was to see if we could build up some assurance to a number of groups, recognizing that there were some people with track records who might be potential winners in the long term. But there weren’t all that many, and we had to make some judgments. The question of putting our dollars on somebody, who over the long term wasn’t likely to be a successful production house, is an ongoing problem.

In 1980, we are continuing this trend but we will get tougher on producers and on scripts. We have probably over-emphasized theLink to scripts we shouldn’t have. But we are going to have to adjust this, and when projects come forward from relatively untried producers we will try to direct them to people with more experience to see if we can’t develop these little grass-roots producers and sometimes, because we liked the producer, have gone with a script we shouldn’t have. But we are going to have to adjust this, and when projects come forward from relatively untried producers we will try to direct them to people with more experience to see if we can’t develop these little grass-roots producers.

Do you mean production houses making feature films solely, or also television programs?

Most of the English-language filmmakers, in Toronto in particular, work almost exclusively in the feature film business. In Montreal, both English- and French-language producers tend to be more diverse in their activities. I am not sure why, but it seems that Montreal producers have tended to have a base in the production of commercials, short films and the production of television. In Toronto, there seems to be a real divorce between the film producers, producers of television commercials, and producers of television programming.

Our view is that we should increasingly encourage feature film producers to move to television production. We have made it clear to the industry that although we don’t want to prescribe the format for them, or how they ought to go at it, we would be open to proposals for television production. We are interested in people who are prepared to propose a program of features for television, as opposed to single productions, or the development of specials, mini-series and pilots for longer series.

We have said that initially we would like to stay clear of the actual production funding in a single series, because we would prefer to help in the development and pilot stages, and hope that the actual production financing would come from the networks.

We worked very hard with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to get them to take independent feature filmmaking more seriously, and it is particularly about what we want to do with the American networks are prepared to do with our films, which is to buy them for use on the network after theatrical release. We are hopeful that soon the CBC will agree.

One of the avenues chosen by producers is to sell network in the U.S., pay-television and syndication in advance. Normally, you don’t get the full price at that stage — you get a contract. What you get when you sign is normally five or 10 per cent of the contract, and then you get part of it on delivery to the network and the rest by the time of their last pay. But what you can do with a contract is discount it at a bank, which gives you the financing in your hand, or you can go to your investors and say you have this conditional contract. We have been able to do that with a number of films.

We have also been doing it with foreign sales contracts. You go off and get ICM, Caroclo or another Los Angeles sales firm to sell, Germany, France, whatever, and then you either discount those contracts or merely display to investors the fact that you have these sales. That has been quite an important factor in 1978-79 in our financing of films. Unfortunately, Canadian banks don’t discount contracts at this stage, so you have to go to the Guiness-Mann Bank in Britain, or the Chemical Bank or Bank of America in the U.S.

Do you offer producers marketing assistance?

What we do at major markets like Cannes and Milan is provide an umbrella marketing effort. Secondly, we provide introductions to people in the major studios and sales agencies. Thirdly, we provide assistance to producers in development or marketing strategies. Finally, we keep a record of all sales, so that if a producer says he is going to sell his film to a distributor in Germany, we can tell him the record of that distributor and whether his price is any good.

So, we provide a consultative service. We are not in the selling business as such.

Of the $150 million spent in 1979, how much was Canadian?

All of it. But a lot of it happens without the CFDC’s involvement. In 1979, we were in 25 English and 17 French films, and $95 million of that $150 million represents films in which we had put development funds, or an investment. So there were 28 films with budgets totalling around $55 million in which we were not involved — a good third of the productions.

Then, you have to add the other features that are made in the country by purely foreign companies, which use Canada as a location. We don’t enter those in our figures because they don’t have a Canadian content; though sometimes there is a problem if they rob our producers of crews, facilities, etc. On the other hand, there is an advantage, in that our crews get to work with higher professional people from American and other industries.

We made films last year whose quality we aren’t too happy about because they were made with inferior crews. Our aim is that we sought to attempt to keep the lid on the growth in 1980. We think we can keep it at about $150 million, or a little lower.

At the beginning of last year, we were worried about whether we could find $100 million. About half the way through, it became clear that we would be able to get to $150 million. There were some films that went down the drain and got a lot of publicity, but they were the exceptions; though sometimes there is a problem if they rob our producers of crews, facilities, etc.

I think money will be easier this year and the problem will be to see if we can’t, as an industry, keep films that shouldn’t be made from being made. Sometimes films get made just because the dollars are there, and they are crappy films.

Given the vast number of films being made, how many are films by Canadians? Many seem suspiciously mid-Atlantic and awkward . . .

The purpose of the CFDC, when it was established by parliament, was a cultural one. It is reasonably clear, however, that in our view film is a mass cultural instrument. In other words, we could not feel we were succeeding in our cultural role if we made films that very few people were interested in seeing. That is, directors, writers, producers — surely could feel that they were succeeding if they were communicating with a limited number of people. Also, the cultural role we assume to be partly within Canada — that is, using film to talk to Canadians about themselves — is part of the Films outside Canada — that is, talking to the world about who we are and the way we live.

Clearly, it was not the intention of parliament that this mass medium should be forever sustained on the Government purse — at least by the CFDC. It may well be
that organizations like the CBC and the National Film Board should be an ongoing cultural subsidy role, but it was clear to us that our Act required that we develop an industry. We assumed that to mean a self-sustaining industry.

So, we set out by saying, “We want activity, we want films made and we want filmmakers — be they writers, directors, cinematographers, producers or actors — to practise their art.” We recognize that the result is that, out of the films produced in any given year, the majority will probably not be about Canadian themes. They will be made by Canadians and a significant number of them, we hope and expect, will be about traditional Canadian themes.

We have a problem living next door to the Americans, in that they are our biggest market, and our similarities as a people are much greater than our differences. A film with an urban setting in Canada may not be vastly different from one located in the U.S.

We have seen in the first couple of years of this policy a lot of films made which have this look of coming from nowhere. We have decided we are going to look at three categories of films: (1) films that really are about Canada, such as Suzanne, Surfacing and Fantastica, (2) films that are necessarily non-Canadian in their location and theme, such as Atlantic City USA, which Louis Malle is directing for Daniel Heroux; and (3) films like City on Fire, where the location could be anywhere, and you could make in Cleveland instead of Toronto. We will be announcing this year that we are not prepared to go into films where producers gratuitously choose non-Canadian locations.

I saw two or three films of last year’s productions where I was quite pleased with the fact that the producer had, even though the theme may be international, a Canadian basis to the film. In Circle of Two with Richard Burton and Tatum O’Neal, Burton plays an artist living in Toronto. It is quite clear it is Toronto. Then I saw Final Assignment, with Genevieve Bujold, Michael York and Colleen Dewhurst. That film is set mostly in the Soviet Union, though it was shot in Montreal. It is about a Canadian television reporter who goes over to the Soviet Union to interview the Soviet Prime Minister and gets caught up with dissidents. In 1978, people would have been tempted to say, “Well, let’s make her an American reporter instead, and let’s have Richard Burton as an artist in New York.” It is that kind of situation on which we intend to clamp down. We just won’t invest if they use a non-Canadian location when it could, just as easily, be Canada on the screen.

I really don’t want to restrict the capabilities of producers and directors to make films other than ones about Canada, but we will probably give special consideration, if for no other reason than political, to people who have themes that are Canadian. We had doubts, say, about Atlantic City USA, but I wanted Malle to work in the country, and liked John Kemeny and Daniel Heroux as long-term producers in the industry. There were a lot of reasons why we should do it.

On the other hand, what do we make of a film called Incident at Northampton, written by Bill Frueet’s wife and directed by Bill, and is essentially a horror film? Though set in Ontario, it could be shot anywhere. So, do I call that a Canadian film? Every element in the film is Canadian — there isn’t an American or a non-Canadian near the goddamned thing — but it’s not Canadian in the sense that there are any beavers or moose or maple leaves around.

I always come back to Alan King, as he is surely the prototype Canadian filmmaker. He says, “I’ve been making films all my life, and if you asked me to make a Canadian film, I wouldn’t know how to do it: I wouldn’t know where to start.”

One thing I can say is that we certainly turn down productions where we believe the Canadian producer is a front for some Americans.

Has that happened?

I believe it has, but I am not prepared to name the films right now. We try at the CFDC to make a judgment by examining the contracts and by talking to the people. The Secretary of State’s Department certified these films and they do the checking, but I don’t believe that the certification office is sufficiently strong or tough. I think some films made in Canada last year should be blown out of the water. In other words, we should have refused to give them certification as Canadian films. We have been conned a couple of times and we won’t go with those people again.

But, I want to qualify this on the other side: I believe it is important we not develop a “Fortress Canada” mentality. We must recognize that the film business is international, that we haven’t been in it for very long, and that there are a lot of people out there from whom we can learn. And when you bring in Louis Malle as a director, or indeed John Huston, John Guillermoin or Jules Dassin, our producers and crews can learn from these people.

The Directors’ Guild is forever landing on our neck about American or non-Canadian directors coming into the country. I take a look and say, “Last year we were involved in 42 films, and only on four of them were there non-Canadian directors, and each was a distinguished international director.” I think we gained something, and it would be sad if the pressure from the Directors’ Guild, or whoever, forced them out of the country.

So, there is a balance you have to find. I want Americans to help us. I want Americans involved in a lot of aspects of our films. You need talented foreigners working with you, because you learn from them. Too often, we hide behind our nationalism to protect mediocrity. Too often, all it really means is we are afraid to get out there and compete.
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Publicity still for Ivan Reitman's run-away success, Meatballs.
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A total of 70 films completed principal photography in 1979, whereas a couple of years before there were only three or four made a year — that's a big jump.

The other aspect of making films in Canada, as opposed to anywhere else, is that we are next door to the U.S. Now, our dollar is 85c of the American dollar, so the Americans get 15 per cent on their dollar here. For an American producer making a $2 million film, 15 per cent is a lot of money. So it makes sense for him, if he can find a certain level of competence, to come up here and make a film.

Another point is that Canada has co-production treaties with Britain, France, Germany and Israel. These countries have all been making films for years, but now their industries are in various states of collapse or disarray. So they say, “Okay, we have a treaty with Canada, so how can we con Canada into raising half the money? Then, we'll send all the good technicians, etc.”

In terms of the British co-

productions, there have been 10, with four Canadian directors being involved. Four out of 10 is not bad, and there is a balance, considering how the British have been going a lot longer than we have. As for the French co-productions, the score is one Canadian director in 10 films, whereas the Italians come in with 0 out of three. Overall, you have five Canadian directors out of 23 co-productions, which is lousy.

But, if the directors are in bad shape, the writers are in worse shape. They have not been involved in co-productions anywhere near the extent as directors.

What kind of films are being made with the Capital Cost Allowance money?

They used to say you either played tennis to win or to practise.

At the moment, we are making features to practise. If you are a country that used to make five feature films a year and you are suddenly making 70, there is the problem of people not under­ standing all the mechanics of making features. So I wouldn't be as harsh as some of the people are on the resulting films. We have been playing tennis to practise, and hopefully we are going to start playing to win.

Does that mean making more films like “Meatballs”?

Meatballs is a winner. Producer Ivan Reitman has made several films, and doing Meatballs is no surprise — you can’t lose them all! Ivan has been playing to win since he started, and he claims to be the only person of those who got money out of the CFDC to have put money back in profit.

How successfully have Canadian storytellers been telling their own stories?

We have been practising the craft of making films; we haven’t been making films that have a great deal with being culturally relevant. The films are primarily features, from scripts that come from everywhere in the world except Canada.

The other thing is that there has been a kind of a myth — and this is another dangerous development in Canada — that if you want to communicate to people, then you have to have some people with whom you can communicate. To the Canadian filmmaker, this means communicating not only with Canadians, but Americans as well. There are so many similarities between Canadians and Americans, and people like Charlton Heston, Marilyn Monroe and Marlon Brando are stars to an ordinary Canadian. So, if a Canadian is trying to reach ordinary Canadians, he has to deal with their stars, their images — that is, American stars. Canadians also think of their own market as being very limited, the way French Canadians, or Swedes or Danes, think of their market as being very specific.

The really dangerous thing in the development of any kind of Canadian film is the type of people involved in producing the films. These people, by and large, have a financial expertise, some of
them being chartered accountants and others lawyers. There are five large brokerage houses in Canada and when you go before them you need a package that the brokers understand. Say you have Glenn Ford in your package: well the guy you are dealing with, who may be in his fifties, probably remembers Glenn Ford from the time when he was in his teens and was going to films. Mind you, he hasn’t been to a film for 30 years, and he has no idea whether Glenn Ford is box-office or not. But he does remember him. So there are certain names who may be nowhere, who may not be able to get arrested in the contemporary film business, but there are brokers in Canada who have heard of them.

Now the problem there is a unique form of censorship. You don’t have people in this country who are working at producing, they are working at selling. It is a necessary thing to make the financing happen, but it is not the whole story.

In Canada now, the directors — even the art directors and assistant directors — are saying they are not interested in working on films like those we have been working on; they want to work on something that has some meaning. You have directors saying, “Do you know a good producer, because I have this neat idea that will make a great feature film?”, because they can’t find a producer in Canada who is interested in movies.

Is it also possible that the scene is becoming very bunched up at the expensive end of the market and that there isn’t a low-budget stream?

That’s another aspect. If you have people who are primarily interested in financing, and if you have a situation where the downside risk of an investment is taken care of by the Government’s marvellous plan, the emphasis is not on putting the money on the screen, but on getting enough money out of the project before the whole industry falls apart so that you won’t ever have to work again.

People are working on percentages, so the higher the budget, the higher your percentage. Take Midnight Matinee as an example. It is being produced now for $7.5 million and the director is being paid $700,000. When that film was first written, 10 years ago, believe it or not, there was a Canadian director who picked it up and said his entire budget was $700,000. That was 10 years ago, but it would not have been more than $700,000 five years ago. That film does not require a budget of $7.5 million. People inflate budgets for all the wrong reasons. People say, “What are the negative and the above-the-line costs?”

Another thing, and it’s related to the inflated budgets, is that there are certain people walking around in this country saying there aren’t any Canadian directors who can handle a $6 million feature. The truth is, there aren’t many producers who can handle a $6 million feature. As a result, you have an industry which — in terms of the development of directors — is rather static: as the budgets go up, they cling to the guys who have done it before. They are not interested in bringing in guys who have never done it before, or the guys who have done television.

As far as the Guild is concerned, the country has a very good record of producing directors. Canadian directors have gone all over the world, working on television, film, theatre — everything. It is not that we don’t have talent, but we are not geared to developing that talent.

We are geared to making money while the money lasts, and making “sure things” in a market where there is no such thing as a “sure thing”.

On films made for $6 and $7 million, what are the negative and the above-the-line costs?

Take Midnight Matinee as an example. Why is it being shot for $7.5 million when it could have been shot with a first-class international star to head it up, for something like $2 million. In that $7.5 million, the below-the-line budget is $2 million.

So there is $5.5 million worth of high-priced help . . .

Yes. You take $700,000 for the director, which is a bit phenomenal, and $1,000,000 for the two stars, so you are up to $2,000,000 without really having said hello to anybody.

What is the effect of pumping up the budgets? Does that mean there is less money to go around, or that no-body is interested if you have a good idea that can be done cheaply?

Let’s come to an area which is the trickiest one of all. The Americans are making films for a market they know very well. We are not only not familiar with that marketplace, but we are not dealing with the Americans who do understand it. We are making stuff that’s geared to an aspect of the market, the made-for-television features or B-pictures; we are not dealing with the main market in the U.S.

Some people have suggested that it is what the Australian film industry should be doing; getting advance money from American television and making the “Movie of the Week” . . .

But the Australians have proven that they can make good films that people want to see. You have films that have track records in theatres. Sure there is the language problem, but that is solvable. It can’t be that much more difficult to translate from Australian than it is from Japanese!

To you, you have an industry which is making great films. But we only see the films, we don’t see the sweat, or the difficulties. The films have variety, whereas Canadian films all deal in a certain genre.

You had a Patrick White story (The Night The Prowler), which I saw here, and which was a very intellectual kind of film, and a knockout film like The Chant of Jimmy Blacksmith. Then there was an essentially entertainment film, which you wonder how the hell you got involved in, but you find you enjoyed the trip, and saying “Am I glad I’m off that ride!” That was Don’s Party.

As to the historical films, they look so much like the kind of thing we could do here. They are reminiscent of the colonial experience which we share with Australia, in the sense that we were looked upon as models and exploited for years.

In Australia, you make films over the whole spectrum or color band. We never get off the red band! Apparently there are moves to affiliate your Guild with the Directors’ Guild in Australia . . .

We are attempting to have a meeting where we discuss some kind of affiliation between the directors of the U.S., Britain, Canada and Australia, because we would like to know what’s working and what’s not. But we are not interested in finding out how things are going as far as we are concerned. I am sure the Australian directors would be interested in finding out how things are going as far as others are concerned. I am sure all of us would love to meet the American directors who have been living with the major English-speaking market all their lives, and have the kind of separation from the audience that you and we have.
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by Bob Fosse, I think he is the best director for it.

There is something about this country that has a strange ability to please because it has a kind of colonialist shame, or something else, I don’t know. I was brought up as a Canadian believing that we were superior to Americans. There was no kind of indoctrination which said Americans were people with funny Bermuda shorts and cameras, who were loud on planes and ships. Then, when England declined, so the Canada. It became confused about itself.

So, it is not a question of nationalism, but of a realization that there is a tradition here which should be continued. There certainly is a tradition in literature, and there is one in films — a documentary tradition. The documentary film is essentially a primitive form, in the sense that you don’t allow yourself to create fictions, which are acts of the imagination and, therefore, have a psychological reality. There is a tendency to say, “This is true because it happened and therefore it must be good. This is how we approach it.”

When the art of a country comes out of a tradition that is so fundamentally journalistic, based upon recorded files or what is there in front of your eyes, it suffers. One is forced to imitate. So there is this habit of imitating American action films and spy thrillers. It is a tendency to say, “This is commercial; let’s do it”, rather than working on a project that has the chance of creating an atmosphere which will then create a commercial response. We have spent the first two or three years of this particular boom imitating the Americans to the point where there is a lack of credibility in the Canadian film industry.

Any country that wants to have an industry in the U.S. shouldn’t sell out to some imitative, commercial notion of what the U.S. wants. Instead, it should concentrate on a kind of exotic expression that is universal and connects to an audience in the U.S.

What is the situation like for Canadian writers in the film industry?

We have two kinds of writers. There are those who have emerged out of the past 10 years of nationalism, and who write basically...
towns on the prairies. They are stories of place and self-consciously provincial stories about small writers who are acutely aware of Then there is the generation of documentary in their approach. Then there is the generation of Hollywood films. There is a particular Canadian vision that has showed itself in writing and literature. Brian Moore, who says he is a Canadian — he is actually Irish — feels very strongly that his vision as a writer has been shaped by living in Canada. And people like Mordecai Richler and Morley Callaghan, who have been here for years, have produced something that is definable as Canadian work. This hasn't happened in film yet. There is just not enough original work done here. The fact that we live in Canada and that Hollywood is only three hours away by plane is beside the point. It has nothing to do with Canada or Hollywood, it has to do with the work itself.

I really am a believer that the times dictate what the art is, and there is a kind of relevance which a writer must get down on paper, whether it is a story, a character, or an atmosphere. That is the thing that will really elucidate the piece. So the choice of director becomes crucial, as does how the film is produced, how the music is done or how the film is designed. All those things come out of some kind of original atmosphere and character. It doesn't necessarily come out of a good story. It is a kind of magic that happens in films and is really creative work. We are missing that stuff.

There are three essential betrayals or failures in this country. The first is the artist, for not creating on all sides, for not creating and articulating people in a place. The second is the academic community, for mystifying the national experience. It tends to do that because it doesn't have the art to interpret; it tends to mystify.

Donnan Cavin as Smitty in Circle of Two.

Falling in love: 16-year-old Sarah (Tatum O'Neal) and 60-year-old Ashley (Richard Burton). Circle of Two.
We started shooting *Silence of the North* on August 28, and finished just before Christmas. Our original estimate was 65 days, but we had to cut it because Universal felt the film's potential audience wasn't big enough to recoup $9 million; they felt it could only do $8 million.

Universal came into the film partly as a showcase for their establishment of a Canadian film operation, and partly because they thought it was an extremely good script. They were very proud of it and wanted to be associated in terms of the prestige.

The idea was developed by the producer, a Canadian, who eventually lost control of it, and Ellen Burstyn, who also lost control — if, in fact, she ever had any.

There were three or four scripts done in the U.S., none of which worked. The final script was done in Los Angeles by an American writer [Alan Palmer] who had done many scripts but had not sold a great number. It is a terrific script, and when I saw it at first draft stage I was very excited about it. So was Universal.

Below: director Alan King on location for *Silence of the North*.
I found Universal, by and large, quite good to work with. They had few anxieties about us shooting in the North — Would we get snowed in? How do you shoot in the snow? What are those cold Canadians like anyway? — but it’s true we had a few anxieties on our side as well.

How did you become involved with Universal?

I had made a film called Who Has Seen the Wind? which was screened widely at Universal. The president liked it enormously and had all his production executives screen it. Also, the executive producer on our film, Murray Shostak, who is a Canadian, either suggested me as director or supported the idea.

It sounds like Universal were looking for someone to do this project . . .

Because it is the first film a major studio had done in Canada, Universal consciously set out to make a Canadian film. Even so, Silence of the North is not as Canadian a film as I would like to make. There are aspects to it that came from Ellen Burstyn and Tom Skerritt, the two American leads, which just aren’t Canadian.

Do you regret that?

Yes. I like a great deal of what Ellen brought to the film, but the flavor is different.

When Michael McCabe quoted me as saying I couldn’t set out to make a Canadian film, he was quite right. At the same time, I don’t think I could make a non-Canadian film. If I went to Los Angeles and did a big-budget, international film it would be a big-budget, international film, but that’s a different thing.

Do you feel it has become increasingly difficult for the ordinary person to identify with, or even feel pride in, the national product . . .

Yes. I don’t know that after a while local taxpayers won’t say, “Well, what are we spending all this money for?” And things will close down and everybody will be worse off than before. That certainly was the pattern of the British film industry, which went through this process before we did.

Then came the massive state subsidies . . .

There were already things like the Film Finance Corporation at the end of the war. The Eady Plan drew a tremendous amount of American money into Britain, as did the Spanish lock-up of remittances into Spain.

Is it possible for films to do what literature has had so much trouble doing, in terms of developing nationalistic consciousness?

That is really tricky ground, because literature did not do its work under State direction, or as a
result of a conscious policy. There was no particular push given to Victorian literature to throw up Charles Dickens, who had a very large social effect. Above all, he is enormously popular.

We are having real difficulty publishing in Canada right now because, up until three years ago, publishers could do a number of prestigious books at a relatively low cost. We had a real explosion of writers, as we had in theatre. Publishers are now getting very pressured by inflation and are looking for big-market, mass-appeal books.

The anomaly, of course, is that the writers who really break out tend to appear because the activity is going on. It is an extremely Darwinian process.

I don't know how it is in Australia, but here there is always somebody who wants to put the Canadian Broadcasting Commission, the National Film Board of Canada, the Canada Council and the Canadian Film Development Corporation in one big bureaucratic structure. It would be so much better to administer, but filmmakers have lived on the bureaucratic differences and attitudes of the four different organizations, with their divergent points of view. One was also bound to be able to get something going.

How do you feel about the big budgets of Canadian films?

I think it is desirable for us to have big-budget films.

Do you mean $5 million or $6 million?

Oh, up to $12 million! It is getting enormously expensive.

How much of that is negative costs, and how much salaries?

A fair amount is salaries, and I don't think you can cut them down significantly. The stars command that kind of money, and if you are running a $10,000,000 operation you are not going to get someone for $10,000.

At the same time, I don't believe in a huge spread of income. I subscribe to the well-researched sociological theory that if you get a spread beyond the ratio of 7:1, you get a real sense of social deprivation by the guys who are getting one, compared to the guys who are getting seven. When you get that, you are going to have crime and social disorder.

We are trying to get people to give up the 7-on-up ratio spread, but right now, I don't think one can do an awful lot about it.

Are private investors sinking their money into films that they hope will fail?

I have never really bought that argument. I have sold shares in a couple of films and tried to raise money for two or three more, and there is no question that the investors are in profit on their tax deferral from the outset. Without that, they are not going to go on, because who is going to invest in something where they are certain to lose money?

At the same time, I have never seen whose eyes didn't glinten at the thought of hitting the jackpot. As they say in advertising, that jackpot is the sizzle on the steak. And you need sizzle on the steak, otherwise it doesn't matter how nutritious the tax shelter is. They could buy an oil well, but there is no sizzle in an oil well.

For that sizzle, do you need American stars?

It really is nonsense to say that you must have an American star. They are not irrelevant, but close to it. Star Wars is the biggest-grossing film ever, but nobody went to see Alec Guinness, and he was the only recognizable name in it. Superman had no names other than Marlon Brando, who had a peripheral role, and it has just topped $200 million.

So, such an argument is not valid. It is merely a security blanket for distributors and for people who want to beat you down on a deal.

Our actors, by and large, are also extremely experienced, and do more work on a professional level than most American actors. Here actors do television, theatre and film all the time, and are very hard to hire because they are so heavily booked. A major actor in the U.S., on the other hand, will only do two or three television episodes a year, and maybe a feature every two years. He will work eight or 10 weeks each year.

I have worked on a number of films where the American actors may have had a certain flash, but also a tremendous amount of self-indulgence and sloppiness. There was a lack of preparation of lines and lack of consistency in continuity, which was quite surprising. Yet the assumption is that they know better than we do.

McCabe claims that he is trying to build a Canadian star system . . .

Well, he hasn't found the right way. I don't see any sign of it.

Not even the insistence on equal billing, pay and the number of roles . . .

At the moment you can have two non-Canadians in principal roles, though there is tremendous pressure from producers to make it three. They say there aren't enough Canadian actors, and it's true. We are a little short of male leads at the moment.

There seems to be a world-wide shortage of leading men . . .

Yes and you can't correct it unless you spend money. I was never a big fan of Stewart Granger, but in some respects he was created by the British film industry. They spent a hell of a lot of money promoting him, and, if you want a star system, that's one way of doing it.

However, I don't think a star system is particularly good. I don't think Stewart Granger's contribution to the screen — other than in King Solomon's Mines — was very great.

Film is an industry fraught with insecurities and misjudgments about what is going to work. It is like gambling and not like a lot of other industries where you can predict trends easily. With films, you are always looking for the unique, but not so unique that people don't recognize its relationship to others that have gone before or are going to come after.

The distributors, for instance, really don't know what they want until it's done and given to them. When you are making a deal as a producer, it means satisfying certain criteria — evolved in Los Angeles and New York. There are many ways of slicing it and they always change. But American commitment does mean a heavy American involvement. If they have money in it, obviously they want a big say.

They also don't know our experience, so they tend to be contemptuous of us, as the British and Australians are of Australians. Furthermore, the colonial groups collude in this by feeling insecure and prone to failure, which is not so.

At the same time, involvement by American producers can be very good. They do control the distribution, and it is very hard to persuade someone to voluntarily give you a chunk of it. General Motors does not give Ford a break, even to protect itself from anti-trust suits. They are not particularly venomous about it: they are just in the business of making money for their shareholders.

Have you had a lot of carpet-baggers?

I am not sure, though I think it is probably a mistake on the part of the Government to have a structure that allows such people to operate. At the same time, it is difficult to stop them without stultifying things. It is much more difficult than people realize: how to prime the pump well, how to spend money for stimulating activity in a really healthy, judicious and effective way. One tends to either mop up after disasters or plug loopholes in the tax system.

Are you in favor of the tax deferral system?

Yes. It is without question the instrumental factor in the increase in production. Until then it was extremely difficult, if not impossible, to finance features. As soon as the law came in, there was a great deal of activity. You just can't make film without the money, not in a capitalist society. And, at the moment, I'm not sure I would like to make film in Czechoslovakia.

The difficulty with the tax deferral system is that you then get an exercise in taste by the doctors, dentists and lawyers of the country, because most of the money comes from corporations or business, but from people who are highly exposed. The films are being made for the prosperous upper-middle-class: professional people, engineers. You get a kind of film that reflects what they'll go for — to the degree that they can make an intelligent choice.
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Final word in the Film and Politics debate

Adrian Martin

Within the conservatism of Australian film culture, provocation is an important and necessary weapon. For far too long, no one has seen fit to argue with anyone else. "The music of individual voices" is not always the best tune to hear. I wrote "Film and Politics" to provoke and succeed, thanks to the strong positions and commitments of Ken Mogg and Peter Hay.

Provocation is an attractive, but dangerous tactic. It can lead one to overstate what has been hitherto unspoken in film, politics, or any combination of the two. That is why I spoke of form rather than content, non-narrative rather than narrative, sexual politics rather than political politics.

And leaving the wider political argument open here, to provisionally conclude the Film and Politics debate, I think it would be most useful to make a few remarks about how each of us, in our arguments, has conceived and constructed the category of film, and the possible ideological implications of these positions.

Berbert Brehm once said something like: things are simple once you realize things are complex. And I would say to Ken Mogg: in film as in life. Cinema is, perhaps, of all creative forms, the most heterogeneous, a technological and expressive hybrid. Because of its commercial and industrial place, it is also the most open to ideological saturation. Which is to say that I do not believe, like Mogg, in "simple and obvious" filmic facts, or "common-sense, non-political" readings.

Films are, above all, acts of language, signifying practices. Meanings must be deciphered, not skimmed off the surface. And meanings can be transformed — that's what political struggle is all about.

Mogg lacks a cinema theory which is sufficiently rigorous to describe films in terms of logic, systematicity and textual relations. The curious thing is that the people he holds up as being the masters of free artistic expression, finally beyond political determination, are precisely the ones who initially inspired the semiotic study of literary and filmic language in France — James Joyce and Jean Renoir (what film is more logical, more concerned with cultural connotations than La regie du jeu?).

For Mogg, the self is the principal source of reality, the individual is "the ultimate point of reference". But he does not canvass the possibility that the whole obsession with self, one of the defining traits of modern Western culture (e.g., popular songs like "My Way", "I Gotta Be Me", "This Is My Life"), could itself be a nod to "superb visuals" and an "engaging Maurice Jarre score", then I suggest he peruse the semiotic film analyses of Thierry Kuntzel which really get to grips with the task of reading films at all their stylistic and conceptual levels.

At a year's distance from my original article, I am prepared to accept the criticisms of my position made by Peter Hay — that I was using a "bad praxis" in wanting to demagnify narrative-commercial form grosso modo. However, I must make an essential theoretical point: Hay and I are floundering on either side of an artificial and unproductive form/content opposition.

I am similarly bothered by Mogg's enslavement of the author as he/she who knows and controls the work, who can, with will and insight, shuffle off the political coil (e.g., "Kubrick's ego"). The politics of filmmaking is not a matter of "vested interests" or conscious decisions. It is a question of the identity, the place, the power and the unconsciousness assumes in order to be a subject within a given society. Kubrick is only a cog in the cinema-machine, which further has its place in the larger machines of our culture.

Films cannot be "reality-tested", as Mogg claims, for reality is itself constructed in relations of meaning, places, positions. One gains insight only through working inside these relations, not im-
Compiled by Terry Bourke

**United States**

The 11-week long Screen Actors Guild strike ended late October and the almost-dormant Hollywood and New York production scenes quickly regained momentum as 22 feature films resumed shooting, with another five new projects getting underway within 10 days of the resumption.

Several planned films were cancelled because of the strike, including the big-budgeted Mariniun, to have been directed by Japan's Hiroki Adachi with an American-Japanese cast.

Other casualties included John Byrum's Mercyville, Jan Camer's Duel in the Stars and Burgess Meredith's Return to Paradise.

Fred Schepisi got underway with his mythical western Barbarosa for Lord Lew Grade. Willie Nelson and Gary Busey play the key roles. Tragedy struck the Texas location in the fourth week of shooting when two crew members and a woman visitor were killed in a car crash after a Saturday-night party.

There is plenty of American production activity preceding Christmas, with 14 features starting in November and December, and another 16 with January start-dates confirmed, 12 in February and nine in March.

Colin Higgins, writer of Harold and Maude and Silver Streak and writer-director of Foul Play, has begun principal photography on his second film, Prince of the City, currently shooting in Three Mile Island, Pennsylvania. The film, about the corruption at the Three Mile Island nuclear plant, is a spin-off of his 1971 feature, The Parallax View.

Director Sidney Lumet, who directed the popular political thriller Network, is now directing the courtroom drama The Offense. The film stars Al Pacino as a man on trial for the murder of a police officer. The Offense is based on the true story of a man who was convicted of murder in the 1970s, but was later cleared by a retrial.

Barbra Streisand is to direct and star in The Way We Were, a romantic drama about a couple in the 1930s and 40s. The film is based on the novel by Arthur Hirsh, and is expected to be released in the fall of 1985.

American director Richard Donner is directing The Goonies, a family adventure film about a group of kids who discover a treasure map and set out to find the legendary Goonies Island. The film features a star-studded cast including Sean Astin, Corey Feldman, and Jonathan Taylor Thomas.

Director John Cassavetes is directing a new film titled A Woman Under the Influence. The film is a psychological thriller about a woman who is driven to madness by her own inner demons.

Director Steven Spielberg is directing a sequel to his 1997 film Jurassic Park titled The Lost World. The film is set 55 million years after the events of the first film and will feature new dinosaurs and continue the story of the original characters.

**International**

**United States**

Cunningham (Friday the 13th), Ridge Run; Peter Yates (Breaking Away), The Dragons of Krull; Steve Shagan, Playback.

Candice Bergen and Jacqueline Bisset have finished Rich and Famous with Robert Mulligan directing; Lawrence Kasdan has written and directed Body Heat; William Ascher, Thrilled to Death; Frank Gacy, Jackpot; Glenn Jordan, Only When I Laugh.

Ridley Scott (The Duellists, Alien) will direct Dune after he completes Blade Runner; Vernon Zimmerman, who directed Wagg Wagg's Linda Kerridge in Fade to Black, is preparing Kyle: The American.

Novelist-scr iptwriter Max Robinowitz makes his debut as a producer-director with the $9 million The Concrete Zoo, based on his 1976 award-winning novel. Patrick Pittelli is directing Jambulaya for producer Erich Williams (Darryl Zanuck's former right-hand man at Twentieth Century-Fox).

Australian director Phillipine Mora has abandoned plans for Errol Flynn: The Untold Years, a film based on former Sydney journalist Charles Higham's controversial biography of the hell-raising Aussie actor, now that CBS has announced a mini-series on Flynn's autobiography My Wicked, Wicked Ways. Mora (Mad Dog Morgan) is preparing a horror-thriller, The Beast Within, to be shot in the U.S.

Steve Gordon is directing Dudley Moore and Liza Minnelli in Arthur, for Orion Pictures-Warner Bros. with some investment backing from United American and Australasian Productions Pty Ltd. A Sydney firm headed by insurance broker David Thomas and Perth lawyer John Picton Warlow. UAAP was an initial investor in Orion's Under the Rainbow (starring Chevy Chase, Carrie Fisher, directed by Steve Fash), but withdrew from the financing.

Warner Bros finally announced cancellation of The Thorn Birds when "third" director Arthur Hiller (following Herbert Ross and Peter Weir) quit the production as the budget soared to an estimated $32.8 million. Warners will now make a four-episode mini-series around Diehl's best-selling police novel.

American director Sam Fuller (The Big Red One) plans to shoot his next film, the Tunnel, on location in Yugoslavia. The World War II action-drama deals with the German occupation of Yugoslavia, and the construction of a mammoth tunnel by prisoners under the orders of the German occupation forces.

Director C.B. Griffiths is shooting exteriors for House of a Hundred Horrors in Spain and Germany, with interiors in Hollywood.

American director Sam Fuller (The Big Red One) plans to shoot his next film, the Tunnel, on location in Yugoslavia. The World War II action-drama deals with the German occupation of Yugoslavia, and the construction of a mammoth tunnel by prisoners under the orders of the German occupation forces.

Director C.B. Griffiths is shooting exteriors for House of a Hundred Horrors in Spain and Germany, with interiors in Hollywood.
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American director Sam Fuller (The Big Red One) plans to shoot his next film, the Tunnel, on location in Yugoslavia. The World War II action-drama deals with the German occupation of Yugoslavia, and the construction of a mammoth tunnel by prisoners under the orders of the German occupation forces.
**Britain**

Production on the British scene continues to be dominated by American finance, with no signs of any real infusion of local funds.

One significant domestic contribution is the £4.6 million EMIL-National Film Finance Corporation-Memorial Films-Memoirs of a Survivor, starring Julie Christie and directed by David Gladwell. The film is based on the famous novel by Doris Lessing, with ex-actor Michael Medwin acting as producer.

**Miloš Forman continues with Ragtime**, while other American-financed continuations in Britain include Karel Reisz's 'The French Lieutenant's Woman; Norman J. Warren, Insomniad, Steven Spielberg, Raiders of the Lost Ark, Peter Hyams, Outland.

Further American-financed input is imminent as George Lucas and Gary Kurtz start pre-production on the third film in the *Star Wars* saga, *Revenge of the Jedi*. Star Wars and its greatly successful sequel, *The Empire Strikes Back*, were filmed mostly in Britain, providing nearly four years of work for studios and technicians.

Influx of major special effects and input for the new genre of *Your Eyes Only* (directed by John Gien) will help the London studio scene in early 1981. Harold Orton is directing *4D Kids* and Jim Henson again helms *The Great Muppet Caper*.

**Canada**

Canadian filmmakers will try to forget the big slump of 1980, and hope for better things in 1981.

In a year of bitter union and co-production treaty wrangles, Canadian production dropped dramatically after the big slump of 1980, and hope for the rapid gains in 1978 and 1979. Production treaty negotiations will stop their progress, and Canadian filmmakers will try to forget the rather barren year awaits their work for the industry.

Four years of work for studios and technicians will continue to be dominated by American film. *The French Lieutenant's Woman*; *Star Wars*; *Spielberg*, and Jim Henson again helms *The Muppet Caper*. *Muppets in their second film, *A Day in a Cab*, starring Burt Reynolds*. *Floria de la Lucre's The Last Chase* (Leo Majors, Burgess Meredith, Chris Makepeace), has been shot. Canadian-American interests and will direct an early 1981 screen version with Deakin Hoffman in the lead role.

Michel Amoussou has finally finished *Belis* (starring Richard Chamberlain). *Belis* looms as Canada's best prospect for provincial courts have thrown out nine obscenity charges against five films in the past two months, and Italian film critics are pretty hopeful the work of Canadian and American interests will direct an early 1981 screen version with Deakin Hoffman in the lead role.

Jerry Goldsmith has been in Rome scoring *The Salamander*, directed by Peter Zinner from the book by Australian novelist Morris West.

Spanish producer-director Abel Garcia is checking locations in Milan and Sorrento for his contemporary thriller *The Dead Are Many*. Garcia's 1976 thriller, *The Killing Fields*, is still held in Spain, but had good runs in Italian cinemas last year.

**Spain**

Spanish production levelled off towards the end of 1980, after what local producers term "an average year", although they admitted several planned and France did not come to fruition.

Italy's interest in Spanish co-productions continued with a late-November start on *When Love is Poison*, directed by Italian Stefano Rella in Madrid, with a predominantly Spanish cast.

Jorge Allamand is shooting *Caesar's Ghost*; *Lebre, Manilla, Castaneda, Alfredo Bombilil*, *The Nicest People are Bad, Nestor Alendro, Change of Skies*, *Nami Palandro, Escape at Balana Point*.

Juan Antonio Bardem's *Days of Heaven*: *Lebre, Manilla, Castaneda, Alfredo Bombilil*, *The Nicest People are Bad, Nestor Alendro, Change of Skies*, *Nami Palandro, Escape at Balana Point*.

Jorge Allamand is shooting *Caesar's Ghost*; *Lebre, Manilla, Castaneda, Alfredo Bombilil*, *The Nicest People are Bad, Nestor Alendro, Change of Skies*, *Nami Palandro, Escape at Balana Point*.

**India**

Sir Richard Attenborough holds the line against5, by Cuba, and will make his first feature film, a $4.5 million adventure-drama which

**Cuba**

Cuba has announced plans for its biggest-ever film, *Cecilia Valdes*, a $4.5 million costume-adventure-drama which
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An international star’s Australian debut

KEM the sophisticated German editing system has proved itself as a vital tool in Hollywood film production.

KEM now introduces versatility and economy to the Australian film industry.

FILMWEST, the sole import agents in Australia and Asia can supply a full range of KEM tables, and provide interchangeable modules for S8, 16mm S16 and 35mm picture and sound editing as you need them.

The KEM RS8-16 8-plate twin pic editing table is available to producers for a free demonstration and trial.

KEM & FILMWEST, the state of the art.

For information and appointments contact:
FILMWEST Equipment Pty Ltd
7 Bowman Street
South Perth
Western Australia 6151
Phone 367 7677.
Cable ‘Filmwest’ Perth
Telex AA 94150 FILMWA

KEM & FILMWEST Pte Ltd
Suite 1S5, Raffles Hotel
1*3 Beach Road
Singapore 0718
Phone 336 1509, 332 8041
Cable ‘Raffles’
Telex RS 21586 Raffles.

At last,
a 16mm DOUBLE HEAD projector at a reasonable price

How?
Because you buy direct from the factory.

Yes, the all new HOKUSHIN SC10 DB series is modified and tested in Australia and exported to 20 countries.

3 models to choose from. Plenty of stock.
No more service problems. No more parts problems.

To buy or rent or have your SC10 converted phone Barry Brown on (02) 4382086 now.

Decibel International. 50 Atchison Street, St. Leonards NSW 2065.
The Club

In San Francisco, a young woman, with a background of urban poverty and juvenile strike, attempts to become a fashion model. The hypocrite and double standards of society are juxtaposed against the confusion and frustration in which the struggles between a community of a woman is set for her. Surrounded by people who offer little assistance, she realizes that she is lucky to escape her past.

SYNOPSIS:
A young woman with a background of urban poverty and juvenile strike attempts to become a fashion model. The hypocrisy and double standards of society are juxtaposed against the confusion and frustration in which the struggles between a community of a woman is set for her. Surrounded by people who offer little assistance, she realizes that she is lucky to escape her past.

THE CLUB

Produced by: South Australian Film Corporation
Directed by: William Anderson
Screenplay by: Bill Emms
Production design: Henry Salter
Costumes: Virginie Bleneman
Music: Cameron Allen
Casting: David Copping
Sound: Steve Andrews
Editor: Henry Salter
Camera operator: Steven Goddard
Production manager: Camilla O’Sullivan
Stunts co-ordinator: Peter Armstrong
Art director: David Copping
DOP: Peter Smith
Production manager: Craig Lahiff
Synopsis: A young woman with a background of urban poverty and juvenile strike attempts to become a fashion model. The hypocrisy and double standards of society are juxtaposed against the confusion and frustration in which the struggles between a community of a woman is set for her. Surrounded by people who offer little assistance, she realizes that she is lucky to escape her past.

THE JOKER

Produced by: Peter Smith Films
Directed by: David A. E. Smith
Screenplay by: Kay Self
Production design: Craig Lahiff
Costumes: Virginia Bleneman
Music: Cameron Allen
Casting: David Copping
Sound: Steve Andrews
Editor: Henry Salter
Camera operator: Steven Goddard
Production manager: Camilla O’Sullivan
Stunts co-ordinator: Peter Armstrong
Art director: David Copping
DOP: Peter Smith
Production manager: Craig Lahiff
Synopsis: A young woman with a background of urban poverty and juvenile strike attempts to become a fashion model. The hypocrisy and double standards of society are juxtaposed against the confusion and frustration in which the struggles between a community of a woman is set for her. Surrounded by people who offer little assistance, she realizes that she is lucky to escape her past.

THE DEVIL IN ME

Produced by: Richard Davis
Directed by: Richard Davis
Screenplay by: Richard Davis
Production design: Craig Lahiff
Costumes: Virginia Bleneman
Music: Cameron Allen
Casting: David Copping
Sound: Steve Andrews
Editor: Henry Salter
Camera operator: Steven Goddard
Production manager: Camilla O’Sullivan
Stunts co-ordinator: Peter Armstrong
Art director: David Copping
DOP: Peter Smith
Production manager: Craig Lahiff
Synopsis: A young woman with a background of urban poverty and juvenile strike attempts to become a fashion model. The hypocrisy and double standards of society are juxtaposed against the confusion and frustration in which the struggles between a community of a woman is set for her. Surrounded by people who offer little assistance, she realizes that she is lucky to escape her past.

THE MOVIE

Produced by: Michael Robertson
Directed by: Michael Robertson
Screenplay by: Michael Robertson
Production design: Craig Lahiff
Costumes: Virginia Bleneman
Music: Cameron Allen
Casting: David Copping
Sound: Steve Andrews
Editor: Henry Salter
Camera operator: Steven Goddard
Production manager: Camilla O’Sullivan
Stunts co-ordinator: Peter Armstrong
Art director: David Copping
DOP: Peter Smith
Production manager: Craig Lahiff
Synopsis: A young woman with a background of urban poverty and juvenile strike attempts to become a fashion model. The hypocrisy and double standards of society are juxtaposed against the confusion and frustration in which the struggles between a community of a woman is set for her. Surrounded by people who offer little assistance, she realizes that she is lucky to escape her past.

THE DEVIL IN ME

Produced by: Richard Davis
Directed by: Richard Davis
Screenplay by: Richard Davis
Production design: Craig Lahiff
Costumes: Virginia Bleneman
Music: Cameron Allen
Casting: David Copping
Sound: Steve Andrews
Editor: Henry Salter
Camera operator: Steven Goddard
Production manager: Camilla O’Sullivan
Stunts co-ordinator: Peter Armstrong
Art director: David Copping
DOP: Peter Smith
Production manager: Craig Lahiff
Synopsis: A young woman with a background of urban poverty and juvenile strike attempts to become a fashion model. The hypocrisy and double standards of society are juxtaposed against the confusion and frustration in which the struggles between a community of a woman is set for her. Surrounded by people who offer little assistance, she realizes that she is lucky to escape her past.

THE DEVIL IN ME

Produced by: Michael Robertson
Directed by: Michael Robertson
Screenplay by: Michael Robertson
Production design: Craig Lahiff
Costumes: Virginia Bleneman
Music: Cameron Allen
Casting: David Copping
Sound: Steve Andrews
Editor: Henry Salter
Camera operator: Steven Goddard
Production manager: Camilla O’Sullivan
Stunts co-ordinator: Peter Armstrong
Art director: David Copping
DOP: Peter Smith
Production manager: Craig Lahiff
Synopsis: A young woman with a background of urban poverty and juvenile strike attempts to become a fashion model. The hypocrisy and double standards of society are juxtaposed against the confusion and frustration in which the struggles between a community of a woman is set for her. Surrounded by people who offer little assistance, she realizes that she is lucky to escape her past.
A Business Like Investment
Dirty Harry

Support for policies that challenge those of:

Gauge .....................................................16mm

Scheduled release ..........December, 1980

Additional photography .............Louis Irving

Camera operators ................Shaun Brown,
Composer................................................Shaun Brown

Scriptwriter..............................................Shaun Brown

Sound recordist ......................Adrian Brady

Narrator ......................................................Peter Gwynne

Mixer .........................................Peter Fenton

Original music and

lyrics ...................................Dennis Kevans,

Based on the

produced by.................................Shaun Brown

Prod, company ... Archival Film Program

Length ................................................90 mins

Neg. matching ......................Jackie Gelling

Editor ...........................................Jim Stevens

Photography ..........................Martha Ansara

Director .....................................Paul Williams

Prod, company ..................................Galfilms

Length ................................................50 mins

Budget ...................................................$46,000

Dist. company ..................inma Productions

Sound recordist ..........John Hollingshead

Assoc, producer ....................Bryan Gracey

Prod, manager .......................Quentin Gray
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Pyral Magnetic Film

16mm, 17.5mm, 35mm

ACETATE OR POLYESTER

Available from:

MAGNA-TECHtronics (Aust.) Pty. Limited
14 Whiting Street, Artarmon, NSW 2064
Telephone 438 3377

SOUND STAGE STUDIO
356 for Hire

Suitable for video — stills — film clips or rehearsals for orchestras.

• 33' x 35' — 12' to 14' ceiling height
• Fixed lighting grid with power points in ceiling
• Fixed cyclorama (gyprock)
• Acoustically treated
• Air conditioned * Hot and cold water in studio
• Make-up room with hair washing basin and hot and cold water
• Kitchen, cafe-bar, fridge, stove and toilets
• Loading dock access to studio
• Drive-in ground level to studio floor
• Ample parking for trucks, semi-trailers and O.B. vans

Second sound stage egg: Roller door access suitable for truck commercials ready in February.

For bookings and information, please phone Sydney 799 3424, 798 6782, 798 5647. Telex — AA 27732.

CASH-MORE ENTERPRISES INCORPORATED
356 Liverpool Road, Ashfield, NSW 2131
Additional photography Peter Lettenmaier, Neg matching Peter Strain, Sound editor Liz Goldfinger, Mix John Lend, Animations Graham Burleigh, Budget $34,000, Length 16mm, Shooting stock Eastmancolor, Progress - Post-production, Scheduled release January 19, 1981.

SYNOPSIS: The documentary covers the historical events that led to the confrontation involving the public, environment and the Government of Australia, over the expansion of bauxite mining in Western Australia, and the building of a new alumina refinery at Wagerup in Western Australia.
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Sound recordist, Electronic sound, Scheduled release, April 1, 1981.
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A Higher Degree in Interdisciplinary Study

Applications are invited from suitably qualified graduates interested in advanced interdisciplinary study. This higher degree is especially designed for students whose interests and experience relate to a number of academic disciplines and are not easily accommodated by a traditional department of learning. The Master of General Studies can be obtained by course-work and/or research thesis, involving two years' study (4 academic sessions) part-time. The degree by research may also be completed by full-time studies. Graduate course-work offered for 1981 includes:

- AMERICAN STUDIES: Structures, conflict and change in modern USA. Emphasis in social history, political sociology, culture and society (literature, music, cinema, drama).
- CHRISTIAN BELIEF IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD: Factors relevant to the operation of Christian belief in the present through an interdisciplinary consideration of the works of certain philosophers, theologians, social and political theorists.
- PERSPECTIVES ON THE CINEMA: Major issues in current film theory and criticism. Film history, aesthetics and criticism considered in the light of theoretical concepts derived from a number of related disciplines e.g. linguistics, semiotics, psychoanalysis, sociology.

The Department of General Studies has a multi-disciplinary organisation unique in Australia, with 21 full-time members of staff representing a broad spectrum of humanistic and liberal studies as well as the social and physical sciences. The Department has an established tradition of interdisciplinary research and collaborative teaching.

Inquiries and applications should be addressed to Professor R. F. Hall, Department of General Studies, The University of New South Wales, P.O. Box 1, Kensington, 2033. Telephone (02) 662 2091.

Applications for the degree close 2 January 1981.
**Channel 0/28 Launched**

Bruce Gyngell, the first person to appear on Australian television in 1956, made it a double when he launched multicultural television, Channel 0/28, on Australia Day, October 24.

At 5:30 p.m., the new station came to life, introduced by Gyngell, chairman-designate of the new network, which is run by the Special Broadcasting Service.

Although officially a consultant to the SBS, Gyngell has tackled his new appointment enthusiastically, and has set about selling the new station. Full-page press advertisements, radio commercials, special inserts in television magazines are all part of the aggressive manner in which Channel 0/28 is approaching its emergence.

Gyngell seems determined to establish the new network as an entertaining and informative alternative to the ABC and commercial stations. Judging by the quality of many of the programs, particularly the films and dramas, there should be a large audience across the board.

The first available ratings, in fact, show that Channel 0/28, in its first full week on air, captured 3.3 per cent of the Melbourne viewing audience. The same figures reveal that the ABC's share of the viewing audience dropped, while those of the three commercial channels remained about average. According to Gyngell, Channel 0/28 won't rely solely on imported programs. He says the network could be a profit of $1.2 million could be spent on locally-produced shows.

The first local productions for Independent Multicultural Broadcasting Commission, through the Special Broadcasting Service, were two Greek language features: The Three Seaweeds and A Shoe From Your Homeland. They were made at AAV studios in Melbourne and produced by Jill Robb.

**McNair-Anderson Takeover**

ABG Research Ltd, the world's second largest audience research organization after A. O. Nielsen of the U.S., has taken over Australia's best-known audience surveyors — McNair-Anderson.

The takeover is likely to result in the introduction of meters fixed to television sets to measure television ratings, as a supplement to the existing diary system. No time limit has been set for introduction of the meters, though they are expected to be in operation within three years.

Gary Morgan, of the Roy Morgan Research Centre, protested to the Foreign Investment Review Board over the takeover. The Morgan centre, the main rival of McNair-Anderson, claimed McNair-Anderson held a monopoly on television ratings in Australia.

The contracts to conduct audience surveys for television programs, at present held by McNair-Anderson, expire next year. The contracts are negotiated individually by each station.

Morgan pioneered the use of television meter ratings devices in Australia more than two years ago, and holds world patents on a locally-developed system claimed to be more advanced than those used in other countries. Television executives believe there is need for a combination of the meter and diary systems.

Christopher Muir, executive producer in charge of ABC drama, was appointed to ABC's Playbox to head the new network as an enterprising and informative alternative to the ABC and commercial stations. He has recently been producing and directing the series Music Around Australia.

Talking to the Melbourne Age about his new appointment, Muir said he believed in absolute accuracy in detail, and that "not to the detriment of the drama line".

"Using the costume drama seems to me to be a little like looking at life through the wrong end of the telescope," he commented.

**Penguins For VFC**

The Victorian Film Corporation took top honors in the 21st Annual Television Society Penguin Awards. The VFC took a major award for its highly-praised documentary Do Not Pass Go. A Penguin was awarded for Best Documentary, and the HSV Award for Best Television Documentary and Best Direction went to VFC. The Victorian Film Corporation took top honors in the 21st Annual Television Society Penguin Awards. The VFC took a major award for its highly-praised documentary Do Not Pass Go. A Penguin was awarded for Best Documentary, and the HSV Award for Best Television Documentary and Best Direction went to VFC.
Water Under the Bridge, the nine-hour, $1.5 million drama series based on expatiate author Sumner Locke Elliott’s novel, started on Channel 10 on September 25 to a fanfare of critical superlatives. Brought here from New York to help promote the series, Sumner Locke Elliott told Age ‘Green Guide’ journalist Barbara Hooks that the series had moved him to tears; technically it was “as good, if not better than BBC masterpiece The Guide’.”

Three weeks later Brian Courtis headlined his Age column with the accusation “Ratings Sink a Quality Series”. The series had flapped and the blame was being laid on the viewers.

Was Water Under the Bridge too good for philistine ocker viewers, or was it simply too boring?

On the surface, Water Under the Bridge had a lot going for it. First the story itself: set in Sydney in the nostalgia-ridden years between 1932 and the late 1940s, it contrasted seedy Kings Cross boarding-house life with the seamy high life of Point Piper socialites, and pepped up the mixture with doses of sentimental melodrama and showbiz. Maybe not BBC, but certainly 1940s Hollywood, and few would complain about that.

Then, a cast headed by three compelling actresses with star quality: Robyn Nevin, Judy Davis and Jacki Weaver; a producer, John McRae, with a string of quality British productions behind him; and a budget enabling McRae to make the series a nostalgia trip as authentic as money would allow.

So why did it fail?

The plain fact is that, in spite of all the series had in its favor, it was simply boring. It didn’t achieve what we expect of even B-grade Hollywood: the excitement that is generated by clearly-defined heroes and/or heroines propelled by a strong storyline and backed up by a convincing cast and locations.

In Water Under the Bridge none of the three leading women — Shasta (Robyn Nevin), Carrie (Judy Davis), and Maggie (Jacki Weaver) — was focused upon in a consistently involving way. Instead, the fortunes of all three were dealt with in a curiously cursory fashion. Bits of their lives surfaced, but then each dropped from view: Carrie sank without trace in the second last episode; Maggie was brought to the screen only to display her romantic disasters; and the most important years of Shasta’s life — her fifteen-year struggle to raise the orphaned Neil (David Cameron) — disappeared in a two-minute advertising break.

Of the men, only Neil’s fortunes were central to the story, yet even Neil was, in Sumner Locke Elliott’s words, “a rotten part . . . such a dull character”. Instead of Bogart, all they were offered were the floundering Neilie, the ineffectual T. C. Shallcott (Peter Whatford), and the psychologically-troubled Ben Mazzini (Chris Milne) and Don Brandywine (Rod Mullinar).

Not even the wise-cracking Maggie McGhee (Jacki Weaver), the tough lady journos with a heart of gold in the Hollywood role played so often by Eve Arden and Betty Garrett, could compensate for the confusion of viewers’ expectations generated by that first episode.

From there on, viewers who stuck with the series had to live with a script that meandered on our screens. It was as a prematurely-aged harridan, stooped over a frying pan with a fig drooping from her lower lip. The result: instant viewer alienation.

The shock of this transition also deepened the dramatic impact of the crucial Mazzini party. To viewers still dreading their eyes over Neil’s parents’ deaths, the party came as an irritating and confusing digression. Why were we having to put up with new characters like the loathsome Archie Eagles (John Howard), and the Flagg sisters, Ila (Linden Wilkinson) and Geraldine (Jan Hamilton), who seemed to be having a party on a vaudevillian routine? There were, in addition, the extraordinary Mazzini sisters, Honor (Rowena Wallace) and Carrie (Judy Davis), who seemed to have stepped out of an altogether more sophisticated Hollywood genre — The Big Sleep perhaps?

Sure enough, before the end of the seemingly endless first episode, there was a brutal murder and Honor and Carrie were behaving more like Raymond Chandler ladies than ever. But if this was where the plot was headed, where was Philip Marlow? Instead of Bogart, all they were offered were the floundering Neilie, the ineffectual T. C. Shallcott (Peter Whatford), and the psychologically-troubled Ben Mazzini (Chris Milne) and Don Brandywine (Rod Mullinar).

Not even the wise-cracking Maggie McGhee (Jacki Weaver), the tough lady journos with a heart of gold in the Hollywood role played so often by Eve Arden and Betty Garrett, could compensate for the confusion of viewers’ expectations generated by that first episode.

From there on, viewers who stuck with the series had to live with a script that meandered...
Honor (Rowena Wallace) and Ben Mazzini (Chris Milne). Gamely spitting out the last line of the script on her own in boarding-house; even the adorable stroke, is abandoned by Neil in a nursing home, pensate; and finally Shasta, paralysed by a bed; Chauncey (Penelope Shelton), the Kings your own: Mrs Mazzini gurgling in a hospital hypochondriac^ on her own, in the Blue Mountains, the second on the Manly ferry; and in true Hollywood style the passengers applauded. Ila and Germ (Geraldine) continued to provide comic relief, helped sometimes by their mid father, played, inexplicably, by the youthful Ralph Cotterill (even one of the characters remarked that he looked more like their brother).

This slowly-paced script was worryingly at odds with the bizarre events unfolding in the story, where deaths were piling up at a Shakespearean rate. Flu had carried off Uke (Peita Toppano) and Pete (Sean Scully) in the first hour, and they were followed by most of the men in the story: Luigi Mazzini (Frank Gallacher), murdered; Ben Mazzini (Chris Milne), in a car crash; T.C. (Peter Whitford), in a plane crash; Don Brandywine (Rod Mullinar), by suicide.

For the women who survived them, the lesson was made clear. You were bound to end up on your own: Mrs Mazzini gurgling in a hospital bed; Chauncey (Penelope Shelton), the Kings Cross character who runs Neil and Shasta's boarding house, friendless in hospital; VeeVee, a hypochondriac, on her own, in the Blue Mountains; Ila, looking after Dadda, on her own: Mona (Anne Pendlebury), another ex-showgirl, on her own in boarding-house; even the adorable Maggie is left manless, and over-eating to compensate; and finally Shasta, paralysed by a stroke, is abandoned by Neil in a nursing home, gamely spitting out the last line of the script from her twisted mouth: "So long, kid".

Certainly, Carrie is last seen with a husband, but he's so murderously threatening that her future looks as bleak as Shasta's.

For this chain of events, Sumner Locke Elliott, not the scriptwriters, was responsible. The script stuck faithfully to the storyline almost to the end, even reproducing verbatim most of the book's dialogue. Only the book's coda, which brings Neil and Maggie together years later, was left out — a deletion approved by Sumner Locke Elliott, who dismissed his own ending as "an anti-climax".

This unlikely story was more credible in the book, thanks to crisp writing and cross-cutting, and a style that reproduced perfectly the terse Sydney humor of the period. But stretched to nine hours of television, the story lost its punch and turned into phony, labored melodrama.

Too often it seemed that the director (Igor Auzins) and the scriptwriters were spinning out scenes to fill in time or to give the actor or actress a big scene. This destroyed the pace and ruined the dramatic unity of the series. It became a vehicle for a string of scenes from different genres. If one scene was played like an all-stops-out Hollywood musical, the next was like a scene from a gangster movie. If Judy Davis seemed to be modelling herself on the young Bette Davis, nervily chain-smoking and brittle as glass, then David Cameron seemed to have wandered in from The Sullivans. Meanwhile Robyn Nevin was giving a tour de force performance that veered from Garland to Tennessee Williams.

So, was Water Under the Bridge 'money down the drain' as some critics were heard to remark?

Not entirely. John McRae showed he can bring together an ambitious and stylish production, helped by art director Logan Brewer's ability to reproduce period settings with stunning attention to detail. The clothes, hairstyles, furnishings, even Shasta's lipstick stub, gave the series the verisimilitude we've come to expect of the best English series. And the three women stars confirmed that they have the talent and presence to warrant better-written and better-directed television roles.

But perhaps there's more to be learned from the mistakes Water Under the Bridge made: the episodes were too long; the repeated advertisements for Cuddly jarred with the series' dramatic pretensions; the script's soap-opera meanderings deprived it of the dramatic verve of a quality drama series; there were no good male roles; there was no hero or heroine with whom viewers could identify throughout; over nine hours' filming, the direction was too slow and lacking in tautness, the editing lacked style, and too many interior shots dissolved in a glowing romantic fuzz. As well, too little of Sydney was seen to establish it as the setting for the characters' lives; a handful of shots of the harbor and one or two of the Bridge were not enough to give us the city's ambience, let alone that of the Cross, which was, sadly, recognizably Carlton.

But it was brave of Channel 10 to break away from the First Fleet and bushrangers in its first big drama series. Here's hoping all the experience gained by cast and crew will be put to work on other series, preferably in a genre we all recognize as contemporary Australian. For Hollywood does Hollywood so much better. *
There is evidence of the continuing entrance of new people and companies into the television industry and of the efforts by some of the existing facilities to provide better and more diversified programming. At the same time there is a need for information about the way television signals are derived, processed and used.

The purpose in this series is to answer some of the questions commonly asked by various television staff members: creative staff, technicians, engineers, filmmakers, processing personnel and closed circuit operators, among others. We have provided information that is as uncomplicated as possible, consistent with the need to be technically accurate. By giving such simplified information, it is our intent, in this series, to promote and encourage a better understanding of basic television system information.

Other articles in this series will include:
- Making television pictures from films and slides
- Techniques of telecine video operation
- Film post-production on videotape
- Transferring videotape to film
- Film processing for television stations

**Part 1: What is Television? How Does it Work?**

The basic requirements of a television system are:

1. A camera to convert patterns of light and shade into electrical (video) signals, varying in frequency and amplitude with time.
2. A transmitter to convert the video signals into radio frequency energy, and an antenna system for radiating this energy.
3. A receiving antenna to capture a portion of the radio frequency energy from the transmitter, and a receiver to convert this energy back into video signals.
4. A picture tube capable of displaying patterns of light and shade in conformity with the varying frequencies and amplitudes of the video signals. (See Fig. 1.)

The accompanying sound must be picked up with a microphone, transmitted, received and reproduced with a loudspeaker simultaneously with the video.

In color television, the camera converts patterns of light, shade and color into video signals. At the receiving end, these signals must be capable of producing black and white pictures on monochrome receivers and color images on color receivers.

**Television System Fundamentals**

An ordinary scene consists of a great many picture elements or items of information. These elements are seen at the same time by the eye. Fortunately, for television purposes, it is not necessary to transmit all the elements of a picture at the same time. Picture elements may be reproduced sequentially — that is, one after another — providing that the action is carried on at a sufficiently rapid rate.

This is the basic principle of the television scanning process.

The human eye is capable of receiving a partial image and interpreting it as a complete image. This is known as persistence of vision. By successively presenting picture elements to the eye at a rate within the visual persistence interval, the eye and brain interpret them as if all of the picture elements were presented simultaneously.

A number of different methods may be employed to transmit television pictures. The method that has been adopted is known as horizontal interlaced scanning in which the images are broken up into horizontal lines traced out by a scanning beam travelling at a very rapid rate. (See Fig. 2.)

In Australia, a complete picture is transmitted 25 times every second. In the scanning process, the information in the picture elements is transmitted in the form of a rapidly-changing stream of electrical variations known as the video signal.

**Television Cameras** (See Fig. 3.)

A color television camera has three electron tubes to provide red, green and blue signal outputs. The lens forms an optical image on the photoconductive layer on the faceplate of each electron tube.

Inside each tube a sharply-focused beam of...
Camera Control Unit

Each camera in a studio must be connected by a cable to a camera control unit. Through this cable, horizontal and vertical driving pulses are fed to the camera from the station synchronizing generator, and the picture signal, along with the camera blanking pulses, is fed back to the camera control unit. (See Fig. 5.)

In the camera control unit, the picture signals are amplified to the standard distribution level and displayed on picture and waveform monitors.

The picture monitor in the camera control unit displays the pictures from the camera on a receiver-type tube, usually 10 inches (25.4 cm) in diameter. The circuitry for the picture monitor is similar to that found in a home receiver. Video signals are received by picture monitors directly from a video amplifier via co-axial cable, whereas in a home receiver the video signals must be extracted from a high-frequency modulated carrier before being applied to the picture tube.

It is customary to underscan picture monitor tubes so that the entire rectangular raster generated by the camera may be viewed on the monitor. Usually, a rectangular mask is placed over the picture tube, with the raster area appearing just inside the edges of the mask.

Waveform Monitor

The pictures appearing on monitors in television studios and control rooms are utilized mainly to check for obvious picture faults and to ensure that continuity is being maintained.

To analyze the electrical characteristics of the camera outputs, the video signals are displayed on a special type of cathode-ray oscilloscope known as a waveform monitor. Normally a 5 inch (12.7 cm) oscilloscope tube is used for this purpose, the display being viewed through an opening in the front panel of the camera control unit.

Electrostatic deflection is usually employed in oscilloscope tubes, with two sets of plates — one for vertical and the other for horizontal deflection of the electron beam. By applying a sawtooth voltage to the horizontal deflection plates and the incoming video signal to the vertical plates, the variations occurring in the video signal may be displayed on the face of the tube.

Either one of two horizontal deflection frequencies may be employed — one equal to half of the horizontal line scanning rate, and the other one-half of the vertical field rate. In this way two cycles of either the horizontal or vertical signal variations may be displayed, side by side, on the monitor, with the blanking and synchronizing pulses appearing between the two picture traces. (See Fig. 6.)

When the waveform monitor is adjusted for horizontal or vertical display, the oscilloscope beam traces out the waveform for a considerable number of picture lines, and the traces for successive lines are superimposed to make up the patterns.

In the field display, all the lines making up a television frame are traced out by the beam, with the field of even lines on one side and the field of odd lines on the other.

To provide a means for evaluating the waveform displays, and to ensure that the video signals conform with industry standards, an engraved graticule is placed over the face of the oscilloscope tube. The scale is divided into 140 units, with 100 units above zero (blanking level), representing the picture portion of the video signal, while the remaining 40 units represent the sync pulses. By common usage the amplitude of video signals is normally expressed in terms of IEEE scale units, as read from the waveform monitor graticule.

A waveform monitor must be calibrated before it can be used. A standard of the Electrical Industries Association — RS-170, November 1957, “Electrical Performance Standards — Monochrome Television Studio Facilities” — specifies a total excursion in the video signal of one volt from tip of sync to peak white. By means of an internal calibrating voltage, the vertical deflection of the oscilloscope beam may be adjusted to fill the waveform graticule. When the reference voltage is replaced with a video signal, its amplitude can be estimated by locating the position of the various portions of the display in relation to the lines engraved on the graticule.

Picture and Waveform Evaluation

When a television camera is directed toward a scene in a studio, the video signal output is not likely to be suitable for transmission until at least some adjustments have been made, either in the settings of the camera controls or in the lighting of the studio set. (See Fig. 7.)

The intensity of the optical image on the photocathode of the camera tube has a marked effect on picture quality. For a given set lighting arrangement, photocathode illumination depends on the setting of the camera lens aperture — the f-number. Generally, the lens aperture is adjusted to locate scene highlights slightly above the knee of the image vidicon characteristic curve.

A light meter is not needed in television practice to determine the correct exposure level for the image orthicon. The tube is, in itself, an unusually sensitive light meter, because of the illumination on a scene increases, the video...
If you are going to produce a 35mm feature, a 16mm or 35mm documentary or a commercial originating on film, come and speak to us here at 15-17 Gordon St., Elsternwick, or phone (03) 528 6188.

VIDI-MAG
M T E
A NEW SYSTEM FOR TELEVISION AUDIO POST PRODUCTION

- Color work picture recorded directly onto 16mm video film from video tape.
- Locked to editing machines for building sound tracks
- Can be used with any existing synchronous interlock system
- A new solution for television dialogue and effects replacement with the “EL” looping system
- Uses the perfected techniques of film mixing for television sound post production

For more information please contact

MAGNA-TECHTRONICS (AUST.) PTY. LTD.
14 WHITING STREET, ARTARMON, NSW 2064
TELEPHONE 438 3377
Contributors

Arthur Abeles
Worldwide Marketing and Distribution Head, Chairman, Filmarketeers Ltd (U.S.)

Barbara D. Boyle
Executive Vice-President, and Chief Operating Officer, New World Pictures (U.S.)

Ashley Boone
Ladd Company (U.S.) and Selvin
Vice-President, Television Sales. Avco Embassy Office (U.S.)

Mark Damon
President, Producers Sales Organization (U.S.)

Michael Fuchs
Senior Vice-President, Programming, Home Box Office (U.S.)

Samuel W. Gelfman
President, Producers Sales Organization (U.S.)

Harry Ufland
Partner, Kaplan, Livingston, Goodwin, Berkowitz

Barry Spikings
Executive Vice-President. Orion Pictures (U.S.)

Mike Medavoy
President, The Ufland Agency (U.S.)

Eric Weissmann
Independent Producer (U.S.)

Mike Medavoy
Lawyer (Italy)

Professor Avv. Massimo Ferrara-
Santamaria

Lawyer (Italy)

Mark Damon
President, Producers Sales Organization (U.S.)

Michael Fuchs
Senior Vice-President, Programming, Home Box Office (U.S.)

Samuel W. Gelfman
Independent Producer (U.S.)

Klaus Hellwig
President, Janus Film Und Fernsehen (Germany)

Lois Luger
Vice-President. Television Sales, Avco Embassy Pictures Corporation (U.S.)

Rudy Petersdorf
President and Chief Operating Officer, Australian Films Office Inc. (U.S.)

Barry Spikings
Chairman and Chief Executive, EMI Film and Theatre Corporation (Britain)

Eric Weissmann
Partner. Kaplan, Livingston, Goodwin, Berkowitz and Selvin

Harry Ufland
President, The Ufland Agency (U.S.)

Contents

Theatrical Production
The Package: Two Perspectives
Perspective I: As Seen by the Buyer
(ii) Partial versus complete packaging, or starting from scratch with an idea
(iii) Evaluating for different markets, different costs (budgeting)

Perspective II: As Seen by the Seller
The role of the agent in packaging

Theatrical Production
Business and Legal Aspects
(i) Sources of materials (published, original screenplays, etc.)
(ii) Forms of acquisition agreements and/or writer's agreements
(iii) Talent agreements ("pay or play" deferred, "going rates" approval)
(iv) Insurance
(v) Guild and union requirements (foreign and domestic production)
(vi) Subsidiary rights. Publishing music, merchandising, etc.

Distribution in the United States
Perspective: As Seen by the Buyer
(i) Mapping the distribution sales campaign
When and where to open. How to allocate advertising budgets. Number of theatres 70mm and stereo. Reissues. Ancillary markets — hold back for pay and free television
(ii) Exhibition terms. Advances and guarantees. Split of box-office (90-10 with "floor house-nut," etc.). Blind bidding, policing

Perspective: As Seen by the Seller
Advantages and problems. Interim and completion financing. Subsidiary rights. Publishing music, merchandising, etc.

Distribution Outside the United States
Perspective: As Seen by the Buyer
(i) Subsidiary rights Publishing music, merchandising, etc.

Perspective: As Seen by the Seller
Advantages and problems. Interim and completion financing. Subsidiary rights. Publishing music, merchandising, etc.

Distribution in the United States
Perspective: As Seen by the Buyer
(i) Partial versus complete packaging, or starting from scratch with an idea
(ii) Evaluating for different markets, different costs (budgeting)

Perspective: As Seen by the Seller
The role of the agent in packaging

Distribution Outside the United States
Perspective: As Seen by the Buyer
(i) Subsidiary rights Publishing music, merchandising, etc.

Perspective: As Seen by the Seller
Advantages and problems. Interim and completion financing. Subsidiary rights. Publishing music, merchandising, etc.

Television Production and Distribution
Production for network or syndication. Deficit financing. Tape versus film. Licensing "off-network." United States and foreign. Commercial versus public broadcasting

Financing of Theatrical Films
Major Studios
Control approvals, over-ride, over-budget provisions. Total or partial financing. Negative pick-up

Independent Studios
Advantages and problems. Interim and completion financing. Subsidiary rights. Publishing music, merchandising, etc.

Persale by Territory
Advantages and problems. Interim and completion financing. Term of distribution rights

Multi-National and Other Co-Productions
Availability of subsidies. Tax incentives. Government investments

Barbara D. Boyle
Executive Vice-President, and Chief Operating Officer, New World Pictures (U.S.)

Ashley Boone
Ladd Company (U.S.) and Selvin
Vice-President, Television Sales. Avco Embassy Office (U.S.)

Mark Damon
President, Producers Sales Organization (U.S.)

Michael Fuchs
Senior Vice-President, Programming, Home Box Office (U.S.)

Samuel W. Gelfman
President, Producers Sales Organization (U.S.)

Harry Ufland
Partner, Kaplan, Livingston, Goodwin, Berkowitz and Selvin

Barry Spikings
Executive Vice-President. Orion Pictures (U.S.)

Mike Medavoy
President, The Ufland Agency (U.S.)

Eric Weissmann
Independent Producer (U.S.)

Mike Medavoy
Lawyer (Italy)

Professor Avv. Massimo Ferrara-Santamaria

Lawyer (Italy)

Mark Damon
President, Producers Sales Organization (U.S.)

Michael Fuchs
Senior Vice-President, Programming, Home Box Office (U.S.)

Samuel W. Gelfman
Independent Producer (U.S.)

Klaus Hellwig
President, Janus Film Und Fernsehen (Germany)

Lois Luger
Vice-President. Television Sales, Avco Embassy Pictures Corporation (U.S.)

Rudy Petersdorf
President and Chief Operating Officer, Australian Films Office Inc. (U.S.)

Barry Spikings
Chairman and Chief Executive, EMI Film and Theatre Corporation (Britain)

Eric Weissmann
Partner. Kaplan, Livingston, Goodwin, Berkowitz and Selvin

Harry Ufland
President, The Ufland Agency (U.S.)

Contents

Theatrical Production
The Package: Two Perspectives
Perspective I: As Seen by the Buyer
(i) Partial versus complete packaging, or starting from scratch with an idea
(ii) Evaluating for different markets, different costs (budgeting)

Perspective II: As Seen by the Seller
The role of the agent in packaging

Theatrical Production
Business and Legal Aspects
(i) Sources of materials (published, original screenplays, etc.)
(ii) Forms of acquisition agreements and/or writer's agreements
(iii) Talent agreements ("pay or play" deferred, "going rates" approval)
(iv) Insurance
(v) Guild and union requirements (foreign and domestic production)
(vi) Subsidiary rights. Publishing music, merchandising, etc.

Distribution in the United States
Perspective: As Seen by the Buyer
(i) Mapping the distribution sales campaign
When and where to open. How to allocate advertising budgets. Number of theatres 70mm and stereo. Reissues. Ancillary markets — hold back for pay and free television
(ii) Exhibition terms. Advances and guarantees. Split of box-office (90-10 with "floor house-nut," etc.). Blind bidding, policing

Perspective: As Seen by the Seller
Advantages and problems. Interim and completion financing. Subsidiary rights. Publishing music, merchandising, etc.

Distribution Outside the United States
Perspective: As Seen by the Buyer
(i) Subsidiary rights Publishing music, merchandising, etc.

Perspective: As Seen by the Seller
Advantages and problems. Interim and completion financing. Subsidiary rights. Publishing music, merchandising, etc.

Television Production and Distribution
Production for network or syndication. Deficit financing. Tape versus film. Licensing "off-network." United States and foreign. Commercial versus public broadcasting

Financing of Theatrical Films
Major Studios
Control approvals, over-ride, over-budget provisions. Total or partial financing. Negative pick-up

Independent Studios
Advantages and problems. Interim and completion financing. Subsidiary rights. Publishing music, merchandising, etc.

Presale by Territory
Advantages and problems. Interim and completion financing. Term of distribution rights

Multi-National and Other Co-Productions
Availability of subsidies. Tax incentives. Government investments

Barbara D. Boyle
Executive Vice-President, and Chief Operating Officer, New World Pictures (U.S.)

Ashley Boone
Ladd Company (U.S.) and Selvin
Vice-President, Television Sales. Avco Embassy Office (U.S.)

Mark Damon
President, Producers Sales Organization (U.S.)

Michael Fuchs
Senior Vice-President, Programming, Home Box Office (U.S.)

Samuel W. Gelfman
President, Producers Sales Organization (U.S.)

Harry Ufland
Partner, Kaplan, Livingston, Goodwin, Berkowitz and Selvin

Barry Spikings
Executive Vice-President. Orion Pictures (U.S.)

Mike Medavoy
President, The Ufland Agency (U.S.)

Eric Weissmann
Independent Producer (U.S.)

Mike Medavoy
Lawyer (Italy)

Professor Avv. Massimo Ferrara-Santamaria

Lawyer (Italy)

Mark Damon
President, Producers Sales Organization (U.S.)

Michael Fuchs
Senior Vice-President, Programming, Home Box Office (U.S.)

Samuel W. Gelfman
Independent Producer (U.S.)

Klaus Hellwig
President, Janus Film Und Fernsehen (Germany)

Lois Luger
Vice-President. Television Sales, Avco Embassy Pictures Corporation (U.S.)

Rudy Petersdorf
President and Chief Operating Officer, Australian Films Office Inc. (U.S.)

Barry Spikings
Chairman and Chief Executive, EMI Film and Theatre Corporation (Britain)

Eric Weissmann
Partner. Kaplan, Livingston, Goodwin, Berkowitz and Selvin

Harry Ufland
President, The Ufland Agency (U.S.)
BACK ISSUES SALE

Take advantage of our special offer and catch up on your missing issues. Multiple copies less than half-price!

Order Form

1 or 2 copies $4 each
3 or 4 copies $3 each (save $1 per copy)
5 or 6 copies $2 each (save $2 per copy)
7 or more copies $1.60 each (save $2.20 per copy)

To order your copies place a cross in the box next to your missing issues, and fill out the form below. If you would like multiple copies of any one issue, indicate the number you require in the appropriate box.

[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7 [ ] 8 [ ] 9 [ ] 10 [ ] 11 [ ] 12 [ ] 13 [ ] 14 [ ] 15 [ ] 16 [ ] 17 [ ] 18
[ ] 19 [ ] 20 [ ] 21 [ ] 22 [ ] 23 [ ] 24 [ ] 25 [ ] 26 [ ] 27 [ ] 28 [ ] 29

Number of copies ordered at $ each.

Name

Address

Total amount enclosed $ .

(Note: numbers 4, 6, 7, and 5 are out of print!)

Please make your cheque or money order payable to: Cinema Papers Pty Ltd 644 Victoria St, North Melbourne, Victoria, 3051, Australia.

Number 1 January 1974

Number 2 April 1974

Number 3 July 1974
John Randolph. Willis O'Brien. The Mon­

Number 5 March-April 1975

Number 6 June-July 1975

Number 9 September-October 1976

Number 11 January 1977

Number 12 April 1977

Number 13 July 1977

Number 14 October 1977

Number 15 January 1978

Number 16 April-June 1978

Number 17 August-September 1978

Number 18 October-November 1978

Number 19 January-February 1979

Number 20 March-April 1979

Number 21 May-June 1979

Number 22 July-August 1979
Bruce Hines. All the Thrills: Newsfront. Film Study Resources. Koostas: Money Movers. The Australian Film and Television School. Index: Volume 5

Number 23 September-October 1979

Number 24 December 1979 - January 1980

Number 25 February-March 1980

Number 26 April-May 1980
The Films of Peter Weir. Charles John Harlequin Nightcare in Australia. Italian Cinema: The Little Con­
Index: Volume 6

Number 27 June-July 1980

Number 28 August-September 1980

Number 29 October-November 1980
signal output, as observed on the waveform monitor, also increases.

At the dark end of the picture grey scale, blanking level corresponds to maximum black.

**Television Transmitter**

Every television station must be equipped with a transmitter and an antenna to radiate program signals into space. The transmitter is made up of two sections—one for the video signals and the other for the accompanying sound.

To conserve space in the radio frequency spectrum, a method known as vestigial sideband transmission is utilized for the video transmissions. This method permits a greater amount of information in the form of picture details to be transmitted in a given bandwidth.

To obtain radiation of electrical energy into space, high-frequency currents are fed into the antenna, producing electromagnetic and electrostatic fields known as radio waves. A high frequency current is generated by an oscillator and the carrier is then amplitude-modulated with the signals to be transmitted.

In this process two sidebands are normally generated. These sidebands are separated from the carrier frequency by the frequency of the modulating signal. In the vestigial sideband transmission method, the greater part of the lower sideband is suppressed in the transmitter. Since the sidebands carry identical information, this method has no adverse effects on the radiated signals, except to reduce the level of the energy.

**Frequency Assignments**

In all countries, broadcasting activities are subject to regulation by government bodies. The frequencies that may be utilized for various services, as well as the manner in which these frequency allocations may be employed, are controlled by law. A licensee is required to operate a transmitter, and the licence holder is obligated to conform with all applicable regulations.

### The Television Receiver

The basic functions of a television receiver are:

1. Radiated signals available at the antenna are collected and carried to the input terminals of the receiver by a cable.
2. By means of a channel selector, the desired signal is separated from others that may be present in the antenna.
3. The selected signal is amplified to a usable level.
4. The video and audio signals are extracted from their carriers and separated from each other.
5. The audio signal is amplified sufficiently to drive the loudspeaker and reproduce the sound portion of the program.
6. The synchronizing pulses are separated from the picture signal.
7. The vertical sync pulses are separated from the horizontal pulses.
8. Horizontal and vertical sawtooth generators in the receiver are triggered by the respective sync pulses, driving the receiver scanning beam to trace out the scanning pattern in exact synchronism with the scanning beam at the originating television studio.
9. The video signal is applied to the control element in the picture tube, modulating the scanning mean as it traverses the face of the tube, to produce picture images. In this way, the patterns of light and shade formed on the photocathode of the television camera tube in the originating studio are reproduced on receiver viewing screens. (See Figs. 8 and 9.)

The scanning action continues independently of picture transmission. So long as the station transmitter is operating and the receiver is tuned to that station, a stationary raster will be obtained on the receiver picture tube. This condition is maintained by the synchronizing pulses transmitted continuously by the station while it is on the air.

Basically, the television transmission system may be considered as a means of establishing communication between the station and all the receivers tuned to it. It is commonplace in modern television broadcasting for the originating camera and the receiver to be separated by thousands of kilometres.

---

**Figure 7** Adjusting the camera settings and lighting on a set at the studios of HSV-7, Melbourne.

**Figure 8** Monochrome picture tube.

**Figure 9** Color picture tube.
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Photokina ‘80

“New Products and Processes” will be a regular feature in future issues. In the first instalment, Fred Harden reports on the 1980 Photokina Trade Fair held bi-annually in Germany.

With Photokina ‘80, the trade fair of the Photographic Industry Association is 30 years old. It has been held every second year since 1950, and to dealers in the photographic industry its importance as a meeting place and showcase is undisputed.

This year, more than 1100 firms participated, spread through the 12 large halls of the Cologne Trade Fair buildings, requiring the 40,000-odd visitors to use maps and buses to cover the exhibition thoroughly.

Given the vast range of equipment on display at Photokina, this report reviews only new products and processes previewed at the fair. Items have been grouped together under the headings of cameras, production accessories, sound, editing systems, projection and transfer, and animation.

Cameras

The Arriflex stand’s big attraction was the new Arriflex 35 BL 111. The good news is that this model is considerably quieter, down to a quoted 25.1 dB (A) measured one metre from the front of the lens. The lens housing blimp cage has been eliminated (Arriflex themselves admitted it was a nuisance) and the camera side cover. The camera is now 280mm wide and the extra space houses the electronics, a 24/52fps switch, fuse, signal tone adjusting screw, ‘blinking’ run lamp plus electrical accessory and battery connectors. All the standard 35 BL accessories can be fitted.

The new accessories are: a new camera door with quick change hinge and rigid finder. A rugged-looking video viewer unit that replaces the rigid finder. There is a lightweight support guide rails set, a lightweight matte box, bellows matte box and a new follow focus unit that fits as well. The follow focus unit also works with the 16SR and with most of the fixed and high speed lenses, and Angenieux zoom, when fitted with a gear ring.

The Arriflex 16 SR 11 has also been reworked to take advantage of new sound insulation and material technologies. Arriflex quote a noise level reduction to 26.1 dB (A), with a weight of 5.9kg (body only). The meter system is completely changed, and it now takes into account the camera speeds (5-7fps) and the ASA range is extended (16 to 1000 ASA).

Arriflex also announced two new zoom lenses. For the 35mm cameras there is an Angenieux 25-625mm (f3.4-6.8) T4-7.5. It’s a wide range, and at its shortest focusing distance of 1.5m, and on full telephoto, an area 200mm x 27mm fills the frame. It weighs 5kg.

For the 16mm camera, there is a new Vario Sonnar 11.8 (T-2) 10-100mm. Arriflex are claiming superior optical performance for this Zeiss zoom with macro range and multi coating.

The new Arriflex 16 SR 11, quieter, with improved metering system.

Aspheron is a new Bolex trade mark for a wide-angle supplementary lens. Arriflex have announced for the 9.5mm and 12mm high speed Zeiss Distagons. Called the 566A, it gives focal lengths of 5.6mm and 6.6mm with the aforementioned lenses respectively. I tried the Aspheron with the 12mm and was amazed by the lack of fish-eye distortion and extreme depth of field. There is no loss of the 11.2 apertures of the high speed lenses, and high resolution is claimed.

This year was the first time I’ve seen the Arriflex image stabilizer. Although it wasn’t new for Photokina, they were showing a new swivel mount. It allows the stabilizer to be quickly swung to the side when it is necessary to change lenses or to use a wide-angle. On the 16mm, a 35mm wide lens is the maximum usable angle without vignetting.

Apparently a larger mirror size was tried, but it made the unit too large. To demonstrate the device, it was mounted to a 16SR with video finder and clamped to a vibrating board. The image was quite stable, with a strange “fluid” feel on the highlights (probably resulting from lag on the video). The two gyroscope controlled mirrors smooth out vertical and horizontal movement and fit most film and video cameras. A dry battery runs the motors for about eight hours.

The Astoll 7 LTR 16mm camera is guaranteed quieter than 26 dB measured 1m from the film plane (not from the front of the lens as Arri quote from). As dB measurements are logarithmic, for each 3dB stepdown the sound level is twice as quiet (e.g., 23dB is twice as quiet as 26dB). The Astoll is quiet, and appears to be one of those pieces of equipment that engenders a fierce devotion from many camera users. The Aaton 8-35, also on display, features a 200ft (61m) magazine and weighs about 5kg.

The one new Aaton release is the Scribe, a microphone that provides 24 hour/day information for 16LTR and tape recorder, and now runs any available speaker and recording copy paper. The system provides an hours, minutes and seconds figure on the film edge. It also encodes and decodes that information for the audio tape, which in turn feeds the information to a machine that edge numbers the times in ink on 16mm tape magnetic track.

The Scribe also gives a hard copy paper printout of the complete day’s takes, arranged in various ways. It can give each take a number, as well as starting and stopping times for each camera run, or can be programmed for “go” takes only.

Eclair had their range of cameras displayed, but only announced a new 35mm high speed camera, the GV-150. It looks like a complete re-design of the GV-32 and with a modification will take the old magazines. It runs 25 to 150 pictures a second, and reaches maximum speed in two seconds with a precision of ±1 per cent at any speed.

The new features on the Movictam SN (a much ignored camera in Australia) are a 1000ft (305m) magazine, a 12-inch (30.48cm) viewfinder extension and a high resolution video viewer. The noise level quoted is 18dB (A).

Bolex have updated the light metering system of the H16 EL, to handle up to 1600 ASA. This is for allow for the pushed processing speed of VNF. As the diaphragm ring is turned, two LEDs (light-emitting diodes) light-up with two figures. The viewing frame are balanced in brightness for the correct exposure. The camera is now designated H16 EL Series 3.

There is a new single frame animation unit that fits the external shaft spring motor camera and the H16 EB Electric, and a power relay to switch lamps for two-speed cameras and the H16 EL Remote Timer. There is a new synchro unit that allows syncing of the ESM and EL camera or any equipped with ESM motors, to 50 or 60 Hz mains or a pilot-tone recorder.

I was particularly interested in a new mount that fits a small video camera against the eyepiece and gives a video viewerfinder capability when the camera is on an animation stand, or attached to a microscope or other difficult viewing position. It uses the Eumig 571 Newvicam camera, a very small low light black and white video camera with a 16mm lens. There is more precision than precision optics involved, but it works and would certainly be adaptable to other cameras.

For the first time at Photokina (and, I suspect, anywhere in the West), there was an exhibit from China. The equipment, however, looked as if it was out of the 1950 Photokina.

The SKH 35 camera is a Mitchell hybrid, and the Red Flag 16mm looks like a spring-wound Bolex H16 machined from one block of iron. There is more than a passing resemblance to the Arriflex 35 BL in the Noiseless Newsreel 35mm Cinecamera 935 LB, but I was unable to verify if the quoted noise level
of 40 dB is accurate (or where in fact it is measured from.)

China also exhibited an extensive range of 35mm portable and theatre projectors, some with xenon arcs and full accessories, such as a 12kw petrol generator. There were 16mm projectors, magnetic and optical sound recorders, studio audio equipment, processing equipment for 35mm, 16mm and Super 8, contact printers, a 35mm optical printer, dual format moviola, and more. There was a comprehensive list of 35mm lenses with Arri-type mounts, 16mm fixed and zoom lenses, projection lenses and a few telecines.

Production Accessories

Many of the stands had dozens of new items, and each of the major manufacturers had their own variations. I have tried to select the most relevant items for review here.

Hensel Studio Technik make professional flash equipment, and were showing a flash front projection unit for still photography, as well as a version for video front projection. I could see no reason, other than the possibility of 50-cycle strobing, why it would not work with film cameras.

The system provides an alternative to chroma key backgrounds when used with a video camera, and the image on the monitor was excellent, even with the cheap color camera. For special effects work on 16mm, the 5ft (1.52m) wide screen would be restricting, but the flash unit has a wider background of the same material. There is a switchable bright-ness control to balance the background-to-subject brightness, and the slide carrier takes two 35mm or 2¼ square slides.

R. E. Miller were one of the four Australian firms at Photokina. I had just walked from the Sachtler tripod stands and asked how Miller could compete against the beautifully-designed and lightweight gear available in Europe. After bemoaning the lack of machinable magnesium and other lightweight alloys, the Swiss group said: "There's a market for lightweight cameras, but heavy duty is still popular, and Miller occupied that market.

Miller are now selling three times more in Australia than in Japan. To counter the beautiful-lightweight camera, they have developed two new heads that will be in production early next year, and a multi-position clamp with a Miller ball cup attached, which is

available now. The new range of alloy-leg tripods has a built-in removable spreader.

The CV/H fluid head has a built-in, variable-counterbalancing device designed for film and video cameras up to 50 kg. There are six preset positions of fluid control that seem fast and foolproof. The CV/I is a smaller head with the same fluid settings and a quick release camera mounting plate but no counterbalance.

Vinten also displayed a range of tripod heads. The Cygnet type 89 post pan and tilt head is designed for lighter camera and ENG video cameras. A ball head is available, and the camera can be swung through a full 360 degrees.

The other item is the Vinten shoulder mount type 204. It's a comfortable shoulder support intended for ENG cameras, but would also work with smaller flat-based cine cameras. The support hinges in two parts and will hold the camera safely when placed on a flat surface.

Minolta have added to their range of spot light meters and color meters. The Minolta Spot 2 and Auto Spot 2 digital meters and according to the manufacturers, is the world's first spot meter with liquid-crystal digital/analog readout, memory and direct digital exposure zone calculation capability.

The exposure zone control stores maximum highlight and minimum shadow exposures and gives the option to choose a bias toward one or the other, or just average the two. The figures are stored in the memory and can be recalled or erased for new inputs. This helps one keep the subject brightness range within the film's latitude.

Minolta have also added a digital display to the Color Meter 11, which has CC (color compensatory) and LB (light balancing) filter index readouts as well as a direct degrees Kelvin reading.

Horst Werta from John Barry (Sydney) and John Barry (Sydney) are two of the largest items is the Lowel Grand Stand, a heavy duty, light-weight stand for big lights and reflectors, designed to take accessory casters for studio use and Lowel Anchors (wire pegs that are pushed into the ground for use on windy locations).

The Lowel Lightflector is a 15in x 24in x 3/8in (38cm x 61cm x 1cm) sheet of aircraft aluminium with smooth reflective Mylar on one side and textured on the other. There is a Tota-Tilter constant tension clutch device mounted in the centre allowing precise rotation. The Space Clamp is an updated version of a beam clamp, with two ½in (16mm) mounting studs that take the rest of the

I also saw the Kowa 16mm Cine 5.9mm f 1.8 (T2.2) wide-angle. With the wide-angle supplementary lens that would achieve a 3.5mm wide-angle (and probably your feet in shot as well. I was also surprised to see another wide-angle supplementary lens with features almost identical to the Arri 9666 Asperon. The price is almost the same as the Arri unit. As both lenses have the Bolex trademark I presume they are being marketed concurrently. The difference is that Film Technik are offering adaptor rings to fit a wide range of lenses.

Sound

I saw very few new developments in the area of film sound at Photokina. Nagra Kudelski had their full range of equipment on display, but showcased only one new item — the Nagra T1, a portable instrumentation recorder for technical and computer-controlled work. The Nagra equipment is displayed it becomes clear that a large portion of their range is for technical applications.
NEW PRODUCTS AND PROCESSES

Edited by

The Broker S200 sound film recorder.

Steenbeck had on display what their press release described as a number of novelties. Among these was the ST 1901 16mm editor, with six plates. 2 sound heads with a recorder for time-code, and a synchronizer to interlock a Sony U-matic VTR. It was also equipped with a Bosch TOX30 color video camera, so that it acts as a video transfer unit to give a rough double head facility on cassette. There was also the new dual 16/35mm model ST 6001 (c), which has two integrated picture systems that eliminate the need to change the picture decks. It uses the 18-faced polygon prism, and the 35mm unit can be adapted to CinemaScope.

New at the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers’ show in Los Angeles in 1979 was the STI 16mm magnetic recorder/playback unit. It would seem to have excellent small studio possibilities. The STI acts as a transfer unit for pilot tone and EBU/IRT time coded tapes. The 24/25ips sync speeds are mains frequency or crystal controlled. It will interlock with the usual synchronizable projectors or editing tables and has a loop programming facility for studio use.

Kem showed a large range of four and six plate editing machines. The Super 8, 16mm and 35mm. What took my attention, was an array of three machines in a semi-circle. The K500 system is designed as an interchangeable multi-format machine that can be expanded with the volume or complexity of the work. The modules can be interlocked in various configurations (e.g., two 16mm pictures and one 35mm, or three 17.5mm tracks and a 35mm and 16mm picture or tape). When I asked for a demonstration of the Kem PR 1000 16mm and 35mm dual format projectors, its electronics systems had decided that since it was the last day of the fair it needed a break. But before it did, I saw enough of the projector to be impressed by its simplicity and features. Designed as an interlock projector for dubbing/marking/studio, it can be used in a “rock and roll” mode with an electronic counter that can be pre-set for a certain frame. The projector will automatically run fast backwards and then forward at normal speed, as often as required. When running at 24 or 25fps it is possible to fast-forward at either 48/50 frames and 96/100 frames, or continuously variable from 0 to 1000fps. The machine uses the Kem Holoscope praying which gives a flicker free image at all speeds (but with a considerable loss in light output). The lamp house has a 1600w Xenon lamp, but the picture would be quite dim over a longer throw than the 6m displayed.

Sta (Societe Francaise Appareillages de Telecommandes) have been making editing consoles for Super 8 for some time, and their 16mm equipment displays the hand-built look of their early equipment. Basically, a electronically, system viewer, a gang synchronizer, sound reader and motorized arms mounted on a single unit. Of the various 16mm models offered, the EM 600 SR appeared to be the fairest. Dubbing/marking/studio, it can be used in various configurations (e.g., two 16mm and 35mm dual format projectors. The electronics systems had decided that since it was the last day of the fair it needed a break. But before it did, I saw enough of the projector to be impressed by its simplicity and features. Designed as an interlock projector for dubbing/marking/studio, it can be used in a “rock and roll” mode with an electronic counter that can be pre-set for a certain frame. The projector will automatically run fast backwards and then forward at normal speed, as often as required. When running at 24 or 25fps it is possible to fast-forward at either 48/50 frames and 96/100 frames, or continuously variable from 0 to 1000fps. The machine uses the Kem Holoscope praying which gives a flicker free image at all speeds (but with a considerable loss in light output). The lamp house has a 1600w Xenon lamp, but the picture would be quite dim over a longer throw than the 6m displayed.

CMX also displayed The Edge, a low-cost computer assisted video-editing system that uses CMX 340X technology. The system has a small table top editing console with two rotating knobs and a small display screen surrounded by a number of multi-function “smart keys”. Anyone who has used a U-Matic editing system could grasp the basics. The Edge is designed as an electronically reverse the negative and never have a work-print cutting copy, or from one work-print provide a number of cuts and times. One of the best new products is the EM 600 SR, which has a sound pitch corrector as an accessory which gives (almost) intelligible speech when running at half to 2½ times speeds. Together with the Magnasynch/Moviola, CMX / Orrox Systems had on display their Computer-Assisted Film Editor / Controller. It takes advantage of the number of different editing tables with video capability. The machine being used was the Videola V-1000 (see the transfer section for details), and the system is designed to let an editor rapidly build a videotape assembly without cutting the film. It gives either a paper printout of the edge numbers for the negative cutter, or displays the edge numbers on the video image. The system, as displayed, uses a BUV, but it could have been a number of U-matics or VTRs. It has an edit preview ability and a smooth forward and reverse control of film and video transport. The controller will handle NTSC, PAL or SECAM, and the Videola is 16/35mm interchangeable. CMX have attempted to make this system a film editor oriented as possible (the edit button is even marked “splice!”). The Edges controller had on display was an apresse of MAST’S in double head for the editor to edit. In about 20 minutes we had assembled a five-minute lip-sync sequence with cutaways and sound edits, and the quality from the broadcast standard as it can control the Rank Cintel MK3 telecine and 1” and 2” VTRs.

Editing Systems

A wide range of editing systems were on display this year. Steenbeck, Kem, Moviola, Sta, Oldelft and Arriflex all had flat-bed editing systems in various configurations. It was impossible to look more than at the new, eye-catching features.

A number of machines had a video-monitor facility, and some had interlock with a VTR to allow sound editing in parallel with videocassette. The key to this recent development is the ease with which the multi-faceted prisms now being used for flickerless viewers can be adapted. The prisms always display an image with one tending to “dissolve” into the next. There were also a number of time-code systems.

The Kem PR 1000 dual format (16mm and 35mm) projector.

The Magnasynch/Moviola CMX/Orrox Computer Assisted Film Editor/Controller.
"If you need a fast commercial... or a short doco cut overnight... we'll make sure it hits the lab on time..."
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Animation

The addition of computer control to animation stands is now accepted, but at a cost of around $150,000 for the complete Oxberry system, only a few studios in Australia have the volume to afford it. (David Deneen from Film Graphics in Sydney has taken delivery of the first one in Australia.)

The lower cost Oxberry Filmmaker Animation Stands now have the potential to be upgraded with the addition of the Master Camera 5420. The Master is the standard animation studio camera and takes a wide range of format options.

Nielson Hordell were showing a Canadian system for computerized control of a compound table that has a 4" x 5" (10.1cm x 12.7cm) field and precision holder for 35mm slides. Designed for video studio use, but not yet adaptable to other uses, the Optical Art System 1 consists of the manual pin registered compound with an optical precision pantograph viewer and a 4" x 5" contact printer for making reverse mattes.

The System 2 adds a computer control with motorized east west controls. The System 3 adds a Neilson Hordell animation stand and 16mm camera.

By far the most exciting development in the animation field was the Advanced Animation and Graphics System from Japan's NAC company. Under the name of Knock Animatography, it consists of a videotape animation recorder, a film action tracer (photoscope), a video-action tracer, a video-animation stand, a quick action recorder with solid-state frame store, and an electronic painter.

The system is designed as a support for conventional animation techniques, and only the electronic painter awaits. In a broadcast quality videotape animation recorder to become a complete video system. I asked NAC if they were developing a machine, but they said it was beyond their resources, and that they were awaiting an approach from a major manufacturer.

TheAnimation Recorder is a modified VHS cassette recorder with single-frame advance capability. It is designed for use with a video camera mounted on either the NAC stand or the animator's existing stand, and gives an instant replay of pencil tests or a check of final cells.

The Video Animation Stand, has standard pel caps, but is really a simple graphics stand with a pantograph form and controls that allow the color video camera to be panned or zoomed accurately over art work for storyboards or chroma key back rounds for the electronic painter.

The Film Action Tracer is a conventional rear projection tracer using 16mm or 35mm, but the Video Action Tracer allows the animator to use a standard video camera and recorder to provide, instantly, reference material to trace. The image can be changed in size or position. The tracings can then be placed on the Quick Action Recorder, positioned face down, and scanned one at a time. The storage memory is solid state with the option of 30, 60, 120 or 240 picture capacity. The image is black and white lines. Once entered, the controls offer the option to change the speed of the tape, erase individual frames and insert new drawings, and interchange frames in the sequence. The images can then be transferred to videotape to edit into a longer sequence.

When final drawings are made they can be placed on the scanner of the Electronic Painter. The original line drawings are placed in front of the scanner, and the machine traces the line drawing on the back of a negative film. The operator has a joystick lever that controls a cross-hair cursor, which becomes the brush. The width of the brush is variable and can be used to erase, fill in or draw new lines in black. One of the buttons on the control panel will display the screen a color chart of 128 pre-programmed colors. There is also a color generator and the operator can create colors at his discretion.

The brush cursor is placed on an area, and the number of the color chosen is punched in. On the signal to paint, the color wipes across the area selected up to the surrounding black lines. There is an 8x enlargement display for small details, and colors can be changed repeatedly.

When painting is complete, another button will make any areas that have been missed or unpainted flash chroma key blue. If left blue they can be keyed through a mixer over a background video source. The frame is then stored and the next drawing scanned. The sequence is then transferred from the frame store and edited on tape.

The next generation of equipment will link the quick action recorder to the electronic painter and combined with a broadcast animation VTR would radically change the production of conventional animation for television.

The future of the NAC equipment seems an appropriate place to end this report. I am aware of the amount of material not included but to cover it all would fill the whole magazine. And that's without mentioning all the other activity at Photolinks, photographic displays, film screenings, conferences, congresses, awards ... and more.

Many of the new products and processes previewed here will be reviewed in detail in future issues, at which time the information about local distributors, agents and prices will be published.
NOW IN RELEASE FROM C.I.C.

The Bandit, Frog and Justice are at it again in the all new adventures of...

Smokey and the Bandit
Ride Again

The Plane's Going to Chicago...
The Pilot's Going to New York...
The Passengers are Going to Pieces!

Thank God it's only a motion picture!

They're all gems. But who's the fake?

Rough Cut

The most devastating team since nitro and glycerine.

The Blues Brothers

To be followed in 1981 by:

Shōgun

The Formula

C.I.C.—THE WORLD'S FOREMOST DISTRIBUTOR
The Shining
Ken Mogg

When, at the start of The Shining, Jack Torrance (Jack Nicholson) comes to the immense Overlook Hotel in Colorado to be interviewed for the position of winter caretaker, something is already amiss. Sweeping helicopter views of Jack's car crawling upwards through the Rockies are accompanied by a score which suggests first a Gregorian mass for the dead, then an impression of snake rattles and animal cries derived from a Navajo chant.

A casual remark at the interview by the all-American hotel manager (Barry Nelson) notes that the Overlook was erected in 1927 on the site of an Indian burial ground, the builders very probably having had to fight off Indian attacks. He also mentions, not so casually, how 10 years ago a previous winter caretaker got 'cabin fever' and killed his family and himself.

Although taken from a moderately gripping novel by Stephen King (Carrie, Salem's Lot), Stanley Kubrick's film eschews horror and settles for the grotesque. This may not have been altogether Kubrick's intent — a common argument runs that the grotesque is failed realism, a product of social or personal inadequacies — but the result is nonetheless magnificently grotesque.

Visually and aurally, it is always stunning. Further, the grotesque genre has its own distinctive ingredients: it frequently exploits similarities between people and animals or things, and it usually exhibits "unmotivated playfulness". As Jack Torrance becomes demented and terrorizes wife Wendy (Shelley Duvall) and their seven-year-old son Danny (Danny Lloyd), his reversion to infantilism echoes the mist Homepage fortune of 'Hal' the computer in 2001. Half admiringly, one notes that there is life in this Frankenstein's monster. But it is precisely the counterpart with the active signs of Kubrick's "unmotivated playfulness" (not least, his unflagging way with the Steadicam tracking camera) that implies an incipient metaphysics of the grotesque.

Consider Jack's ambitions to write — which come unstuck with his obssessive retyping of the single sentence, "All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy." Like earlier Kubrick protagonists, Jack finds himself caught between notions of glory and the fairly rigid demands of society and family; his particular reaction seems initially the classic one described by Erich Fromm in which puritanism allied with self-hatred turns people into their own slave drivers.

These people put their master within — as witness one of Jack's tirades to Wendy about "responsibility". (It needs to be noted how the Torrances, for all that they exist primarily as part of a Kubrick theorem, are a very puritanical family, and that poor Shelley Duvall as Wendy has very nearly as dispirited a role as the wife, Marisa Berenson, in Barry Lyndon.) Even so, Wendy seems to be the person who really does the work around the hotel: preparing meals, calling the boiler in the basement; and Danny is naturally the playful one: on first arriving at the hotel, he heads straight for the games room.

Jack hardly appears to either work or play, although one day while Wendy and Danny are outdoors exploring the hotel's enormous maze, he takes the opportunity to pound a baseball (which sounds like cannon fire) against a Navajo wall-mural in the main lounge. Jack sees himself as being a red-blooded American like the next man. (Danny with his gift of precognition and telepathy — "the shining" — receives warnings about that red blood; even Wendy, in her essentially repressed state, finally shares her son's vision of blood-dimmed corridors; but Jack never shares it.)

In one of several fantasies Jack has, he is a macho Westerner ordering drinks from a respectful bartender. About here, things become complex. Ostensibly, Jack is alone in the present-day Golden Room of the Overlook Hotel. But suddenly 'ghosts' of past guests appear, wearing period dress circa the 1920s. In turn, one senses behind this reality the earlier one of a pioneering age before the Overlook was built, a time when whites and Indians were at war — and when traditions were being shaped.

Clearly, some of this is present in Jack's mind, which explains why his image retains modern dress. Speaking of a time factor though, perhaps the most crucial element of the scene is the conceit whereby Jack simultaneously succumbs to alcoholic weakness and to other-directedness — when he orders "White Man's Burden".

This "synchronicity" has its Kubrick precedents, too. As 'Hal' in 2001 'dies' singing "Daisy, Daisy", the astronaut Bowman learns his cosmic mission ("To Jupiter and Beyond the Infinite"). Equally, one recalls the crazed and obsessed Jack D. Ripper in Doctor Strangelove preparing to die for McCarthyism.

Jack Torrance and Jack D. Ripper are blood brothers. Moreover, in both films everyone is implicated in a sort of "madman's flytrap" — Kubrick apparently wanted no survivors at the Overlook Hotel.

In The Shining, he makes the media a
particular target. Not only do they feed Jack with his fantasies, but they colonize reality. (A rather cruel touch, one may think, is to make Wendy, "a ghost story and horror film addict").

On vacation in Miami, the black chef Halloran (Scatman Crothers) switches on the television, to be informed, in quick succession, of a heatwave in Florida and blizzards in Colorado.

The banality is representative - and Halloran's own gift of "the shining", which is sufficiently strong to draw him back to the Overlook (his profile during the drive resembling an Indian's), significantly avails no one, because "white man" Jack is waiting. As for Danny, fond of Bugs Bunny cartoons and given to wearing Mickey Mouse sweaters, his conditioning has already started. Or rather, de-conditioning — Danny's imaginary friend 'Tony', who is the medium for his 'shining', isn't supposed to be talked about.

Fairly evidently, this sort of detail must be cumulative if it is to work, and probably not even Jungians (quite at home in 2001) may take 'Tony' very seriously. That it does work should prompt an observation on Kubrick's principles of counterpoint and conflict.

The opening titles in cartoon-blue, which roll up the screen like television credits, deny and confirm the different order of reality of the landscape as brought out by the score. The opposition of ascending vertical movement to forward-travelling helicopter shots and then a rapid lateral track through the hotel foyer is exhilarating.

But some early notes of bathos (the cartoon lettering, the sense of end-of-season blues as Jack enters the hotel to apply for a second-rate job) prefigure the later constant undercutting of Jack's fantasies.

Contrariwise, the brавura moment when Jack's frustration brings a table maze to life — but only to the extent that Wendy and Danny appear in it like tiny figures in a vast Skinner Box — is 'placed' by a cut to the real thing in close-up (and the ubiquitous Steadicam tracking shot).

The opening of the grotesque isn't usual to speak of nobility, but Kubrick's spirited exploration of some inner and outer limits may justify it. Indeed, this is "a Stanley Kubrick film". Jungians might see its director ('thinking') and Ingmar Bergman ('feeling') as facing each other from opposite ends of a continuum.

Strictly speaking, Kubrick's films have about them more play than playfulness — one doesn't easily shrug off having been a chess master at 16. Yet The Shining gives plenty of evidence that Kubrick, while keeping his autonomy, is a master of strategy, and capable of playing to the gallery when appropriate (after all, he used to play exhibition chess in New York).

A scene in which Jack pursues Wendy up the Overlook's main stairway brings the action right into our midst, and Kubrick knows how to tease the audience in the sense that a maze teases.

The film ends on the biggest tease of all: a photograph dated Independence Day, 1921, of a crowded ballroom and (surely not?) a smiling 'Jack Torrance'. After the nightmare the audience has been through, is Kubrick tempting it with some catch-all idea of reincarnation? One can almost hear this most independent of directors demur to comment further on his game of art.


The Chain Reaction

Rick Thompson

The Chain Reaction, despite its similarities with Mad Max, is not Mad Max II. It is a busy, kinetic film with the image and editing skill of Mad Max, but it shows the same mastery of the American action film without the same level of specific quotation as Mad Max.

An earthquake in Western Australia fractures a nuclear waste dumping ground. Heinrich (Ross Thompson), a scientific technician, risks himself to prevent catastrophe and receives a terminal dose of radiation: he has three days to live. The administration and security forces of the (American) multinational corporation in charge of the facility wish to contain Heinrich — for study, and to avoid an information leak and ensuing panic. Heinrich escapes into the bush and is pursued.

At the same time, Larry Stilton (Steve Bisley), a small garage owner, and his nurse wife Carmel (Arna-Maria Winchester) head for a dirty weekend in a bush cabin in Paradise Valley. There they meet Heinrich.

All the other characters in the film orbit around this triad. An army of security men arrive, as does an anti-nuclear energy activist. Eagle (Hugh Keays-Byrne, bizarre as ever), who posed as the couple's only hope against the security men. The Stiltons ran the gauntlet and escape with the body of the now-dead Heinrich (he had instructed them to use it as a visual aid for the media) to a rendezvous with Larry under a Channel 7 Newscopter.

The specific problem, made clear economically and early, is that the liquid plutonium waste has reached the water table. The contamination is irreversible and will surface at random.

Action films set a personal plot in relation to the 'larger' plot. The groups here are Gray (Ralph Cotterill), the chief security officer (an Anglo-Australian version of George Peppard's Tuxan in The Groundstar Conspiracy), and his mute, muscular ichi-ban, Oates (Patrick Ward), on the one hand, and Larry, Carmel and Heinrich on the other. Carmel (because she is a nurse? because she is a woman? because she is more mature?) is immediately sympathetic to Heinrich. She nurses him and draws him out in an attempt to understand his trauma.

Larry's hostility to Heinrich draws rebukes from Carmel several times, goading him into escalating adolescent outbursts. When Larry is removed from the retreat cabin — locked up in the small-town gaol — Carmel and Heinrich share idyllic and personal moments while Larry rages about Heinrich being "up there in Paradise with my wife!"

These two circuits are closed at the end of the film. Heinrich — a post-Harrishburg version of "D.O.A." — is as good as dead all through the film, but at the time of his clinical death Larry kills Oates, triggering an uncharacteristic burst of reckless and fatal behaviour from Gray.

The two types of story — nuclear and sexual — are economically twined in an early scene, the morning after Heinrich joins the Stiltons at their cabin. In the scene pitched as comic frolic, a nude Larry walks down to the pool which serves as a water supply for the cabin. He jumps in with a Tarzan yell, though, as the music makes clear, he should be screaming for the loss of his atomic virginity. He removes a grotesquely-bloated fish from the pipeline.

Carmel arrives as Larry emerges
from the water, Venus-on-the-half-shell; she remarks that the monkey has lost his nuts, the first inflection of the film's sexual imagery toward emasculation. He asks her for a hand up and pulls her into the water instead, contaminating her. Then he feigns unconsciousness. Carmel is alarmed and attends to him — but it's a joke. It is also a childish counterfeit of the truly sick Heinrich, through which Larry competes for Carmel's attention.

There are parallel childhoods in the film: Larry's adolescence, and Heinrich's rapid regression from his childhood as the radiation poisoning advances (“Why 1957?”). Carmel asks. No answer is forthcoming from Heinrich, although he mentions that it is the year he hopes to achieve his doctorate, and the year of a Marilyn Monroe film he likes. It is also the year of Sputnik.

There is a clear play here with a time of innocence which extends to all the characters in the film, but the strategy also brings in a continuing literary (water) allusion: Heinrich's view of himself as the Boy At the Dike.

The filmmakers are quite knowing about the site they have chosen for their film, although its hectic movement through various types of film causes problems. They have chosen not to make a The China Syndrome liberal exemplum; in so doing, they have simply assumed audience knowledge of many things. The China Syndrome spent so much time developing, The Chain Reaction doesn't explain the significance of plutonium entering the water-table at any length; nor does it investigate the motives for corporate cover-ups. The film stays in the area of the action film (its few moments of verbal didacticism stand out the more so for this).

The conflicts of the story are presented in terms of physical power: bodies, violence, speed, technology, flight and pursuit. The companion process to this, which ups the ante from a simple action film, is an interlocking imagery of water. Water is specifically charged from its first appearance in the film, flooding Heinrich and the nuclear waste tank farm. It then contaminates him as the Boy At the Dike.

As the narrative continues, Larry and Carmel receive from their water is explained to the audience abstractly, in assertions and audio counter-readings; in counterpart, Heinrich, the visual aid, gives a progressive index of explicit bodily radiation damage.

Another significant line of imagery centres on white as the dominant color — the color of death. It is the color of the nuclear tank farm, of the security forces' outer-space radiation suits, the color most often associated with Heinrich, and the color of the film's long, static, final shot of a dam gushing millions of gallons of white water. It is posed against green and other natural colors for clear reasons: fertility/sterility, life/death, and so on. Unlike The Exorcist, when Heinrich vomits (into the water) it is white.

Around this line, Larry's moral education is built. Heinrich, whose wife and family one sees in a photo, chooses a larger responsibility and commitment stemming from his work: warning the nation.

At the outset, Larry's concerns are selfish: his business, privacy (which Heinrich disrupts), and sexual gratification. When Heinrich dies, his mission is formally passed on to Larry and Carmel. Dressed for the first time in plain white robes, they are ceremoniously escorted by the security zombies to the decontamination chambers, where they are stripped and subjected to a painful healing shower which cleanses their outsides, but not their now-cancerous insides. The scene suggests many things — a wedding among others — but is in fact their confirmation into the world of rotegen death into which Heinrich had preceded them.

The chain reaction doesn't have Mad Max's gleeful, exploitation-film vulgarity (except in the juicy cruelty of the scene introducing Larry, amidst his garage full of mates, when he points a grease gun at the nagging mother-in-law and asks, "Want a lube job?"). Neither does it establish a kineticism so completely tied to in-frame movement by the subject of the image. Instead, The Chain Reaction sets up a style of brisk, pointed-elliptical editing which often features succinct condensation.

Example: in jail, Larry doesn't want to know about any larger social possibilities, so crusader Hugh Keays-Byrne explains to him about the multi-national corporation, the U-239 spill, etc. as the image shows the tank farm site, the industrial complex, a huge black C-130 taking off. Eagle winds up his moral explanation with, "...and we are all on board" as the plane blows skyrocket.

A key shot: this plane, so associated with photo-journalism of the Vietnam war, is shown flying over a deserted and crumbling industrial village near the Stilsons' cabin, a place where one has seen Heinrich and Carmel walking — one of the film's preview images of the future.

Third shot: Carmel and Heinrich inside the cabin. Heinrich is at a table when we hear a rumble and bric-a-brac begins to dance; he panics, reminded of the initial earthquake and its consequences, but Carmel quiets him, saying, "It's only a big airplane."

In fact, one of the film's shortcomings is at the Mad Max level. It has two car-chase set-pieces. The first, in the middle of the film, is reassuringly good — these filmmakers know their moves. The second, which climaxes the film, in very nearly a re-run of the first. This sort of elaborate repetition of a sequence can be made to work if the film establishes pointed comparisons:

The Chain Reaction doesn't.

Steve Bisley provides a nicely wired-up ocker with anti-authoritarian energy to burn and no inkling of what is going on around him, an appropriate central performance for the film. But the other Mad Max veteran, Hugh (Toecutter) Keays-Byrne, is ubiquitous, in a constantly changing series of costumes and hairstyles, and disturbingly arch.

The unusual tone of his performance (with its direct allusions to Stone and Mad Max, and an indirect reminder of one other performance, Stanton Kaye's version of himself as media baron in Brandy in the Wilderness) can only be associated with the film's surfaces rather sense which abruptly percolates to the surface — like plutonium water — in the film's ironic, cold, final shots.

The Blue Lagoon

Scott Murray

Randal Kleiser's The Blue Lagoon is a refreshingly old-fashioned entertainment about two children shipwrecked on a tropical island. Isolated from civilization and the traditional teaching processes of family and school life, they grow by experience, inventing their own wisdoms and forms of behaviour.

The film, which has been a major commercial success in the U.S., belongs determinedly to the Hollywood tradition of island romances. It willfully forges realism for a fantasy paradise, and abandons conventional story-telling techniques in favor of a fragmented narrative lightly strung together by listless dissolves. Australian producer Richard Brennan has favorably described the film as "one long montage", a description which helps convey its drone-like intonation.

The Blue Lagoon also derives from the little-discussed genre of teenage romances — particularly those where the lovers build a life outside a society inhabited by intolerant parents. Lewis Gilbert's Friends and its sequel, Paul and Michele, are rich examples, as is, to a lesser degree, the more recent A Little Romance.

In these films, though, the lovers are more-or-less obliged to flee civilization, whereas in The Blue Lagoon chance provides the means. Fate, of course, is a necessary part of much successful romance, and here it helps ensure the film is undemanding of audience involvement. The film simply washes past, extracting, and expecting, no response except simple-minded pleasure.

Yet, while consciously keeping his film safely within tested boundaries, Kleiser is more openly explicit than most directors before him. When, for
example. Emmeline (Brooke Shields) experiences her first period, the pool in which she is bathing turns a dark red. As well, her numerous sexual intimacies with Richard (Christopher Atkins) are nicely suggestive of the pleasures sex can bring. The lingering dissolve from hands gliding across fair skin and through sun-baked hair to lips pressed on a mouth, an ear, create a delightfully erotic tinge.

Such scenes are, of course, consciously pretty, and Kleiser side-steps any mention of fumbling or pain. But the point is not to realistically detail intercourse as girlish fatuousness. Ultimately, though, such considerations are irrelevant compared to how successfully the film evokes a special world, and how appealing its young actors manage to be.

Aided by Nestor Almendros' crystalline photography, a picturesque use of landscape and an obsession with filming at those times of day when light is most magical, Kleiser succeeds in making his fantasy land sufficiently seductive. One would certainly want to visit it.

As for the stars, Shields has a strong screen presence and she poses and smiles well enough to cover any lack in acting craft. Atkins, by comparison, is a better actor, though his Los Angeles surfer appearance is more tied to American beachcake good looks than Shields' timeless beauty. She is yet to give an altogether convincing performance (except, perhaps, in Pretty Baby), but her intelligent use of her image on screen suggests that one day she will.

Richard carries Emmeline (Brooke Shields) back to their hut. The Blue Lagoon

Hanover Street

Geoff Mayer

Writer-director Peter Hyams' latest film, Hanover Street, is the sort of film which is rarely taken seriously by reviewers. Certainly it is easy to ignore or relegate it to the "guilty pleasures" compartment by outlining its plot and highlighting dialogue such as David Halloran's (Harrison Ford) farewell to Margaret Sellinger (Lesley-Anne Down), "Think of me when you drink tea."

The highly-schematized narrative involving bomber pilot David's love for Red Cross nurse Margaret, who is married to Paul (Christopher Plummer), a British Intelligence man, offers little that is new. After discovering each other during a German bombing raid on London, the first half of the film traces their bitter/sweet affair and the effect it has on each other; David's transformation from "gung ho" to ultra cautious pilot parallels Margaret's guilt as she frequently watches Paul play with their young daughter.

Eventually, the two men are brought together when they volunteer for a dangerous mission in occupied France, whereupon David learns that Paul is Margaret's husband. At this point David must balance his need for Margaret against his respect for Paul and, appropriately, this decision is made as Paul hangs precariously from the last rung of a partially-destroyed bridge as the Germans open fire on him.

The melodramatic qualities of the narrative obviously expose Hanover Street to ridicule, but it also exposes the difficulty of adequately dealing with a film which never attempts to appeal to an audience on an intellectual level. Hanover Street, like most other examples of popular culture, assumes that the main attraction of films is emotional, not intellectual.

For example, when David anxiously waits for Margaret at a pre-arranged spot, one is consciously aware that Hyams is manipulating the audience's fear that Margaret's conscience will overrule her love for David. However, when she finally appears, to the accompaniment of John Barry's romantic string and piano score, the emotional dimension easily overrides any rational objections.

A structuralist analysis of Hanover Street could point to the film's sub-text and the conservative ideological framework, which, in turn, generates the narrative structure. This conservatism surfaces in many ways throughout the film: the different parameters of action permitted to the men (David and Paul) compared to Margaret (particularly in the last section of the film); the narrative movement to integrate the central characters into a certain type of society; the depiction of war as a great adventure (cf The Deerhunter, Apocalypse Now, etc.); the depiction of marriage and children; etc.
Perhaps the only surprising aspect of this form of analysis is the confirmation of how few allowances Hyams has made to contemporary attitudes and values. It is as if he has made a conscious attempt to retain what would commonly be perceived as the value system of the period in which the film was set (1943).

An amateurish and generic approach to the film doesn't help all that much either — except confirm the bitter/sweet and essentially romantic view of life consistently found in Hyams' previous films, such as the underrated Our Time, Goodnight My Love and even Capricorn One (remember the slow motion conclusion involving James Brolin and Elliott Gould).

Hyams, as usual, complements his optimistic world view with a 'romantic' use of the camera (fluid dolly and crane shots instead of zoom) and composition e.g., Margaret and David's passionate street embrace outlined against the fire and destruction of a London street.

A generic approach reveals that the only concession to the contemporary presentation of the war film is contained in Second Lt Jerry Cimino's (Richard Masur) repeated anguish about the futility of his part in the war, and the rather tentative attempt to explore the possibility that the German people are little different from the British in their concern for Christmas shopping. However, dramatic considerations in the last section of the film require that the Germans merely fulfill the position of 'the enemy'.

Perhaps the only helpful aesthetic perspective from which to view Hanover Street is to adopt the approach used by Robert Warshow in his defence of the gangster film (see The Immediate Experience). Warshow suggests that with regard to this form of formula art, "originality is to be welcomed only in the degree that it intensifies the expected experience without fundamentally altering it." It is from this perspective that I found Hyams' film most satisfying.

There are numerous examples one could cite, but two particularly "intensified" my experience of what otherwise could be considered predictable aspects of the narrative. The first involved the treatment of the initial meeting between David and Margaret at a crowded bus stop. A friendly jostling for position in the bus queue escalates into a series of outrageous antics (Margaret feigning childbirth pains, David a badly wounded leg, etc.), culminating in David's joyous leap as he finally prevents Margaret from boarding her bus.

The second example involves David and Paul's escape from the German headquarters in a captured jeep where Hyams generates a considerable degree of excitement with his subjective use of the camera (although it doesn't quite match a street-chase sequence in Busting, one of his earlier films).

Finally, all one can suggest is that if you find the dramatic premise of films such as Casablanca, Brief Encounter and Mrs Miniver emotionally satisfying, then there is a good chance you will enjoy Hanover Street.


Blood Money
Adrian Martin

For an Australian short feature with "mainstream" ambitions, Blood Money is guilty of an impertinence by the prevailing standards: how dare one make a film that is, on one level, a loving patchwork of quotations from Hollywood crime films! Parody, it seems, is the only acceptable form for such introspection (as in Buckeye and Pinto and Terror Lostralis); no one "seriously" takes genre formulas as models for cinematic excellence.

The Australian cinema, to be sure, is feverishly in the grip of such a mentality. The makers of any well-intentioned film must at least partly convince themselves that their product is sincere and original, untainted by cinema history, untouched by its codes and conventions. Thus an entire set of cultural oppositions come into play, shaping critical evaluation, and deter-
mining for filmmakers what goes and what doesn’t. If a film is not honest, if it does not efface its language and its form to respect a noble human or social theme, it is merely indulgent — or sly, vulgar, trivial, formalist, whatever.

Bryan Jones once epitomized this ideology rather vividly when he demanded of the Australian cinema: “I want films to amuse, move and stimulate. I want to know more about the world and myself after leaving the cinema. I just want films that are exciting, dramatic, funny, thoughtful, sad or a combination of all these qualities.” Against such an enormous cultural totem, the note of protest, or qualification, from a film like Blood Money is barely audible. But it says something like this: forget the world and the self for a while.

A film’s first duty is to place itself in relation to the majority of films which have preceded it, to claim or disown the dominant systems of film language and narrative form.

Blood Money is a fine, sturdy piece of crime fiction. Its shameless array of “cliches” (meant descriptively, not derogatively) are put up to be recognized and admired — for the memories they conjure, and for the skill and economy with which they are arranged on this particular occasion.

Peter Shields (John Flaus) is an ageing criminal in a world that has changed drastically. The young hoods who assist him in the abortive robbery which opens the film are violent, bumbling, and disciplined amateurs. When he revisits Melbourne — to “relive his youth” as his brother Brian (Bryan Brown) puts it — he finds that everyone had changed sides, that there are no more straight, tough crooks. The organization, run by Curtis (Peter Stratford), has conscripted individual operators and police alike. And even the modern acts of crime have a meaningless, a mercenary lack of adventure about them: Curtis robs goods from his own warehouses to claim on the insurance.

Thematically, this terrain is familiar enough. The important and impressive aspect of the film, however, is the precise, crisp way in which meanings are crystallized and conveyed. At the start of the film, Pete gets in the car that is headed for the site of the robbery. The much younger driver has the radio full blast, blaring rock music. Pete curtly orders it be turned off. In just these few seconds, the nature and values of the new criminal scene, and Pete’s attitude towards it, are established.

Another example: a scene that shows the respectable facade of Curtis’ home life begins with a shot of his daughter, Lisa (Caroline Cassidy), playing tennis. When one of Curtis’ men rings — an unwanted intrusion of the sordid truth — a deep focus shot sets up simultaneously the phone call and the tennis match going on behind, contrasting the innocence and fragility of the girl with the corruption and secrecy of the criminal operation.

The scene is also cleverly functional in a narrative sense — it subtly announces the major part Lisa will play in the plot when Pete later kidnaps her.

The substance of the film is not confined solely to these visibly dramatic crime-genre elements. Like so many Hollywood films, Blood Money is based also on an implicit, hovering scenario that arises from the exchanges between the principal characters.

In the “past” time denoted by the film, Pete loved Brian’s wife, Jeannie (Chrissie James). The nature and depth of this affair is only ever alluded to, in a deliberately uncertain fashion, primarily through the presence of the daughter, Kathy — whether she is Pete’s or Brian’s is never made exactly clear. Thus the relationship between the two brothers achieves at times an extraordinary resonance and complexity. One is unable to attribute a fixed sense, or explanation, to their actions, which seem equally motivated by an intense love (Pete left Jeannie perhaps out of loyalty to Brian) and a constantly seething aggression (Pete gets Brian the sack; Brian demands to know whether Kathy is his child and punishes Pete).

The narrative working-out of the film is posed between this enigmatic pair and an equally mysterious future event which one sees Pete plotting and preparing. Only at the end can the film’s story be appreciated, when all the pieces are put in place for the privilege of the audience — not for any other of the characters.

Pete never tells anyone that he is dying. The final assertion of his individualism and pride will be to methodically stage-manage his own death scene, once everything he has been involved with is settled to his satisfaction. In a sense — and this is a reflexive turn worthy of Fritz Lang — Pete is the author of a fiction whose victim he will finally be; the end of the story will be the end of a life.

Here, too, the underlying motivations are complex. Pete’s “suicide” is, on one hand, intended as a parting gesture of glory, a homage to himself. On the other hand, it is for the benefit of others — to write himself out of the domestic melodrama besetting Brian and Jeannie and thus restore their marriage; providing money for Kathy’s upbringing into the bargain.

But the ironies are not far below the surface, for this gift is “blood money” in two senses: money raised from crime and murder, and a legacy for the child who may well be his daughter. And the fact that he carefully arranges for Brian to see her die suggests a final, bitter act of cruelty against the seemingly normal, respectable couple — and against the very clues of normality and respectability.

The particularly good ending of the film shows its dramatic excellence, as well as its intelligent assimilation of Hollywood conventions. Earlier, the audience is seduced by Pete and Jeannie arrive at a schoolyard to pick up Kathy; Jeannie remarks, “Brian says she looks like you.” This immediately sets in play all the tensions that surround Pete’s intrusion into the family; he is a virtual “return of the repressed”.

The film’s attention to detail are a reworked repetition of this scene, with Brian now come to pick up Kathy. With Pete dead, and his memory and significance once more repressed, the words “do you love your daddy?” and “we’re going home” voice Brian’s hold over his position as father and husband. The film avoids a facile, facile “happy ending” by making these ironic overtones clear through the scene’s repetition.

Blood Money is most successful in such understated, suggestive moments. The scattered attempts at action and pace (a robbery, a fistfight, a car chase) are neither particularly good in themselves nor blended well with the overall tone of the work. And for a genre film, Blood Money is somewhat under-stylized in its use of lighting, composition, and effects.

But, although the film is entirely neither mood piece nor thriller, what it attempts, and the intervention it makes into Australian crime, is perhaps more important than the final results.

Blood Money is soaked in cinema history, but not hide the fact. It consciously and conspicuously places itself within a narrative tradition that most “official” Australian filmmakers try to pretend does not exist — and their films are the poorer for it.

Blood Money: Directed by Chris Fitchett; Producers: Tom Broadbridge, Chris Oliver; Screenplay: Chris Fitchett; John Ruane; Ellery Ryan; Director of photography: Ellery Ryan; Editor: Emmi Priebe; Music: Mark McIlhenny; Sound recorder: Lloyd Carruth; Cast: John Flaus (Pete), Bryan Brown (Brian), Chrissie James (Jeannie); Peter Stratford (Curtis); Peter Curtain (Richie); John Pyper-Jack; Caroline Cassidy (Lisa). Production company: Lunar Productions. Distributor: Greg Lynch Film Distributors. 106min. 72 min. Australia 1980.

Brubaker

Stephen Garron

Stuart Rosenberg’s Brubaker is one of the most important American films to appear in the past few years. Like the recent Australian film Str, it tackles difficult and controversial issues, often adopting a tough, “no-holds-barred” approach to the realities of prison life. Taking their inspiration from real events, they are excellent depictions of man’s inhumanity to man.

Brubaker is based on the experiences of the late 1960s, when an American penal reformer, Thomas Murton, here, the fictional prison farm is Wakefield, considered to be the end of the line, where the most incorrigible prisoners are incarcerated in appalling conditions.

Brubaker (Robert Redford) is the newly-appointed reformist governor who enters Wakefield as a prisoner to experience the prison regime first hand. He is shocked by the beatings, intimidation, bad food and chronically-poor accommodation. Along with him, the audience experiences a growing awareness that beyond the prison wall lies a world far worse than one’s liberal conscience ever imagined.
types of American prisons. Its accuracy is ensured by the presence of Murton as the film's consultant.

Wakefield, unlike Australian prisons, is run on the "trustee" system. This entails the selection of about 50 inmates, the "trustees", who take over the role of prison staff. The fierce antagonistic lines drawn between the "trustees", granted extra privileges, and the "rank" prisoner, contained in horrific circumstances, ensure levels of extreme institutional violence.

"Trustees" maintain their tenuous status by effectively controlling the other prisoners, knowing that if they fail they risk being sent back to the "rank", and almost certain death. This is a peculiar variation of the "divide-and-rule" concept, and one that is economical and brutally effective.

In the process of Brubaker's journey of discovery, the levels of local corruption are neatly etched. In the American system, local and state governments have tight control over the administration of prisons. Such a connection is particularly vulnerable to corruption.

In Brubaker, the interrelation of prison "trustees" and local business clearly emerges. The "trustees" provide cheap prison labor to local businessmen, and use prison stores to sell locally or offer as presents to influential locals. In return, the status quo in the prison is defended in the local councils.

The prison board is also dominated by local businessmen. In an important scene at a meeting of the prison board, the head, Deech (played by Murray Hamilton, by now wonderfully typecast as the archetypal small businessman), reveals that he hates all "criminals" because his daughter was raped by one.

Another board member declares his antipathy to all "criminals" because he has been the victim of armed robbery several times. Brubaker attempts to demonstrate that not only does local administration have a vested interest in maintaining Wakefield as it is, but also a personal interest in extracting the maximum possible vengeance on the prisoners.

Eventually, Brubaker is forced to reveal himself to the "trustees" as the new governor. He quickly demonstrates his intention to reform and immediately upset the established lines of power within the prison. He liberates a number of prisoners in solitary confinement, improves the food, repairs the prisoner accommodation, breaks up levels of "trustee"/local business corruption, and attempts to set up lines of sympathetic communication with the prisoners through an elected inmate council. When questioned by Deech about his intentions, he says, "Burn it to the ground and start all over again."

Brubaker has been placed in the governorship by a high-level bureaucrat, Lillian Gray (Jane Alexander), sympathetic to his reforming ideals. It is soon apparent that local business is angry, the prison board hostile and the "trustees" fearful. — Brubaker is treading too hard, on too many toes, too quickly. At one point, a bemused "trustee", Dickie Coombes (Yaphet Kotto), ambivalent in his attitude to Brubaker — fearful of his reforms and yet respectful of his undoubted integrity — warns him to back off, for it will only get people killed.

Events then take an interesting twist. Old Abraham, a long-time prisoner in Wakefield, almost incoherent from years of beatings, reveals to Brubaker the existence of about 200 prisoners buried on the prison farm. Abraham used to make the small coffins, whereas the dismembered limbs of prisoners were placed for burial. Brubaker sets out to find the graves the next day, but during the night, Abraham is tortured and killed by "trustees" fearful of the consequences if the bodies are found. Brubaker is determined to find the graves.

The government and the prison board, desperate to hush up the scandal, eventually offer Brubaker the power to implement his reforms if he stops the digging. Gray urges Brubaker to compromise for the sake of prison reform, but he refuses. The bodies are found.

In the ensuing scenes, a guilty "trustee" escapes and Brubaker is forced to kill him in self-defence. These events result in the sacking of Brubaker. The prison board sets up an inquiry to clear the administration of any guilt.

In the final scenes, Brubaker prepares to leave the prison by car. Coombes rushes up and says that despite what he had said before, he now considers that Brubaker's attempts at real reform were right all along. As Brubaker leaves, all the prisoners break rank and give a long slow clap of recognition for his attempt, although failed, to restore their dignity.

On one level, Brubaker is very similar to Stir. They each explore the violence and corruption of penal institutions effectively and dramatically. The underlying messages of the two films, however, are fundamentally different. The difference stems from the perspectives from which each film operates: Stir is filmed very much from the angle of the prisoners, Brubaker from that of a prison reformer.

While Brubaker exposes the violence of prison, its essential dynamic is that of reform and the problems reform entails. The crucial relationship in this regard is that between Brubaker and Gray, and their conflicts over what are the best strategies for reform. Brubaker delineates the complexities and contradictions of reform in a series of powerful confrontations between the two reformers. Brubaker, pushing a hard line, believes that the aim of reform should be the total eradication of violence and corruption. For Gray, reform can only be achieved in small incremental stages, because of the powerful vested interests opposed to any change. To her, any change is better than no change at all. To Brubaker, such an approach does not fundamentally change a corrupt system.

The film attempts to endorse the position of Brubaker. In an important symbolic sequence, Coombes and the other prisoners applaud the actions of Brubaker, despite his defeat. In a further endorsement, the film credits reveal that two years after the sacking of Brubaker, Dickie Coombes and 24 other prisoners brought a criminal action against the prison board, resulting in the closure of Wakefield.

The strength of Brubaker is that it sensitively explores the ambiguities and difficulties of social reform and, in the end, presents a compelling case for the necessity of proper, not "band-aid", reforms. Its real testament, however, is to the courage of an individual who fought a corrupt system all the way down the line.

In essence, Brubaker continues a "John Wayne" tradition in American films, where the "good" individual fights the forces of vested interest and corruption and, more often than not, triumphs. Brubaker is a sophisticated post-Watergate variation of this theme, where the forces of evil are corrupt government and dishonest politicians. This tradition has produced some interesting films in the past few years, for example, All the President's Men.

Concluded on p. 508
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The Australian Film Industry and Key Films of the 1970s: An Annotated Bibliography.

George Lugg Film Information and Research Centre, $4.50

Judith Manning

Apart from the bibliography compiled by Andrew Pike and Ross Cooper in the process of researching their recently published Australian Film 1900-1977 (and soon to be made available by the National Film Archive), this is the only attempt to draw together a variety of available resources pertaining to the Australian film industry during the 1970s. To quote Ken Berryman in his introduction: "... the main emphasis is on the films themselves — the motivating forces behind them, details of their actual production, and critical responses to them."

The bibliography lists dramatic features — that is, films made on 35mm or 16mm and 60 minutes or longer in duration. The number of references given for each of the 136 films comport with the critical attention each has received. For example, while 24 references are cited for Newsfront, Scobie Malone receives only seven.

The references include film and non-film periodicals, international newspaper articles/reviews, books, book chapters, study notes and publicity material which the author considers of value. General books and periodicals which deal with more than one film precede the section.

As well, an introductory section on the Australian film industry, "itemizes books and articles from periodicals, magazines and newspapers which deal with Australian feature film production during the 1970s — its beginnings, development, problems, national and international successes. Major issues affecting the film industry are covered, but specific articles on such topics as the income tax law and its application, unions, guilds, societies, festivals, associations, commissions, co-operatives and production companies have generally not been included."

While many of these aspects of Australian film would warrant their own bibliographies, there are a number of references to the financing of the feature film industry, even more on the AFC as a funding and marketing body, and innumerable which refer to discussions and counter-arguments on the "state of the industry".

A section on interviews conducted with key figures of the industry, and articles concerning specific actors/actresses, directors, producers, composers, scriptwriters, etc., is included and arranged alphabetically by surname for quick access. Any documentation which pertains equitably to a film and specific person(s) is saved duplicated listings by generous cross-referencing. Thus an interview with Russell Boyd on filming The Last Wave is fully cited with a description of the article's content in the "people" section and listed under the film in its section.

Anyone who has attempted to compile an encompassing bibliography will know how difficult the task can become. Yet Berryman has persevered further to provide one with descriptive, and sometimes comparative, annotations of each item's content. What is more, they are sufficiently comprehensive to allow the user to select (and discard) the most pertinent items without necessarily referring to the item proper.

While it doesn't purport to be exhaustive, a successful attempt has been made to record the documentation which arose during a most significant 10-year period of the Australian cinema. No doubt, it will become a well-thumbed reference on the shelves of industry persons and producers alike. It also warrants more than a glance from teachers in a variety of disciplines who are using Australian film as a core to their approach. A long-overdue resource, one hopes it will serve as a precursor to a series of bibliographies on the industry.

International Index to Film Periodicals 1978

International Federation of Film Archives. $85 or $52 (on standing order from the AFI).

Judith Manning

The International Index to Film Periodicals was initiated in 1972 by the International Federation of Film Archives as a collaborative project in film documentation between major film archives throughout the world. The Index also originates as a card subscription service, and the annual volumes are a cumulative record of these cards (usually subscribed to by libraries, institutions and archives), with additional cross references and three indexes to facilitate quick reference.

The 1978 volume has just been published. The 84 periodicals chosen for indexing (40 English language, including Cinema Papers, and 44 foreign languages) were selected as making a serious contribution to the literature in the field, containing material likely to be of lasting value from a historical, critical, or aesthetic point-of-view.

The volume is arranged in chapters by subject, film title and biography. It has some 10,000 entries which not only include the bibliographic citation (detailing the inclusion of credits, a filmography, bibliography, statistics, photographs), but also provide a short synopsis of the article.

The first section (188 pages) embraces articles with a distinctive subject content. This is followed by a 296-page (and, at a guess, covering about 2000 films) section on individual films. If an article or review has been written during the 1978 period, regardless of whether it was of a short, documentary or feature, produced in 1938 or 1978, one would find it listed there alphabetically. Each film title cited includes the country of production, director(s) and production date. A division is made in each entry between reviews, dossiers, etc.

The biography section, which covers everyone from animators to women filmmakers, is by alphabetical arrangement and distinguishes between interviews, articles, special issues, reviews and dossiers. While articles about directors, generally and specifically, are included, a director index (to films appearing in the volume) is given at the end of the volume.

It is perhaps unfortunate that the leading U.S. trade paper Variety (where only the film reviews are extracted for indexing) does not receive the capacious indexing of other titles. And for those interested in reading the...
literature about the literature, book reviews are not included. Nonetheless, of the various indexes to periodical content now available, this is unarguably the most scholarly and exhaustive work. The group of people behind the indexing project not only have a necessarily broad knowledge of film, but also work in the area of film documentation and research. The combined experience allows each indexer to examine every article and to make a decision on the kind of research needs it might answer, classifying it accordingly.

The quality and care brought to this work by archivists is apparent in the descriptive, rather than evaluative, annotations for each entry. They have been designed to indicate the subject of the article, the films on which the article concentrates and, where appropriate, the critical methods used in the article. These descriptions (sadly precluded from many similar publications) serve the user in efficient retrieval of the most pertinent information. The annotations are particularly helpful in assessing the relevance of a foreign language article.

Specialist film documentation libraries are ever-reliant on a current and encompassing index. The International Index to Film Periodicals in card form provides a basic resource to libraries and the National Index to Film Periodicals in the George Lugg Film Information and Research Centre, the State Film Centre in Melbourne, the Australian Film and Television School library and the National Film Archive. While an exhaustive work, the group of people behind the indexing project not only have a necessarily broad knowledge of film, but also work in the area of film documentation and research. The combined experience allows each indexer to examine every article and to make a decision on the kind of research needs it might answer, classifying it accordingly.

The quality and care brought to this work by archivists is apparent in the descriptive, rather than evaluative, annotations for each entry. They have been designed to indicate the subject of the article, the films on which the article concentrates and, where appropriate, the critical methods used in the article. These descriptions (sadly precluded from many similar publications) serve the user in efficient retrieval of the most pertinent information. The annotations are particularly helpful in assessing the relevance of a foreign language article.

Specialist film documentation libraries are ever-reliant on a current and encompassing index. The International Index to Film Periodicals in card form provides a basic resource to the George Lugg Film Information and Research Centre, the State Film Centre in Melbourne, the Australian Film and Television School library and the National Film Archive. While an author index would be useful in furthering research, a self-contained group of the director's films. The recommended prizes listed are for paperbacks, unless otherwise indicated, and are subject to variations between bookshops and states. The list was compiled by Mervyn R. Binns of the Space Age Bookstore, Melbourne.

Recent Releases
Mervyn Binns

This column lists books released in Australia, between October and November 1980, which deal with the cinema or related topics. All titles are on sale in bookshops. The publishers and the local distributors are listed below the author in each entry. If no distributor is indicated, the book is imported (Imp.).

Critical

The Films of Charles Bronson
Jerry Vernihle
Citadel/Davis, $25.50 (HC)
A new title in the popular 'Citadel' series.

Film Biographies

Finn. Bloody Finch
Elaine Dundy

Michael Joseph/Nelson, $22.50 (HC)
An exhilarating biography of the great Finch's life, from being a Balinese boy in India, to a copy-boy on a Sydney newspaper, to his career as an award-winning actor.

40 Days with Marilyn
Hans Jorgensen Lombard

Arrow/Hodder, $4.95
Paperback edition of this tender story of a very special love, and an intimate portrait of a very special woman.

Stunman: Autobiography of Yakima Canutt, with Oliver Drake
Robson/Hutchinson, $21.75 (HC)
Exhibits of a top Hollywood stuntman.

This Life
Sydney Portier
Hodder and Stoughton/Hodder, $22.95 (HC)
Story of the first black actor to break through the stereotyping and racism of Hollywood and emerge as a great star.

Typhoon Power: The Last Idol
Fred Lawrence Guiles
Granada/Methuen Aust., $26.95 (HC)
A poignant portrait of a great personality.

Griffith — First Artist of the Movies
Martin Williams
Oxford/Oxford University Press, $19.50 (HC)
Traces Griffith's life and work from before 1912 through to the major films of the 1920s.

Jean Renoir (The French Films 1924-1939)
Alexander Sesonske

Harvard University Press/ANZ Books, $14.95
An authoritative book on the films of Jean Renoir.

The Movie World of Roger Corman
J. Philippe di Franco ed.

Penguin/Imp., $3.95 and $4.95.

A novelistic adaptation of the silent screenplay.

The Great Movie Stars
Harry and Michael Medved

Angus and Robertson/Angus and Robertson, $8.70
The second volume in Shipman's history of the cinema, following the Great Movie Stars.

The Inside Story
Jerry Vernihle

University of Illinois/Imp., $3.95
An illustrated guide to 1000 of the best known and most popular films of the cinema.

The Inside Story
Jerry Vernihle

University of Illinois/Imp., $2.50
A novelistic adaptation of the silent screenplay.

Timeless Land Trilogy
Eleanor Dark

Angus and Robertson/Angus and Robertson, $4.95
The recommended price listed is for paperbacks, unless otherwise indicated, and are subject to variations between bookshops and states.

Recent Releases

Mervyn Binns

This column lists books released in Australia, between October and November 1980, which deal with the cinema or related topics. All titles are on sale in bookshops. The publishers and the local distributors are listed below the author in each entry. If no distributor is indicated, the book is imported (Imp.). The recommended prizes listed are for paperbacks, unless otherwise indicated, and are subject to variations between bookshops and states.

The list was compiled by Mervyn R. Binns of the Space Age Bookstore, Melbourne.

Popular and General Interest

Glorious Technicolor
Fred E. Basten

Burnes, $45 (HC)
The full account of the dazzling Technicolor years. Informative with a complete filmography from 1917 onwards.

The Golden Turkey Awards
Harry and Michael Medved

Angus and Robertson/Angus and Robertson, $8.70
Nominees and winners for the worst achievements in filmmaking history.

The Great Movie Stars — The International Years
David Shipman

Angus and Robertson/Methuen, $22.95 (HC)
The second volume in Shipman's history of the cinema, following the Great Movie Stars.

A Star Is Born (Garland)

Penguin/Penguin Aust., $3.95★

Hollywood packed with the glorious Garbo.

So Hold on

Penguin/Penguin Aust., $3.50

An illustrated guide to the Hollywood packed with the glorious Garbo.

The Films of Charles Bronson
Jerry Vernihle
Citadel/Davis, $25.50 (HC)
A new title in the popular 'Citadel' series.

Finn. Bloody Finch
Elaine Dundy

Michael Joseph/Nelson, $22.50 (HC)
An exhilarating biography of the great Finch's life, from being a Balinese boy in India, to a copy-boy on a Sydney newspaper, to his career as an award-winning actor.

40 Days with Marilyn
Hans Jorgensen Lombard

Arrow/Hodder, $4.95
Paperback edition of this tender story of a very special love, and an intimate portrait of a very special woman.

Stunman: Autobiography of Yakima Canutt, with Oliver Drake
Robson/Hutchinson, $21.75 (HC)
Exhibits of a top Hollywood stuntman.

This Life
Sydney Portier
Hodder and Stoughton/Hodder, $22.95 (HC)
Story of the first black actor to break through the stereotyping and racism of Hollywood and emerge as a great star.

Typhoon Power: The Last Idol
Fred Lawrence Guiles
Granada/Methuen Aust., $26.95 (HC)
A poignant portrait of a great personality.

Griffith — First Artist of the Movies
Martin Williams
Oxford/Oxford University Press, $19.50 (HC)
Traces Griffith's life and work from before 1912 through to the major films of the 1920s.

Jean Renoir (The French Films 1924-1939)
Alexander Sesonske

Harvard University Press/ANZ Books, $14.95
An authoritative book on the films of Jean Renoir.

The Movie World of Roger Corman
J. Philippe di Franco ed.

Penguin/Imp., $3.95 and $4.95.

A novelistic adaptation of the silent screenplay.

The Inside Story
Jerry Vernihle

University of Illinois/Imp., $2.50
A novelistic adaptation of the silent screenplay.

Timeless Land Trilogy
Eleanor Dark

Angus and Robertson/Angus and Robertson, $4.95
The recommended price listed is for paperbacks, unless otherwise indicated, and are subject to variations between bookshops and states.
### FILM CENSORSHIP LISTINGS

Films examined in terms of the Customs (Cinematograph Films) Regulations and States' film censorship legislation are listed below. An explanatory key to reasons for classifying non-"G" films appears hereunder:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Explicitness/Intensity</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In frequent</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Sex)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V (Violence)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L (Language)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O (Other)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AUGUST 1980

FOR GENERAL EXHIBITION "G" FILMS REGISTERED WITHOUT ELIMINATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Producer</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Submitted Length (m)</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Reason for Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Rajul Al Mounasib</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>94 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Right Man (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>117 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Talk (The Crooked Deal) (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>91 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baha Al Khaleel</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>103 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rima For Sale (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>115 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Voyage; Charlie Brown (And Don't Come Back)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1941.89</td>
<td>Le Cleco Films</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gharama El Istanbul (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1184.76</td>
<td>Rohin Films</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khayel Lil Sayyad</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1036.32</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar Al Talib (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>111 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Company Business (16mm)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2816.69</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simone De Beauvoir (16mm)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2872.46</td>
<td>Cinema International Corp. P/L</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yas Balam Al Hudo</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2816.69</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOT RECOMMENDED FOR CHILDREN "MRC" FILMS REGISTERED WITHOUT ELIMINATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Producer</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Submitted Length (m)</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Reason for Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Asab Feast Of Tobias</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>116 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffering Behind Smiles (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>109 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Cheyir Isad (The Devil is a Woman) (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>100 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Hadi Al Sani (Yesterday's Love) (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>114 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Lesa Al Zarr</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>100 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pleasure and the Pain (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>100 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Sukkarees</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>143 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of a Town In Cairo (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>100 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Al Ayne</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>106 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Ayya (Where is My Sanity) (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>100 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banat Akher Zaman (Modern Girls) (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>114 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Beyond the Stars</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>100 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Stopped at Eboli</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>3060.00</td>
<td>Scoop Films</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damas Wa Durnama Waltzlamali</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>100 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dama Mba Durnama Waddalamali</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>100 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Tears and Smiles (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>100 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabreen (Patient Lovers) (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>103 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shatston Fal Abdel</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>106 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devi Fareeri (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>106 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shikka Wa Miltion Milt (The Apartment of a Million Keys) (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>106 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake Deadly Act</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>106 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake Deadly Act (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>106 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake Deadly Act (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>106 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake Deadly Act (videotape)</td>
<td>Not shown</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>106 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FOR MATURE AUDIENCES "M" FILMS REGISTERED WITHOUT ELIMINATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Producer</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Submitted Length (m)</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Reason for Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andyism</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Best Hunter Wins</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha and Suddu Assasinaator</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caskavishin</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caskavishin: Where the Street Comes from</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caskavishin: The Day It Came to Earth</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dragon The Hero</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubious Gambling Den</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duel of Death</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endgame</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filthy Guy</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Happy Hooker Goes Hollywood</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeydewc Rose</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Horror Show</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love in Chilly Spring</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Mean People</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya Rabbi Tobah (God Forgive Me)</td>
<td>Al Screwd Up</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>118 mins</td>
<td>Nile Int'l Film Distributors</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Previously shown in a version measuring 2557.81 metres (July 1980 list)

### Continued on p. 499
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## BOX-OFFICE GROSSES

### PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Distributor</th>
<th>SYD. 31.8.80 to 4.10.80</th>
<th>MLB. 31.8.80 to 4.10.80</th>
<th>PTH 31.8.80 to 4.10.80</th>
<th>ADL 31.8.80 to 4.10.80</th>
<th>BRI. 31.8.80 to 4.10.80</th>
<th>Total $ 31.8.80 to 4.10.80</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>SYD. 6.7.80 to 30.8.80</th>
<th>MLB. 6.7.80 to 30.8.80</th>
<th>PTH 6.7.80 to 30.8.80</th>
<th>ADL 6.7.80 to 30.8.80</th>
<th>BRI. 6.7.80 to 30.8.80</th>
<th>Total $ 6.7.80 to 30.8.80</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breaker Morant</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>(5/5/5/5) 232,656</td>
<td>(5/5/5) 171,999</td>
<td>(3/3) 109,254</td>
<td>(5) 54,483</td>
<td>(3) 48,399</td>
<td>616,701</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(8/3/3) 243,555</td>
<td>(8) 196,526</td>
<td>(8) 87,541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>527,622</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chain Reaction</td>
<td>HTS</td>
<td>(5) 97,975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97,975</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,893</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Club</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>(2) 39,473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39,473</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganinnie</td>
<td>GUO</td>
<td>(2) 8789</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>109,254</td>
<td>(1) 4006</td>
<td>12,795</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1/4/1) 9922</td>
<td>(1) 5971</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 15,893</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Earthling</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>(2) 3282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(14/1) 27,379</td>
<td>(3/9) 10,461</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 41,545</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>342,702</td>
<td>215,388</td>
<td>109,254</td>
<td>54,483</td>
<td>48,399</td>
<td>770,226</td>
<td></td>
<td>280,856</td>
<td>247,834</td>
<td>3819</td>
<td>87,541</td>
<td>3705</td>
<td>623,755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Total‡</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,631,314</td>
<td>1,545,950</td>
<td>759,001</td>
<td>471,990</td>
<td>470,926</td>
<td>4,878,281</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,727,638</td>
<td>2,392,520</td>
<td>1,214,603</td>
<td>641,911</td>
<td>794,381</td>
<td>7,771,053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,974,016</td>
<td>1,761,338</td>
<td>868,255</td>
<td>525,573</td>
<td>519,325</td>
<td>5,648,507</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,008,494</td>
<td>2,640,354</td>
<td>1,214,603</td>
<td>798,086</td>
<td>8,394,808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Notes

- 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.
- * Continues into next period.
- ‡ Figures in parenthesis above the grosses represent weeks in release. If more than one figure appears, the film has been released in more than one cinema during the period.
- (1) Australian theatrical distributor only. RS — Roadshow; GUO — Greater Union Organization Film Distributors; HTS — Hoyts Theatres; FOX — 20th Century Fox; UA — United Artists; CIC — Cinema International Corporation; FW — Filmways Australasian Distributors; 7K — 7 Keys Film Distributors; CCL — Columbia Pictures; REG — Regent Film Distributors; CDG — Cinema Centre Group; AFC — Australian Film Commission; SAFC — South Australian Film Corporation; MCA — Music Corporation of America; S — Sharmill Films; OTH — Other. (2) Figures are drawn from capital city and Inner suburban theatre handbills only. (3) Split figures indicate a multiple cinema release.
Sydney (Head Office):
114 Pyrmont Bridge Road
Camperdown, N.S.W. 2050
Telephone 516 1333 (4 lines)
Telex 27465
Telegram "Zeisaoptic", Sydney

Melbourne:
396 Newnham Road
Carnegie, 3163
Telephone 568 3265
Telex 34461

Brisbane:
265 Stanley Street
South Brisbane, Qld. 4101
Telephone 44 7666
Telex 41002

Adelaide:
21 King William Road
Unley, S.A. 5061
Telephone 375 1100
Telex 82099

Perth:
31 Malcolm Street
Perth, W.A. 6000
Telephone 321 8559
Telex 52021

New Zealand:
4 Frankmore Avenue
Johnsonville, Wellington 4, N.Z.
Telephone 78 4761
Telex 31467

SOUND STUDIO FOR HIRE

Suitable for Film, Video and Stills at:

FILM SETS
88 Warrigal Road,
Oakleigh,
MELBOURNE 3166

Studio 75’ x 46’ with 14’ to lighting grid.
Large three sided paintable fixed cyc.
Good access to studio for cars and trucks.
Design and set construction service available.
Dressing rooms, wardrobe, and make-up facilities.

STUDIO BOOKINGS, PHONE:
Alex Simpson, (03) 568 0058,
(03) 568 2948
AH (03) 25 3858
Thompson for Shooting

Award-winning Australian actor Jack Thompson will star in The Shooting, a new feature film about the Graham murders on the West Coast of the South Island.

Backed by Southern Pictures of London, the film is the project of expatriate tax concessions producer Andrew Brown, who recently won an Emmy for his British television series Edward and Mrs Simpson. The Shooting, so far a working title, will have an overseas director, although most of the supporting cast and crew will be New Zealanders. It will be shot on location in the West Coast early next year.

The film is based on the book by expatriate Australian Howard Willis, and tells the story of one of the most sensational chapters in the history of New Zealand crime.

It began on October 8, 1941 when Stanley Graham, a South Island farmer shot dead three policemen and gravely injured two other men. He was hunted by 200 armed police and soldiers, but the death toll reached six before he was caught.

Lean in New Zealand

Director David Lean has again scouted the prospects of making a film based on the mutiny on the Bounty in New Zealand, but the problem still seems to be production finance at the Hollywood end.

On his latest visit Lean, accompanied by Hollywood producer Dennis O'Dell and his personal production manager Eddie Fowle, re-inspected the new National Film Unit Studios at Lower Hutt and had discussions with a number of Government departments, including Customs, Inland Revenue and Tourism and Publicity.

In February last year Lean and United Artists top executive Lee Katz were involved in talks with the Government on the possibility of Lean using New Zealand as production centre for the shooting of two films based on the Bounty story. However, the discussions founded on the question of tax concessions.

It is understood that the director is now planning to make only one Bounty film.

Delicensing Row

Delicensing of New Zealand cinemas could make film censorship more haphazard and encourage an inflow of smut, according to the president of the New Zealand Motion Picture Exhibitors' Association, Bryan Jennings.

The association represents about 100 independent cinema proprietors outside the main chains of Kerridge-Odeon and Amalgamated Theatres.

Jennings says his association is "very sore" about the legislation recently introduced in Parliament by the Minister for Internal Affairs Allan Higlit, which abolishes the licensing of film exhibitors and renters.

"Introducing the delicensing measure," Higlit said it was part of the Government's program to encourage free and open competition.

Under the existing system, he added, the licensing authority provided protection for one small group in the community, not only from competition from other exhibitors who might provide better films and facilities, but also from the operations of community-based organizations such as Church groups, parent-teacher organizations and schools.

Jennings claimed that one result of the delicensing measure was that the community had been deprived of the protection which had hitherto been provided to them.

"It seems to be production finance at the Hollywood end," he said. "I do not think we can do without the licence system. It will only lead to further problems."

Zephyr Progresses

The biggest film venture to be produced in New Zealand, Race to the Yankee Zephyr is in the second week of a 10-week shoot on location in Queenstown.

Directed by David Hemmings, the film is produced by Endeavour Productions' John Barnett and Australian Tony Ginn. New Zealand's multimillion dollar involvement is underwritten by Australian merchants, banks Pay Rithew and Co Ltd.


Veteran actors Donald Pleasance and George Peppard are co-starring with New Zealand supplying supporting actors and most of the crew.

Yankee Zephyr is the story of a race for a $50 million cargo on board a small DC-13 aircraft that has crashed into a lake somewhere in New Zealand's mountainous South Island.

Censor Active

The number of feature films submitted to the New Zealand Censor during 1979-80 showed an increase, reversing the decline apparent over the previous two years.

According to the annual report of the Internal Affairs Department, recently tabled in Parliament, 1,062 films were examined. Films approved totalled 1,043, with 13 features, one short film and five trailers refused.

The report says that as in previous years, the principal reasons for films being refused approval were the extent, degree and manner in which the films depicted violence, sex or a combination of both. Anti-social behaviour, also, had become an increasingly relevant factor, particularly in association with violence.

Percentage of 35mm films cut was 16.5, while trailers cut amounted to 29.2 per cent of the total examined.

The report says adverse comment and reaction from overseas in regard to the films The Warriors and The Life of Brian stimulated similar developments in New Zealand, resulting in demands for both to be refused exhibition approval.

However, each was approved after the Chief Censor consulted a number of authorities, the classifications being R16.

Pie Release Date Set

Geoff Murphy's new comedy-adventure Goodbye Pork Pie will open in Kerridge-Odeon cinemas throughout the country in February.

Starring Tony Barry, Kelly Johnson and Claire Oberman, and is already in the hands of distributors in West
Alun Bollinger

Television

The first job I had was as a trainee cameraman with the New Zealand Broadcasting Commission. I went along and applied with a whole lot of school leavers and, to my surprise, I got the job. On the second day there, they said to me, “Well, you better do something. Here is a camera and light meter.” It was like that then. They had only just started employing people and we were in the process of building up a camera department. So I shot a news item with 20 ft of film, editing it in the camera as I went along. Luckily, all my mistakes seemed to cancel themselves out and it turned out okay. This surprised everyone, including myself, because the only experience I had before that was with a Brownie box camera when I was a kid!

What sort of camera were you using?
The first one they sent me out with was a little wind-up Bell and Howell—a beautiful, solid little camera with about a 22-second run.

What came next?
The next thing I shot was some footage of the new Wellington freeway. It was just an exercise, but by coincidence they wanted a story on the freeway construction, and it ended up going to air. It was crazy, really, because they were putting my stuff to air as I was tuning up my act!

Were you always shooting news stories?
No, there was also a lot of documentary work, and I got to travel all over the country on different assignments. But there was no drama at that stage.

Did you get any experience with lighting while you were at the NZBC?
No. It wasn’t until I left about two years later that I got into lighting. I started shooting bits and pieces for various people I knew, and got into lighting because on the low-budget documentaries and shorts I was doing, that was simply part of the job. In fact, during that period I was everything: lighting cameraman, camera assistant, camera operator, gaffer. You do it all on small jobs.

Freelancing

What was your first major assignment?
Tankbusters. It was produced by the Acme Sausage Company, an outfit I have been associated with from the outset. It was a 40-minute black and white crime thriller which surprised us all by selling to television here, and in Australia.

You were actually a part of the Acme Sausage Company...
Yes, along with Geoff Murphy and others. What was your largest project with Murphy’s “Wild Man”?
Yes. I shot most of it. John Barnett was also involved. He took over as producer during the final stages and supervised the post-production. We also made a short to accompany it called Dagg Day Afternoon, which starred Fred Dagg, whom Barnett was managing at the time.

In those days, the basic shooting time for a half-hour film was about five days. Wild Man was the first ripple of activity on the New Zealand feature film scene. Straight afterwards we worked on Sleeping Dogs, which I gathered on. Michael Seresin was the director of photography and Paul Leach the operator. At the same time, Tony Williams’ Solo was being shot. The next feature I did was John Laing’s Middle Age Spread, produced by John Barnett. I also worked on several shorts during that period. One, in particular, I feel was important. It was called Uenuku, which was based on a Maori legend, and produced by the Acme Sausage Company for television.

At that stage the company had moved to a remote area called Hawkes Bay, where we based the film, and spent six months building the sets and shooting on weekends. It’s a beautiful film, although it had a very unfortunate post-production period — as a lot of New Zealand films do.

Why?
I think because nobody realizes the importance of post-production here. Producers tend to think the film’s finished once it’s shot, and rush through post-production too quickly. At times it’s related to budgeting. Producers tend to under-budget for post-production, or else use up their post-production allocation during shooting.

Are there any other dramatic shorts you’ve worked on, besides “Uenuku”, which stand out?
I did a little film before Middle Age Spread called State of Siege, which was based on a well-known New Zealand novel by Janet Frame, directed by Vincent Ward, and turned out very well. I am sure it was the one that put me in fashion.

What features have you done since “Middle Age Spread”?
Paul Maunder’s Sons for the Return Home, Geoff Murphy’s Goodbye Pork Pie, and most recently John Laing’s Beyond Reasonable Doubt. I have also shot a second film for Vincent Ward and produced by Tim White, and it was the one that put me in fashion.

Are you very selective about the projects you work on?
At this stage, yes. Originally I wasn’t going to do Beyond Reasonable Doubt because at the time John Barnett approached me I was up to my neck with Goodbye Pork Pie. But the more I found out about the film the more I wanted to do it, and I ended up committing myself to it because of the social comment it was making.

But I am selective because of the amount of work. I am offered. It’s strange really, because there is a lot of other cinematographers around who aren’t working as much, but should be.

I suppose it’s all a matter of experience. No one is prepared, these days, to give inexperienced people a break. Luckily I have done the rounds, and learnt how to run a department — which is one of the most important things to know, working as a director of photography. You have to know how to work as a team.

How do you find the camera crews in New Zealand?
We don’t really have any sort of...
I have noticed that the light in New Zealand seems to be softer than Australia...

We get less sunlight here. In fact we had a very bad summer, which was good for Beyond Reasonable Doubt because we were able to shoot the exteriors in overcast weather — reducing the need for filtering. Keeping the contrast down is very important in achieving a soft look.

When the sun is bright, how do you cut the contrast? Do you get rid of the shadows by using extra lighting?

I prefer to use a screen to knock back the sunlight rather than use lights. It can be very tricky though, particularly when the subject is moving from a wide-shot into a close-up. But for everyone's comfort I try to avoid full light, because fill light softens the picture, it makes for a bright working situation.

Do you use Eastmancolour stock?

Yes, we use Eastmancolour negative. It's American stock. Is that the only option available in New Zealand?

There was a preference in Australia for a while for the British Eastman stock. Many cameramen felt it was softer than the American stock...

I've heard that, but I haven't had a chance to experiment myself. Actually, a grader from Colorfilm came over here when we were doing Sons for the Return Home, and I had the opportunity to talk to him about processing the various stocks. He said he found that working in an Australian lab with the American filmstock that they always had to knock back the magenta, but with the British stock they were always adding a bit. It seems that the colors in the British stock are less intense.

How would you describe the lighting style on "Beyond Reasonable Doubt"?

I am not very good at describing what I do. The way I work is mainly intuitive.

Did John Laing want a realistic style, or a semi-dramatized documentary look?

Basically, we were going for a softened-off realism. The story is current affairs, but most of the events have already taken place. It is 10 years since the murders took place, and Arthur Thomas only got out of prison last year. In the film we deal with the events leading up to putting him away; it's concerned with something that has already happened, as well as something that is still happening. So, we didn't want a crisp, hard reality. Everything is heavily filtered and soft on the edges.

What sort of filters did you use?

Just a net actually. I find that 35mm shot clean and projected up on a wall 15 ft high and 20 ft wide looks unreal, because it's so big. Every pore stands out. Filtering tends to knock the hard edges off.
WE HAVE EVERYTHING
YOU'LL EVER NEED

IF YOU WANT:
• Low cost production and superb quality.
• Fresh faces, clean air, lush locations offering the world's most beautiful backdrops.
• Up to the minute facilities — all under one roof.

Contact us now for information on:
• LABORATORY SERVICES:
  From instant rushes to release prints at competitive rates both in 35mm and 16mm.
• SOUND:
  Superb sound recording and mixing facilities and the experts to go with them. We have 3 sound theatres — a dubbing theatre with a 12-track Neve Mixing console, Music Stage large enough to record a full symphony orchestra, and special effects recording theatre. Our music library and music scoring facilities can also be made available.
• SOUND STAGE:
  Ours is unparalleled in the Southern Hemisphere. Its size is 58' x 86' x 22' (to the lighting grid). Set design and construction, storage and all normal facilities offered.
• EDITING:
  Furnished and equipped editing rooms and edge numbering service available.
• EQUIPMENT:
  The latest in camera and editing equipment for hire for location work.
• DESIGN AND ROSTRUM CAMERA:
  Available for graphics, animation and special effects.
• STOCK SHOT LIBRARY:
  Comprehensive collection of scenic, archival and other material available.
• OFFICE SPACE:
  Two or three offices can be made available for your use.

FOR INFORMATION AND PRICES Contact:
Douglas Eckhoff,
Manager,
National Film Unit,
P.O. Box 46-002, Park Avenue,
Lower Hutt,
NEW ZEALAND.
Telex: NZ23491
Telephone: Wellington 672-059

Film Facilities Ltd.
Complete Camera and Lighting Rental Equipment Services
Arriflex 35 BL, Arriflex 16 SR, Super Speed Lenses, H.M.I. Lighting, Cranes, Dollies etc.
FREELANCE DIRECTORY

A guide to freelance personnel in the New Zealand film and television industry.

Compiled by Lynette Gordon in association with the New Zealand Film Commission.

This list will be updated in a future issue. Please notify any additions or corrections to:

The Editor, Cinema Papers, 644 Victoria St, North Melbourne, Vic. 3051, Australia.
Ph: (03) 329 5983.

AUCKLAND

Producers
David Blyth 545-848
Lynton Butler 762-746
Bill Cole 600-585
Deborah Davidson 764-756
Denis Delaney 372-995
Ronald Donaldson 796-336
Gordon Ell 492-867
Malcolm Ferguson 492-531
Michael Firth 53-6621
John Henry 371-300
Owen Hughes 774-093
Terry King 556-646
Maggie Lewis 779-190
Andy McAlpine 543-362
Larry Marr 465-380
Ian Mune 451-679
Sam Pillbury 371-071
Wayne Sellwood 540-380
Sigmund Spalth 543-496
Bill Thomas 695-273
Richard Tong 34-702

Directors
David Blyth 545-848
Lynton Butler 762-746
Gerben Cath 503-942
Bill Cole 600-585
Denis Delaney 372-995
Roger Donaldson 796-336
Gordon Ell 779-071
Michael Firth 53-558
Bill Hardy 685-205
Philip Howe 761-149
Owen Hughes 774-093
Terry King 556-646
Andy McAlpine 543-362
Bruce Morrison 786-410
Ian Mune 451-679
Sam Pillbury 371-071
Derek Seabourn 795-839
Wayne Sellwood 540-380
Sigmund Spalth 543-486
David Teasman 688-342
Richard Tong 34-702
Andy Tyler 793-316

1st Assistant Directors
Murry Newey 768-879
Dorthe Schaffmann 760-208

2nd Assistant Directors
Jo Hayes 764-486

Production Managers
Sally Bartle 602-330
Elizabeth Croft 814-9608
Julie Cuthbertson 761-781
Trish Downie 688-266
Priscilla Edbrooke 761-851
Jo Hayes 764-466
Susan Humphries 768-168
Lyn Joyce 438-167
Larry Marr 795-838
Midge Mcclay 643-141
Bill Thomas 695-273

Production Assistants
Sally Bartle 602-330
Lyndall Cuthbertson 761-781
Elisabeth Croft 814-9608
Julie Cuthbertson 761-781
Trish Downie 688-266
Lynda Dye 761-966
Priscilla Edbrooke 761-851
Jo Hayes 764-466
Susan Humphries 768-168
Lyn Joyce 438-167
Midge Mcclay 643-141
Bill Thomas 695-273

Continuity
Jackie Sullivan 584-300

Crew and General Assistants
Steve Boese 767-139
Susanna Burton 598-030
Alan Cameron 768-132
Trevor Hayson 452-115
Gary Halm 762-287
Stan Jones 768-252
Justine Lord 769-135
Jeff O'Donnell 767-139

Casting
Julie Cuthbertson 767-727
Wendy Holloway 453-854

Directors of Photography and Lighting Cameramen
James Bartle 802-330
John Eamshaw 437-936
Marcion Ferguson 493-631
Paul Leach 478-1018
Leen Narbey 605-316
Peter Parsons 444-386
Sigmund Spalth 543-486
Graham Titman 871-665

Cameramen and Camera Operators
Dene Johnson 469-381
Terry King 556-864
Paul Leach 478-1018
Andy McAlpine 543-362
Leen Narbey 605-316
Andrew Roelants 597-550
Graham Titman 871-665
Rex Wilmhurst 666-526

Camera Assistants
Roland Carati 885-819
Peter Hay 768-912
David Franklin 603-227
Dene Johnson 496-581
Gerd Pohman 606-399
Andrew Roelants 597-550

Clapper/Loaders
Roland Carati 885-819
John Batch 452-718
Tony Thompson 769-711

Natural History Cameramen
Geoff Moon 769-711

Video Cameramen
Dene Johnson 496-581
Gerd Pohman 606-399

Sound Recordists
Dale Farran 769-856
Craig McLeod 373-631
Graham Monie 492-795
Hammond Peck 856-073
Dane Tews 598-041

Boom Operators
Eric Briggs 373-631
Stewart Main 769-546
Hammond Peck 856-073
Mike Westgate 589-715

Sound Effects
Mike Westgate 589-715

Video Tape Sound
Mike Westgate 589-715

Track-Laying
Dale Farran 769-856
Hammond Peck 856-073
Dane Tews 598-041

Gaffers
Kirkie Campbell 604-456
Stuart Dyrubhag 760-208
Don Eacott 456-216
Brian Norton 861-713
John Spurle 452-718

Electricians
Simon Wyatt 762-064

Video and Television Lighting Directors
James Bartle 802-330
Brian Norton 861-713

Production Designers and Art Directors
Lynn Bergquist 541-193
Elizabeth Croft 814-9608
Resaon Grifiths 769-540
Kai Hawkins 53-6772
Chris Morley 452-818
Liz Mitchell 482-809
John Roberts 589-943
Michael Stockham 814-9614

Props and Set Dressers
Lynn Bergquist 541-193
Elizabeth Croft 814-9608
Brian Delahunty 760-208
Trevor Hayes 452-115
Chris Morley 451-205
Justine Lord 769-125
Liz Mitchell 482-809

Location Scouts
Liz Cooke 762-672

Set Construction
Tony Austin 635-9178
Bill Guar 766-499

Graphics and Titles
Chris Hollyer 415-296
Fiona Kelly 482-953

Costumes and Wardrobe
Tina-Mieke Cath 503-942
Joan McGilp 53-4243
Liz Mitchell 482-953

On Camera Home Economists
Jan Billon 546-492
Louise Doyle 779-271
Van der Kuy 644-820
Justine Lord 796-125
Noami Smith 488-377
Sheila Weight 589-637

Special Effects
John Roberts 599-943

Model-making
Lynn Bergquist 541-193
Brian Borland 439-879
Michael Stockham 814-9614

Location Catering
Lesley Crane 456-885
Felicity Carter 456-601
Louise Doyle 779-271
Justine Lord 796-125

Production Stills
Steve Boese 767-139
Susanna Burton 598-030
Chris Lewis 767-139
24 Crummer Road, Grey Lynn
Lynn, Home, 7 Swift Ave, St Mary's Bay
John Borrington 773-865
Peter Molloy 764-234
Jeff O'Donnell 767-139
John Spurle 452-718

Stunts
Robert Bruce 31-403

Editors
Garben Cath 503-942
Denis Delaney 372-995
Dale Farran 768-956
Philip Howe 769-846
Stewart Main 769-846

Assistant Editors
Stewart Main 769-546

492—Cinema Papers, December/January
**Product:**

**THE ONLY FILM PRODUCTION HOUSE BASED IN NEW ZEALAND'S SCENIC SOUTH ISLAND**

**FULL PRODUCTION FACILITIES**

- Film crew available.
- 35mm ARRIF, 16mm Eclair N.P.R.
- 16mm AATON equipped with videocon tube.
- 6-plate Steinbeck.

Also sole NZ agents for AATON 16mm cameras.

---

**New Zealand's Largest Independent Film Sound Facility**

Sound Producers for New Zealand's best known independent documentaries, feature films, and commercials.

Complete facilities available include:

- 16mm/35mm mixing, transfers and double head screenings.
- Location recordists and location equipment available for hire.

Credits include: "Beyond Reasonable Doubt" - "Goodbye Pork Pie" - "Sons For The Return Home" - "Rodeo" - "Middle Age Spread" - "Skin Deep" and BASF Commercial.

Contact Don Reynolds for complete price list.

**Film lighting problems in New Zealand?**

**Gels Film Lighting Ltd**

Owner/Operator

**Pav Govind**

(Licensed electrician)

Operator experience includes: Features, documentaries, and commercials in Australia, New Zealand and Pacific Islands.

**Fully equipped truck includes**

- 2 x 2.5 H.M.I.
- 4 x 6 lights
- 4 redheads
- 4 blondes
- 2 x 2.5 softlights
- 2 inkies
- and all accessories.

**For 24 hour service**

Phone: 726-639 Wellington, New Zealand
Private: 873-395
NEW ZEALAND PRODUCTION SURVEY

FEATURES

PRE-PRODUCTION

THE LAST LOST HORSE
Prod. company: WTCO Films
Producers: Patrick Cox, Kevin Wilson
Director: John Barnett
Scriptwriter: Kevin Wilson
Length: 100 mins
Synopsis: Based on the true story of Colin Smith and a horse called Smart Parts, Smith sets out to save 500 wild horses from slaughter by boundless interests. Faced with these big business interests, he is faced with defeat and becomes obsessed to save the last lost horse.

THE SCARECROW
Prod. company: Oaks Films
Director: Roger Donaldson
Based on the novel by
Ronald Hugh Morris
New Zealand
Photography: James Barlow
Editor: Ian John
Prod. manager: Graham McLean
Camera operator: John Adair
Gaffer: Don Jewsey
Production Laboratory: National Film Unit
Length: 120 mins
Synopsis: A crazed murderer arrives in a small town where a young adolescent boy and his middle-aged sister are facing the challenges of growing up. The murderer assumes the identity of his victim—only her brother can save her.

THE SHOOTING
Prod. company: Southern Pictures
Producer: John Barnett (NZ)
Director: Andrew Brown
Scriptwriter: Andrew Brown
Exec. producer: Mark Swivas
Gauge: 35 mm
Synopsis: In a farming community in the 1940s, three policemen are shot dead and two men are left gravely injured. A party of 200 armed men set out to track down the man who killed the first three, but by the time the corpses are found, another three men have been killed in one of the most sensational chapters in the history of New Zealand crime.

SMASH PALACE
Producer/director: Roger Donaldson
Assistant producer: Larry Parr
Synopsis: A man separated from his ex-wife and his son by a long estrangement, his son in law and has to face the consequences.

IN PRODUCTION

RACE FOR THE YANKEE ZEPHYR
Co-producers: Antony Gimena (Aust.), John Barnett (NZ)
Director: John Barnett
Scriptwriter: David Pittman
Production: Endavour Productions
Prod. co-ordinator: John Barry
Production secretary: Sylvia James
Length: 100 mins
Synopsis: A race to a crashed DC3 airliner, the face the consequences.

PICTURES

IN PRODUCTION

IN RELEASE

BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT
Prod. company: BDD Productions
Director: John Barnett
Scriptwriter: David Yellup
Synopsis: Beyond Reasonable Doubt?

AWAITING RELEASE
Prod. company: Park Piet Productions
Director: Geoff Murphy
Scriptwriter: Robert Lord
Synopsis: Goodbye Pork Pie

GOODBYE PORK PIE
Prod. company: Park Piet Productions
Director: Geoff Murphy
Scriptwriter: Robert Lord
Synopsis: Goodbye Pork Pie

POST-PRODUCTION

PICTURES
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YOUR TEXT
IS THIS YOUR LOCATION MANAGER?

Has red tape once again snared your production in the abyss of permits and other location unknowns?
We can help!
We're On Location, The Film & Videotape Production Magazine. We bring the most important aspects of location shooting to you every month. What the problems were, how they were solved and who cut the red tape. We show you how, where, when and why.
Send for your subscription today. Your location manager will thank you.

On Location
6464 Sunset Blvd., Suite 570
Los Angeles, California 90028
(213) 467-1268

Please enter my Subscription to ON LOCATION The Film & Videotape Production MAGAZINE.
☐ SIX MONTHS (Introductory Subscription) @ $14.00*
☐ One Year @ $28.00*  ☐ Two Years @ $56.00*

Name ___________________________Title________________
Company____________________________________________
Address ____________________________________________
City_______________________________State_________Zip
Signature____________________________________________
Please indicate the principal nature of your business.

*Payable in U.S. currency
ANIMATION

COTTON ON

Prod. company .................. Paint Pot Studios
Dist. company ............ Paint Pot Studios
Producer/director ................. David Tossman
Scriptwriter ..................... John Gundry
Photography .................... Emily Waugh
Character design .................. Christopher Daley
Animation ...................... John Croft
In-betweening ..................... Sarah Wells
Backgrounds ...................... David Tremlett
Music performed by ............... Andrew Hagen

KESKIDEE-AROHA

Prod. company .................. Scratch Pictures
Dist. company ............ Scratch Pictures
Producer/director ................. Martin Sanderson
Scriptwriter ..................... Martin Sanderson
Research ...................... John Keating
Photography ..................... Kevin Reardon
Editors ......................... Annie Collins
Assistant producer ............... Merata Mita
Production manager ............. Merata Mita
Boom operator .................... Leon Narbey
Laboratory .................. Vid-Com
Additional sound .............. Graeme Morris
Additional photography .......... Tony Keesling
Synopsis: An entertaining educational series for children.

SHORTS

ASIAN SERIES

PRODUCTION FEATURES

THE BRIDGE

Producer/director ................. Gerhard Poeltner
Scriptwriter ..................... Gerhard Poeltner
Photography .................... Lea von Stroh
Sound recordist ................. Michael Housley
Boom operator .................... John King
Laboratory .................. National Film Unit
Mixer .................... John King
Camera assistants ................. Alan Binning

SYMPHONY

Synopsis: When composer and conductor stopped work on the Mangere Bridge construction project in Auckland in May 1978, they were not to know that they would become embroiled in the longest running industrial dispute in New Zealand history. A study in the effect of a crisis situation on worker's lives.

DOCUMENTARIES

PSYCHOTHERAPY

Prod. company .................. Vortex Films
Dist. company ............ Vortex Films
Producer ....................... Rod Prosser
Director ......................... Chris Ghent
Scriptwriter ..................... John Keir
Sound recordist ................. John Keir
Composer ....................... John Keir

Synopsis: A documentary on the subject of parenting and re-rearing, and the use of this treatment for schizophrenic and patients with other serious personality problems.

SEAMEN

Prod. company .................. Vanguard Films
Dist. company ............ Vanguard Films
Producer ....................... Rod Prosser
Director ......................... Russell Campbell
Scriptwriters .................... Alister Barry, Russell Campbell
Photography .................... Rod Prosser
Sound recordist ................. John Kelr
Composer ....................... Jim Hall

Synopsis: A documentary depicting the work of seamen and the history of the New Zealand Seamen's Union.

UNTITLED

Prod. company .................. Motion Pictures
Dist. company ............ Motion Pictures
Producer ....................... Nigel Hutchinson
Director ......................... Graeme Cowley
Photography .................... Warrick Atwell
Editors ....................... Steve Lockie-Lampson, Roy O'Shea, Steve Lockie-Lampson

Synopsis: A documentary on the modern prohibition movement in New Zealand. The film looks at the history of prohibition, the social and political factors that led to its introduction, and theVarious temperance organizations that are actively campaigning for its removal.

For complete details of the following documentary see Issue 29.
**** Continued from p. 426

sent home all kinds of little souvenirs and she accumulated them over three years, in case I ever wrote a book. After the war I did nothing about it; I just kept two and a half suitcases filled with the stuff.

Then, in 1958, my agent said, "Are you ever going to do a story on the Big Red One?" I said, "Yes". He told John Wayne, who called me. We had lunch. He said, "I want to be in the film you are going to do about the 1st Division." He acted as my agent and he took me to see Jack Warner. Then he gave the story on page one of Variety and the Hollywood Reporter. I was even announced the salary he was going to get, which was $77,777,77.

I then left for Europe and when I got back the editor of Panther book came to my office and said, "I read in the trades that you are going to do The Big Red One with Wayne. Don't do it; don't do the film. Give me a book." I'll get you a hardcover, and a year later Pan­

"I'm one of you. I'm sane. I'm sane." The Big Red One.

I read in the trades that you are going to do The Big Red One with Wayne. Don't do it; don't do the film. Give me a book. I'll get you a hardcover, and a year later Panther will come out with paperback.

I liked the idea and told Wayne, but he said, "To hell with the goddamn book, do the film." And Oscar Dystel — he's now the chairman of the board of Panther — said, "To hell with the film, do the book."

I did neither until Peter Bogdanovich said, "If you write the goddamn script, I'll produce it." And that's what happened. I wrote the goddamn thing and he said, "Who do you want?" I said, "Lee Marvin." He sent it to Lee Marvin, and Marvin phoned me from Tucson, Arizona, and said, "This is your Sergeant."

Peter then took it to Lorimar, while I made three trips to Europe and Africa. In the interim, though, Peter had a commitment to make a film called Saint Jack, about a lovable pimp in Singapore. So Gene Corman became the producer and we made the film for Lorimar.

Why did it take so long for you to work with Lee Marvin? He seems an ideal Sam Fuller character . . .

Yeah, he's crazy. It's lucky for him the son-of-the-gun is wearing pants, otherwise I would fall in love with him.

Did you need to give him much direction?

We worked together like two goddamn horses pulling the same stagecoach.

The film was originally much longer than its present 113 minutes . . .

The original cut was four hours and 20 mins. I cut this down to two hours. Then we brought in another editor. I liked 90 per cent of his cut. He put back some things I didn't like, but I was happy to have it under two hours. A four-hour film is too much, if you want to get into a lot of theatres.

Originally, the film didn't have the voice-over narration by Zab, did it?

That was brought in later. They brought in a writer who went through my book and took stuff out of it. If the film is very successful by the end of next year, Merv Adelson of Lorimar is very much taken with the idea of re-releasing it in its full length.

Billy Wilder's film "The Private Life of Sherlock Holmes" had an hour cut out, which he believed defaced it. But you don't think that's happened with "The Big Red One"?

No, it couldn't hurt it, for the simple reason that I am not telling a story like the average storyteller. I am telling the story of three years of war, and people would never miss sequences had I not written them. For every one sequence I did use, I could have used 12 or 15.

There is a magnificent sequence that was cut with my wife, Christa Lang, who played the role of a German countess, and Siegfried Rauch who plays Schroeder, the German soldier. We shot it in Irel­

In 1942, you wrote a book called "The Dark Page". In the film, the character Zab, which I am loosely reading as a nickname for Sam, has written a book called 'The Dark Deadline' . . .

That's legitimate. The character of Zab is me for about three or four in every army who made it after the war.

In war stories, people expect some of the main characters to get killed along the way. There is always someone who gets a letter from his mother and then gets killed. I said, "To hell with that. My book will tell the story of four guys who made it." They represent all the survivors of the war.

You have described the film as "a love story between the Sergeant and the four riflemen" . . .

Yes, but I didn't want any gushing molasses in there. You have no time to fool around like that in combat. And I tried my best to keep away from the development of young men turning into men. That's the normal thing in a war film — or in a Western, where a young fellow joins a group hustling cattle, and by the end of the drive he has become a man.

I wanted to keep away from that, because when you are killing, or being killed, there is no time for development of anything, except the drive to live.

What do you see as going on inside Griff's head when he fires the gun repeatedly into the gas chamber?

First of all, he is completely stymied: he is totally ignorant of what the hell he is looking at. I kept my camera on him just long enough for people to see he has seen a human skeleton in that oven. And by the time he reaches the second and third doors, and sees the SS man, it is the first time he realizes what the hell he is fighting for.

Griff is fighting a very evil thing called Kill; that's Hitler, in this particular case. And you cannot sit at a table with Mr Kill and discuss any deal — it is impossible. You have to resort to his goddamn level and kill his soldiers, and, if possible, kill him. You have to kill Kill, and the ideology of Game of Death when it is all over, you can't tell who really won, or who really lost.

The style of the film is really unlike any other war films I have seen, except perhaps your own. It is more like the surrealism of somebody like Luis Bunuel . . .

I love his work, and what I try to do is get a very coherent and quiet approach to insanity. I didn't want anybody yelling or screaming. I didn't want any silly questions asked, with the exception of one: "Is it alright to kill a sane man?" I wanted that done in a very off-the-shoulder way.

I kept away from bloodshed, because I don't like ketchup on the screen. I prefer to have an audience imagine what is happening.

There is a wonderful scene where a fellow in the asylum grabs a machine-gun and says, "I'm sane, I'm sane, I'm like you", and proceeds to fire at random . . .

Well, that's your whole theme of sanity and insanity. If they are copying us, who the hell is insane?

While that is a disturbing scene, it is also very funny. And "The Big Red One" seems to have a fuller comic sense than the rest of your films. It looks much more worked out . . .

I am glad you said that, because the 10 per cent of the last cut that I didn't like was the 10 per cent without humor.

There is a crazy sequence where the Germans, who are fleeing from one undoing enemy — i.e., the navy — run into a cave and get mown down by the guns of another unseen enemy, the soldiers hiding there . . .

Yeah, it is funny. Half the time when people are taking a piss on the battlefield, they have no idea of the
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SAM FULLER
In this film, the Germans and Americans are seen as reflections of each other. We see a lot of the Germans, and we get a sense of them being the same as the Americans, except on the side... It is so hard to explain to anyone how a goddamn war gets started. All human beings are the same once they are on line with a rifle. The difference here is that we were not brought up to go out and commit mass murder, nor were they in Australia, England or France. Hitler's was a dedicated, very precise plan, which he wrote about in detail in Mein Kampf. The origin of the German and the American soldiers was different. But ironically enough, once we were on that line with our weapons, we were the same.

Are the soldiers' nicknames in your war films a reference to soldiers you knew?

Yeah, except for this one. Some are dead and some are still living.
### Censorship Listings

**Continued from p. 499**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Producer</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Reason for Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Big Brawl&quot;</td>
<td>Vranov &amp; Morse</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>2593.58</td>
<td>V-6-m-g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Blood Incendialed&quot;</td>
<td>C. F. Tu</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2386.27</td>
<td>Comfort Film Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Boardwalk&quot;</td>
<td>T. Squib</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2470.01</td>
<td>V-6-m-g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Love of Corina&quot;</td>
<td>Cinerecon</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>2816.69</td>
<td>Brighton Film Distributors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Club&quot;</td>
<td>S Nino Film Corporation</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2833.02</td>
<td>L-6-m-g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Crying Hustler&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam Film Tins/Na ho Films</td>
<td>2356.27</td>
<td>Roadshow Dist. P/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Dr. Heckle &amp; Mr. Jeeze&quot;</td>
<td>Cinematograph</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>2844.69</td>
<td>Joe Squi Int'l Film Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Elephant Man&quot;</td>
<td>EMI-Brookfilms</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>3374.45</td>
<td>Glav Film Distribution P/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Fearless Hyena&quot;</td>
<td>Goopyball Movie Co.</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>3777.35</td>
<td>Golden West Films</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gaijin: The Roads of Freedom (16mm)&quot;</td>
<td>C.P.C. Co.</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1139.91</td>
<td>Le Ciel Films</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gas Pump Girls&quot;</td>
<td>S. A. Squib</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>2649.69</td>
<td>Seven Keys Film P/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Hedwil (Videoclip)&quot;</td>
<td>Videskowitch</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>43 9m</td>
<td>Electric Blue A &amp; V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Hunter&quot;</td>
<td>Nordic-Media</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>2707.90</td>
<td>Cinema Int'l Corp. P/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Island of Virgin&quot;</td>
<td>Shaw Bros.</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2659.92</td>
<td>Joe Squi Int'l Film Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Jericho Mile&quot;</td>
<td>T. Zhang</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2872.46</td>
<td>Joe Squi Int'l Film Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The King of Fighters&quot;</td>
<td>Shaw Bros.</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2733.02</td>
<td>Joe Squi Int'l Film Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Magnificent 3&quot;</td>
<td>Goldfin Films</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2733.02</td>
<td>Joe Squi Int'l Film Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Phobia&quot;</td>
<td>L. Speir &amp; M. Bergman</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2564.14</td>
<td>VSA Film Distributors P/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rue Haute (High Street)&quot;</td>
<td>Clic Corp/TV/Film</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2593.58</td>
<td>Comfort Film Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shock Within Silently&quot;</td>
<td>Shuyu Yue Fong</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2486.26</td>
<td>Comfort Film Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Stir - A Belgian Saga&quot;</td>
<td>Theatres</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>6861.70</td>
<td>VSA Film Distributors P/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;S&quot;</td>
<td>Smiley Films</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2770.43</td>
<td>Comfort Film Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Suno (The Herd)&quot;</td>
<td>Suno Film</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2929.60</td>
<td>Pale American Productions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Swornman &amp; Enchancers&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>2048.20</td>
<td>Joe Squi Int'l Film Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The True Game of Death&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2342.59</td>
<td>Roadshow Dist. P/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;When Joseph Returns (16mm)&quot;</td>
<td>Runcarlo &amp; Malins</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>956.38</td>
<td>Asian Film Distributors P/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Twinkle Twinke &quot;Killer&quot;Kane&quot;</td>
<td>W. Blyth</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>2894.02</td>
<td>Roadshow Dist. P/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Vice Squad&quot;</td>
<td>Francesco Films</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2513.00</td>
<td>Filmways Asian Dist. P/L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Concluded on p. 503*
**Production Survey**

**Continued from p. 457**

- **A PLACE OF YOUR OWN**
  - **Director**: Stephen Ramsey
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **PLAIN SAILING**
  - **Producer**: Film Australia
  - **Director**: Robin Hughes
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **PLEASE DON’T LEAVE ME**
  - **Director**: Bob Ellis
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **THE WANDERING LAND**
  - **Director**: Tony Maylam
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **NEW SOUTH WALES FILM CORPORATION**
  - **Director**: John Franks
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Executive Producer</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANTI-SMOKING PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td><strong>Richard Davis</strong></td>
<td><strong>30 mins</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BREAKING THE SILENCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Elizabeth McCracken</strong></td>
<td><strong>25 mins</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORGOTTEN WATERS</strong></td>
<td><strong>John Howard</strong></td>
<td><strong>20 mins</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW SOUTH WALES FILM CORPORATION**

- **ANTI-SMOKING PROGRAM**
  - **Executive Producer**: **Richard Davis**
  - **Length**: **30 mins**

- **BREAKING THE SILENCE**
  - **Director**: Elizabeth McCracken
  - **Length**: **25 mins**

- **FORGOTTEN WATERS**
  - **Director**: **John Howard**
  - **Length**: **20 mins**

**SYNDICATES**

- **A PLACE OF YOUR OWN**
  - **Director**: Stephen Ramsey
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **PLAIN SAILING**
  - **Director**: Bob Ellis
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **PLEASE DON’T LEAVE ME**
  - **Director**: Tony Maylam
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **THE WANDERING LAND**
  - **Director**: John Franks
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **NEW SOUTH WALES FILM CORPORATION**
  - **Director**: John Franks
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

**TASMANIAN FILM CORPORATION**

- **DRINK DRIVING EDUCATION PROJECT**
  - **Director**: **Jan Sharp**
  - **Length**: **16 mins**

- **SEAWATCH**
  - **Director**: **Peter Johnson**
  - **Length**: **90 mins**

**SYNDICATES**

- **A PLACE OF YOUR OWN**
  - **Director**: Stephen Ramsey
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **PLAIN SAILING**
  - **Director**: Bob Ellis
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **PLEASE DON’T LEAVE ME**
  - **Director**: Tony Maylam
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **THE WANDERING LAND**
  - **Director**: John Franks
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **NEW SOUTH WALES FILM CORPORATION**
  - **Director**: John Franks
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

**SYNDICATES**

- **A PLACE OF YOUR OWN**
  - **Director**: Stephen Ramsey
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **PLAIN SAILING**
  - **Director**: Bob Ellis
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **PLEASE DON’T LEAVE ME**
  - **Director**: Tony Maylam
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **THE WANDERING LAND**
  - **Director**: John Franks
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.

- **NEW SOUTH WALES FILM CORPORATION**
  - **Director**: John Franks
  - **Synopsis**: A series examining the question of shelter for young people, and the problems connected with finding accommodation for those with limited resources.
It is very vague. You have to trust an awful lot to your cameraman.

Ira Wohl
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it is very vague. You have to trust

Martin Knelman
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have American stars for the American market, and big ad cam­
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mark the formation of the Society of Australian Film and Television Arts and Sciences, which will adjudicate future awards.

Judges for the awards represent Actors Equity, Australian Cinematographers Society, Australian Writers Guild, Film Editors Guild, Designers Association of Australia, Musicians Union, NIDA and the Producers and Directors Guild of Australia.

Newton and Jones were awarded Gold Sammys for top male and female television performers. It was Jones' second gold Sammy, the first being awarded in 1977.


Decision on ATV-10 Deferred

A final decision on the fate of Rupert Murdoch's ATV-10 takeover now seems certain to be deferred until February, 1981. Murdoch's News Limited has appealed against the ruling of the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal that the ATV-10 takeover was against public interest. The ABT refused to approve the takeover.

A preliminary hearing of the appeal, before the Administrative Appeals Tribunal, indicated that the full hearing would not start until next year.

A further preliminary hearing was scheduled to be held on December 1 to determine the standing of groups who have applied to give evidence at the hearing; the Federal and Victorian branches of the ALP, the Australian Journalists Association, Justice in Broadcasting, and the Rupert Public Interest Movement.

The Australian Broadcasting Tribunal has not yet indicated whether it intends to take an active role in defending its decision before the AAT. This is the first time the Administrative Appeals Tribunal has been called on to hear a matter from another Federal Government body which itself hears evidence. Its usual function is to act on procedural matters relating to implementation of government policy and legislation.

The delay in the ATV-10 case means that the channel will now pay dividends to Ansett Transport Industries, which is owned jointly by News Limited and the Australian publisher

In Canberra, there are moves to save the ABT further embarrassment of the kind suffered over the ATV-10 decision.

While the Tribunal refused to approve the News Group's bid, it was powerless to order the Murdoch-owned company to make a share divestiture. This was because the decision was made outside the time limit allowed for such an order to be made.

The Post and Telephone Commission Department is pushing for a procedure whereby the tribunal notifies the Minister of allegations of contraventions of the Broadcasting and Television Act, so that prompt action can be taken.

New Zealand News
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Germany and several other European countries following its market success at the 1980 Cannes Film Festival. It has also been selected for screening at the London Film Festival next month.

Trend to Small Cinemas

The trend towards smaller, more intimate cinemas in New Zealand's main centres appears to be continuing, according to the annual report of the Internal Affairs Department.

In its report to Parliament, the department says there is evidence of renewed interest in suburban operations, possibly as a result of increasing transport costs. "Nevertheless, long-run, well-publicized and widely exhibited feature films continue to draw the public to larger cinemas," it adds.

The Government's decision not to permit the introduction of drive-in cinemas had removed the issue from the centre-stage position it occupied last year.

Independent Television Station Closed

A bid will be made soon to establish New Zealand's first private television network. A consortium of major New Zealand publishers and broadcasters announced that the move will be made within the next two months.

Independent Newspapers, New Zealand News and Hauraki Enterprise are members of the consortium, which hopes to replace one of the two networks currently run by the Broadcasting Corporation of New Zealand with a private service. Each would hold 22 per cent of the shares in the network, with the remaining 34 per cent to be issued to the public.

The consortium's company, to be known as Alternative Television Network, would have as its chairman Norman Hay, the mayor of Christchurch.

A recent survey in Auckland showed that 74 per cent of people were in favor of a privately run television service. With the weight of public opinion behind them the consortium is confident of obtaining a warrant to establish and operate a private television network.
The Vincent Film Library offers a comprehensive marketing service for Australian films.

We provide:

1. Theatrical and non-theatrical distribution for shorts and features of all categories and styles.
2. Sale of films to specialized libraries and institutions.
3. Preparation and printing of brochures, leaflets and other marketing aids.
5. Assistance with print costs.

All activities are on a non-exclusive basis, consequently —

1. The library will accept any new film for distribution.
2. Films which fail to rent will not be excluded from distribution but will be given special attention in search of markets.
3. Films exhibited at A.F.I. Cinemas will not be required to be lodged with the Vincent Film Library for exclusive non-theatrical distribution.

For further information please write to Vincent Film Library, Australian Film Institute, P.O. Box 165, Carlton South, Vic, 3053, or telephone Matthew Percival or Nadia Lettoof on (03) 347 9194.

The Vincent Film Library is a division of the Australian Film Institute which operates with the assistance of the Australian Film Commission.
When you sold off the copyright, did you lose control of the final film?

Don: No. Andromeda, particularly Tom Brodie and Trevor Lucas — were fantastic. We put in a budget, saying, “That was how much we needed to finish the film”, and they agreed. They didn’t question or hassle us in any way. Of course, they suggested things but we had the final cut. In fact, the only pressure on us was to get a print ready for Cannes, which was a bit of a nightmare.

How did you cast the film?

Don: We decided to stay away from well-known people, television actors and people like that. There were a couple of reasons. Firstly, there was the type of roles we were going. There weren’t a lot of young people around who were suited. Secondly, we felt television actors would do what they do in Skysways or Young Doctors. So we decided to go with as many fresh people as we could.

For the part of Sam, I remember sitting up at the Australian Film Institute flipping through Showcases. Peter walked in and said, “You know, I’ve walked out again. Casting a film from Showcases shows my limited working knowledge of actors.

But while flipping through, I noticed a shot of Tracy Mann and thought, “That’s just the way I see Sam.” So I traced her to Sydney and we had a talk. She was on a short list of three and eventually got the role.

Bill Hunter, Max Cullen and Tony Barry played roles they were suited for. I had known Bill for quite a few years, but Hilton organized the other experienced actors.

The main idea behind the casting was to make it as realistic as possible. We wanted people who were prepared to try something different.

How did you decide on the visual style?

Peter: We talked it over and very early on decided on the style. But sometimes this was difficult. If we used a room and, let’s say, established a window with outside light, we tried to maintain the quality of light all day. This is okay for four or five hours, but when you are shooting at eight o’clock in the evening, it is another story. So we decided to take, for instance, the scene where Sam finds herself in the cell.

We started shooting at 10 a.m., with sunlight streaming through the window, and finished shooting at 9 p.m.

On average, it would take two hours to light a scene. Crews really don’t kick off that quickly in the morning. But once everybody has had their three or four cups of coffee, their shaves and shampoos and whatever, we would get into it and there would be minimum time between set-ups.

If Don had wanted back lighting, modelling, etc., it would take much longer. Also, when you have four or five actors moving around a room, it’s another story.

Don: The other good thing about our filming schedule was that we would start in the morning about nine or 10, and go through to four or five in the afternoon — sometimes six. We would just go, with no lunch or coffee breaks. People would grab a cup of coffee when they could. Everybody on a set has some time when they are doing nothing, and the cast and crew appreciated this approach. Certainly nobody objected to it. If you take a one hour lunch break, it ends up being two hours before everybody is fully functional again.

Peter: When we finished we would go back to the production office, and the caterer would have a meal ready. This is an essential part of our filmmaking. Everyone could sit at the end of the day, face each other across the table and complain, “Oh I didn’t have this”, or “You didn’t do that”. In the meantime, they are eating and having a few drinks. Then we would have a bit of a party or smash up, which would get rid of all that accumulated static electricity. Then we would be ready for the next day.

Did you have daily rushes?

Don: Not really. We had rushes when we could get them. It was a budget restriction we had to live with.

Peter: What happens with daily rushes is that the whole crew has an enjoyable time. It acts as a sort of booster for them. But many times the rushes are much funnier, far more amusing, than that. Especially as they are full of in-jokes: the clapper/loader falls over, the cameraman. There were no secrets. Any one could talk to the director or the cameraman. There were no secrets.

Don: The other good thing about those end-of-day sessions was that everybody got together. There was no hierachical bullshit. Anyone could talk to the director or the cameraman. There were no secrets. Sometimes, if the screen was off, it was another matter: the director pissed out of his head and turning up with a hangover the next day, that’s really okay; it’s not a big problem. We got pissed together and everybody got the hangover together, or we blew a joint and everybody got ripped. The next day you just got on with the job.

You chose very contemporary music for the film: rock’n’roll hits from the past couple of years . . .

Don: I always wanted to use music like that; I never thought of having a music score written. But I was at a bit of a loss because I hadn’t listened to music recently and had cut myself off. So Trevor Lucas put me on to Greg Pickhaver, who was working for 3RRR-FM.

I got together with Greg and he looked at the film and we talked about it. He was fantastic. Greg is totally responsible for the music in the film. He would offer me a choice of four or five songs for a particular scene, and I would make the final decision.

We also arranged an excellent deal for the soundtrack album. Hammard Records have released all the songs and backed it up with a huge television campaign which goes to every state in the country. The release of the film has been tied in with their campaign which gives us a television back-up to the normal publicity, at no extra cost.

The music is an essential part of the film although a lot of people reckon the music is mixed too loud.

They always say that about rock’n’roll music . . .

Don: Well, that’s their problem. Mix it the way you feel it.

You are distributing the film through Greg Lynch?

Don: Greg is the other person who helped get the film completed. We showed him a double-head of the film and he was very enthusiastic. That helped convince Andromeda to come in on it.

One of the good things about a guy like Greg is that he has been involved with the big people — like UA, for instance. So he knows that side of the business. He also knows the lower side of the business, as an independent distributor in this country, battling with a print here and a print there, trying to get it in that house, that theatre. We have the benefit of working with a small company. They also have the understanding of how it works.

With someone like Greg, we are the top film he has at the moment. So we get all of his efforts and energies, and those of the people working for him. We would never get that out of Village, Greater Union or Hoyts, because they have so many important films running at the same time. Our film would become insignificant.

There are disadvantages going with a small distributor, however, such as not having access to all the cinemas you would like.

When was the first time you realized it was a good film, despite what everyone had told you?

Don: I always thought it was going to be good. No, that’s a lie. At one stage I was a bit confused about it all, and the first time it started to become a little clearer was when Greg Lynch looked at it. When he said he wanted to get involved, I thought, “Hello, maybe it’s a little better than I thought.”

We had a screening after it was finished, for the cast and crew and their friends, at the Longford one Saturday. It went down very well. People were coming up and saying, “Gee, Tracy is really good, isn’t she?” And then we went through this drama about the flashbacks. Every time we showed Hard Knocks to someone who worked in one of the state corporations, or the AFC, or was involved in the film industry, they all wanted to argue about the flashbacks. But the moment you show it to somebody who knows nothing about filmmaking, who just goes and sees films, there is no problem.

Lachie Shaw looked at a double-head and said, “Well, I am a bit...
Wanted, & Positions Vacant

We are writing a QUALITY sci-fi/adventure/war/car chase film and being perfectionists and award winners both (producer + director) wish to leave no stone unturned in our search for anything and anyone useful and FANTASTIC (e.g.: props, wardrobe, etc.; consultants and/or suppliers of weapons, warfare, cars, heavy vehicles, computer graphics, ELECTRONICS, servo motors, locations, etc; acting talent: human, animal or other; etc. etc.

If you think you have anything to contribute, or if you know of anyone who has, please send fullest info (longhand OK) to Producer, PO Box 333, Bondi Beach, NSW 2026. Enclose sase if you want anything returned.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN FILM INDUSTRY DIRECTORY

SAVE A LOAD ON EXCESS FREIGHT CHARGES,
BY HIRING THE "HEAVIES" IN THE WEST.

AUDIOVISION

- LIGHTING TRUCK. Fully equipped with lights for most location assignments. Includes basic grip gear, 2 way radio, loud hailer, camera platform, etc.
- TRIPods Hi-Hats, mounts, etc.
- ARRIflex 35 mm & 16 mm Bi, and Nagra etc; available for SELECTIVE HIRE.
- BUMPED GENERATORS. 31 & 70 kVA & battery packs.
- LIGHTING HIRE. Mini-brutes, H.M.F.s, Red Heads, Blondes, 5 k's to Inyks, etc, etc
- W.A. DISTRIBUTOR "TUSCAN". Reels, cans, cores, etc.
- CREWS arranged.

For further information contact
DARYL BINNING a.c.s.
15 DENNY WAY. ALFRED COVE W.A. 6154 Ph 09 330 5070.

WESTCOAST FILMS

Photography by

Hugh Kitson, Perth's top film editor has started Western Australia's first post production company—FILMCUT. Film cut has a beautifully appointed and equipped 16mm cutting room and a 35/16mm negative cutting service. U-matic tape preview facilities are available for time-code editing too.

Originally trained and brought up in the British film industry, Hugh has now served ten years of his life sentence in the Australian industry. He has more than sixty documentary and short film credits to his name plus three minor awards and one significant international award.

Next time you are in town call on:
FILMCUT 381 7813 or drop in to 42 Denis Street, Subiaco.
(Tey might just be able to help you with the post-production on your film).

EASTMAN COLOR
EKTAChROME BLACK & WHITE
35mm - 16mm - SUPER 8
SOUND TRANSFERS

7 BENNETT ST.,
PERTH. (09) 325 5233

UNITED AUSTRALASIAN FILMS
WESTERN AUSTRALIA'S GRIP SPECIALISTS

- Elemack Dolly with Tracks
- Jib Arm
- Limpet Mount
- Tripods and Spreaders
- Platform Dollies
- Location Truck
- Hand-Held Communication System
- Grips and Runners

Phone Karel Akkerman (09) 342 2674
7 Winterton Way, Girrawheen. 6064 Perth W.A.

Perry Sandow
Television Lighting
Director
Film Gaffer

Perry Film & Television Lighting
42 Denis Street, Subiaco. 6008 W.A. Phone (09) 381 7065 A/Hrs. (09) 405 1340.
confused about all these flashbacks and I am a master at sorting this stuff out." He says that, and then some 16-year-old kid off the street sees the film and you ask him, "Are you confused about the flashbacks?", and he says, "Oh no, that was fine. I understood what was happening."

**Low-budget Films and AFC Assessment**

What are your thoughts on low-budget feature filmmakers?

Peter: The industry raised its ugly head back in 1970. Within two or three years there was a lot of money available to filmmakers. It was then that suddenly this incredible division came about between those who were going to make films and those who were not.

We found ourselves in the group who were not going to make films. I'm not sure whether any of you feel this way, but I'm always saying to a group of people 'Are you confused about the country is really in a position to make films? Ten feature films is no experience at all; it is just a beginning.

In Australia, we do not have the B-grade training ground that American directors have. Here you have to struggle. And the struggle is against those who make the funding decisions. There are quite a few people who have made films of considerable standard, but you never meet those people on the assessment panels. There are also a lot of people with technical experience, but you never meet them either. They are busy working.

Don: When you walk into an assessment, you look across a table at a group of people and you are lucky if there is one person there who has celluloid under his fingerprints. I went into one assessment, for the King Island project, and the assessors said, "Great, great, great." Donald Crombie gets up and says, "Yeah, it is about time you did a feature Don, you've just done Rainbow Farm." And like it was you [Rod Bishop, the inter-

and confused and fall back on that "I don't understand it but I know what I like" business. Ask these people, 'What do you think of the film?" They like the film and you begin to understand where you stand with them.

When you face that situation, time after time, you have to start looking at other alternatives. You have to start thinking in your game and winding the money out of them, or you just don't do it. Or you write crap they want to read.

I hope those days are past. I don't want to go through it again. There are people who want to make films — not for large amounts of money but because it is in their blood. Everyone knows about films having to make their money back — the famous "track record". But I ask you, who has a financial track record in Australia?

What do you see as the future for low-budget filmmaking in Australia?

Don: The most interesting films made in this country are those made on low budgets. I don't think there has been a big-budget film made in this country that was other than a safe, conventional film. But the people are ready to blame the film-makers; the blame must be spread across the board.

When there is a lot of money involved, like $600,000 or $1 million, people tend to become very conservative about everything. What people should do is take the chance and use it — and low-budget filmmaking allows you to do that. You don't get paranoid about the money, you don't give a damn about it, apart from the fact that you hope you've enough to pay the bills. And by that I don't mean you waste money. Every cent has to end up on the screen, and on Hard Knocks I'm sure it does.

The AFC and the state corporations all want to make profitable films of artistic merit, and build a viable film industry in Australia. Firstly, you are not going to build a viable film industry in this country without some sort of tariff protection from the Yanks, without getting in and breaking up the monopoly that exists on the distribution and exhibition level.

Secondly, we are not going to build a film industry by cracking the American film market. There is no way we are going to do it. There wouldn't be a film industry in the world, outside the U.S., and the other indigenous areas such as India, where the film industry survives without some sort of government protection or subsidy. We just don't have the population.

What is your next project?

Peter: We are resurrecting the King Island project. Andromeda has given us some script development money. I have also been asked to do another film for them. What I am crackin' for is the chance to work. We don't want to fight the establishment, but we refuse to accept their ideas and decisions because they control the purse strings. I am more than prepared to admit to mistakes but I don't believe that there are people who know what makes a good film. No one ever has. You make them with common sense, a little madness, obsession and heartache as many of them are worth. If the public responds to your ideas and your means of communicating these ideas you are hailed as a success; if not, you are in trouble. I can only make films by gut reaction — nothing else is pointless to me.

**New Project**

What is your next project?

Don: We are resurrecting the King Island project. Andromeda has given us some script development money. I have also been asked to do another film for them. What I am crackin' for is the chance to work. We don't want to fight the establishment, but we refuse to accept their ideas and decisions because they control the purse strings. I am more than prepared to admit to mistakes but I don't believe that there are people who know what makes a good film. No one ever has. You make them with common sense, a little madness, obsession and heartache as many of them are worth. If the public responds to your ideas and your means of communicating these ideas you are hailed as a success; if not, you are in trouble. I can only make films by gut reaction — nothing else is pointless to me.
**Film Reviews**
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**Three Days of the Condor and Brubaker**

Interestingly Redford has been in all three.

While such a tradition has produced some fine dramas, the portrayal of the triumph of the individual, against almost insurmountable odds, glosses over some of the difficult social and political realities of these situations.

In *Brubaker*, particularly, the problem that is never considered is what happened to the prisoners at Wakefield once it was closed? Presumably, the Wakefield prisoners would have been transferred to another institution with a similar structure of physical and psychological intimidation and cruelty. This belief in individual solutions contrasts strongly with the tougher, cynical and ultimately more realistic analysis of prison life depicted in films like *Stir*.

---

**Brubaker**


---

**The Earthling**

Jim McCulloh

*The Earthling* is essentially an American film set in colorful Australian bush. This is not to say that using the picturesque Australian wilderness as a setting, and signing up two of the world's best-known actors (William Holden and Ricky Schroder), isn't sensible marketing. But for the sake of the Australian heritage, culture should be a source of pride, which is exactly what we get.

In his first original screenplay, American Lanny Cotier tells the story of Patrick Foley (Holden), who, after 40 years in the U.S. and facing an impending life sentence without parole, decides to return to the place of his birth: a secluded farm deep in the Australian bush. Fate, however, couples him with Shawn Daisy (Schroder), a suddenly-orphaned, helpless little boy, who also hails from the U.S. Together, they trek through the bush, learning how to survive in the wild. Foley supposedly learning how to farm, Foley eventually reaches the old farm where, after confessing the affection they each hold for the other, Foley dies. Shawn, having learned the ways of the wilderness, thanks the old man and confidently sets out to rejoin civilization.

Patrick Foley is portrayed with little verve by a miscast Holden and his character is given little substance by any of the supporting characters. At the beginning of the film, a pub-load of locals, in the township where Foley stops before his final journey, quickly accounts for his American accent. Foley, and mention his long friendship with another local, Christian Neilson (Alwyn Kirts). They talk of Foley's father, his farm, and even compare the two, and so establish, though all too briefly, their familiarity with the Foley clan. But they say nothing about Foley's background, character, or possible reasons for returning. In fact, they hardly bat an eyelid on first seeing him.

Foley's interaction and conversations with Shawn as they trek through the bush also indicate a lack of any depth in characterization. Foley never says anything which reflects the nature of a man, who, after so many years in the outside world, returns to his home in the wild.

In Foley's argument with Christian, for example, he scantily mentions some lack of true identity within himself, and that the essence of self-affirmation lies in the uncivilized wilderness: "You're not me. This isn't me. This place isn't me." But there are too few instances where this idea is brought up, and then all too briefly.

At one stage, with Shawn abandoned by Foley, he shouts out in anger: "You wanna know my name? My name's God. G-O-D. God. I'm not gonna tell you my name." This is presumably meant to indicate Shawn's loss of identity without Foley by his side, and the consequential intensifying of his determination to make it alone.

The themes of survival, living off the land, appreciating what one has and development of human characters are touched upon, but never developed.

After their first meal together, Shawn was made to fetch his own wood by Foley. "You're gonna get a[d]timate without Foley in his mind, and where the animals are colorful and friendly (except for the incidents with the rams, snakes, and wild dogs). It's clear that the Foley family has been lose and shown to have a greater, lasting effect on Shawn, who comes out of each sequence unharmed and undisturbed.

---

**The Earthling**


---

**The Earthling**


The vastness of the bushland extending to the horizon would have been even more impressive if filmed in wide-screen.

**The Earthling** is more a marketing exercise than anything else. With its guaranteed overseas release, the film relies on its photography and the names of the two leads to net its market. The fact that *The Earthling* captures the physical essence of Australia without its cultural fascination is a pity, not only for Australians, but for those overseas who will only see one facet of Australia, namely the Barrington Tops National Park, where the film was shot.

This priority that the exploitation of the land takes over the involvement and development of human characters in *The Earthling* is perhaps best expressed in the short characterisations of Foley himself. One is left to wonder how Foley's character development would have proceeded had he not to be a lifeline for Shawn.

In Foley's argument with Christian, for example, he scantily mentions some lack of true identity within himself, and that the essence of self-affirmation lies in the uncivilized wilderness: "You're not me. This isn't me. This place isn't me." But there are too few instances where this idea is brought up, and then all too briefly.

At one stage, with Shawn abandoned by Foley, he shouts out in anger: "You wanna know my name? My name's God. G-O-D. God. I'm not gonna tell you my name." This is presumably meant to indicate Shawn's loss of identity without Foley by his side, and the consequential intensifying of his determination to make it alone.

The themes of survival, living off the land, appreciating what one has and development of human characters are touched upon, but never developed.

After their first meal together, Shawn was made to fetch his own wood by Foley. "You're gonna get a[d]timate without Foley in his mind, and where the animals are colorful and friendly (except for the incidents with the rams, snakes, and wild dogs). It's clear that the Foley family has been lose and shown to have a greater, lasting effect on Shawn, who comes out of each sequence unharmed and undisturbed.

Just before their deaths, Shawn's father, Ronnie (Olivia Hamnett, who once had given more bearing in the film), and mother Betty (Olivia Hamnett, who was made to cover her British accent with an embarrassingly unconvincing American one) argue about the nature of bringing their son to the bush. Says Ross, "We brought him up here to enjoy his heritage — Australian not Californian." It is odd this is said, because it means the coupling of Shawn with an "American swagman" contradicts the nature of the film. Rather, Ross' angry statement should have been the opening for Shawn's realization that his own role in this is to be Foley's purpose, that he is part of the heritage and culture of Australia. But this never looks like happening.

There is one admirable quality about *The Earthling* and, thankfully, it is Australian: Don McAlpine's splendid photography. Complemented by Don Connolly's crisp sound recording. McAlpine imaginatively captures the color and picturesque (if almost angelic) beauty of the Australian bush and its creatures. Using slow zooms, pans, creative edits and fades, and some beautiful close-up photography, he succeeds in giving a strong physical feel to the film.

In the scene where Shawn is first introduced, an imaginative sequence of fluent shots is used twice. During their conversation the shots cut from one set of frames to the next, taking the eye from one point of view to another. This is not to say that the predominance of shots cut from one set frame of the campsite to several different angles taken from various positions around the camp. The changing of shots occurs in between sentences and varies in distance from the camp, giving a clear, all round feeling of depth.

But from the most memorable piece of direction after Shawn's first night alone. Shouting for help in a small pond, one sees a shot of a cliff ledge upon which the tiny figure of a man is discernible. With several flowing shots, each taken progressively closer, one realizes the figure is Foley. From this, the sequence is essentially reversed, but rather than cutting from one shot to another, fades are used and the angle is taken back until the impressive shot of the figure on the cliff appears again.

The vastness of the bushland extending to the horizon would have been even more impressive if filmed in wide-screen.
The Australian Film and Television School's Open Program

would like to announce some of the projects we shall be undertaking in the near future.

The Open Program conducts a wide range of courses, seminars, workshops and public lectures, for those working in the industry, including:

- PRODUCERS AND ASPIRING PRODUCERS
- PRODUCTION MANAGERS
- DIRECTORS
- LABORATORY TECHNICIANS
- VIDEO EDITORS, ETC. ETC.

We also produce films, videotapes and publications on many aspects of film and television production, marketing and financing.

If you would like more information about courses and resources - dates, costs, venue, etc. please write to:

Open Program
Australian Film and Television School
PO Box 126
NORTH RYDE N.S.W. 2113

An average year for us at Film Australia sees the production of around 100 films and audio-visuals.

As you can imagine, we couldn't handle that volume of work or maintain our high standards without drawing upon the wide range of film-making talent available in the Australian industry today.

Directors, cameramen, grips, writers, composers and artists - in fact everybody who gets into the act, both in front of the camera and behind.

With the help of freelance Film Australians, we've completed important films such as, Let the Balloon Go, Who's Handicapped?, War Without Weapons and award winners Hospitals Don't Burn Down and Leisure.

When you next view a Film Australia production, remember that it's also the production of Australians who work in film. Right across the industry.
A film distributor’s lot isn’t always a happy one, especially when it comes to viewing documentary after documentary. Here, however, are some recent documentaries which have something to say and say it in a fresh and interesting way:

Glenn’s Story: the true and dramatic story of a juvenile delinquent.
Infernal Triangle: the hill tribes of Laos, Cambodia and Thailand and their exploitation by the opium traders.
Life Wasn’t Meant to be Radioactive: the painting of an alternate energy mural.
Oranges and Lemons: the education of Aboriginal children in a country town.
Sangham — Aid to Liberation: the organizing of untouchables into production co-operatives against landlord opposition.
Tools of Change — Introduction to Appropriate Technology: the technology that is appropriate for each society.
Working Up: there are many documentaries on women in the work force. This one is, unlike many of the others, interesting, informed and very well made.

Our other documentaries are on Antarctica, schizophrenia, motor car workers, Sincelejo and bullfighting, Chile, Cuba, filmmakers, Lithuania, Vietnam, Japan, living together, Minamata disease, and Uruguay.

Cine Action Pty Ltd,
263 Adderley St, West Melbourne Vic. 3003
Telephone: (03) 329 5422
Write or ring for our free catalogue.
We have feature films on 16 and 35mm as well.

Offer a fast and thoroughly professional neg cutting service to the film and TV industries. We have a fully equipped cutting room that can handle both 16mm and 35mm productions and is air-conditioned throughout. We also have a prompt pick-up and delivery service. We promise total professional care for your film 24 hours a day.

Give ADAM BAHOUDIAN a call on (03) 368 2147 anytime and know that your film is in the right hands.

FILM NEG CUTTING SERVICES
Features, documentaries, commercials, industrial and short films.
650 Warrigal Road, Chadstone Victoria 3148.
because when you see the rushes, the lab report either explains what's going on or it doesn't. You need very experienced people viewing the rushes to be able to tell you where a spot or a mark or a flare has come from.

Is it just a lack of experience?

No. It's the fact that the NFU lab is part of the government bureaucracy, I have known good people who have come into the lab, but then leave, usually because they are not paid enough. I think that is probably what affects it more than anything. It doesn't matter whether you know your job or not, unless you have a public service grading, you start on the bottom, and get paid peanuts until you work your way up.

Do you push stock much?

Not at all on Beyond Reasonable Doubt. On Sons we pushed quite a lot, because I found in the tests that Colorfilm was giving just as good results with the stock pushed one stop.

In fact, I concluded from those tests that the stock was actually quite capable of being used at twice the normal grade. But it is more economic to shoot at 64 ASA because it goes through the lab quicker.

We also pushed one stop on Goodbye Pork Pie, but it was processed at the NFU lab and didn't look so good. But there were times during the shoot when we couldn't get our hands on enough light and just had to force it.

What sort of cameras do you prefer to work with?

Funnily enough, for a lighting cameraman, I've had very little experience as a camera operator. So, I haven't been involved in deciding what to use as I might otherwise be.

What types of cameras do you generally use?

On Sleeping Dog, we used a Panaflex. Sons for the Return Home was mainly done with PVS, which is a really beautiful camera. But we also used a hand-held Arriflex for hand-holding, which wasn't so good.

On Beyond Reasonable Doubt, we used an Arriflex BL — which was fine by me and the operator, but the camera assistant didn't like because the lens arrangement and focus marks aren't too good. In fact the whole focus-pulling arrangement on the BL is unsatisfactory.

For Goodbye Pork Pie, we shot on an Arriflex 2C, occasionally using the 1205 blimp. As a result a lot of the film was post-synced, which is rare for New Zealand.

Is all the lighting gear you would like to use available in New Zealand?

Yes, but what I use depends on the budget. On a film like Middle Age Spread I had to use 16mm, and was very restricted in what gear I could use. In fact we only had a truck full.

It's nice to be able to draw on whatever is available, and use the right light for the right occasion — but it's rare.

How do you get on for power when you are on location?

The Acme Sausage Company have a nice little 100 amp generator which I use. Generally it's enough when you feed it into the grid, with a little house power as well.

When I can't use the genny, I just make do with what's available.

Imported cameramen

I have noticed recently that several Australian cameramen regularly work in New Zealand, particularly on commercials. How do you feel about that?

A lot of the commercial work in New Zealand is shot by Australians. Frankly, it puzzles me and it gets a lot of New Zealanders' backs up, because the agencies, and production companies are importing cameramen when there are obviously talented and capable people here who can do the job.

The trouble I don't understand it. Fortunately, New Zealand feature film producers haven't adopted the same attitude.

Filmmography

**Features**

- 1977 Wild Man (Geoff Murphy)
- 1979 Middle Age Spread (Paul Mason)
- 1980 Sons for the Return Home (Paul Mason)
- 1981 Goodbye Pork Pie (Geoff Murphy)
- 1980 Beyond Reasonable Doubt (John Luing)

**Shorts**

- 1972 Tankbusters (Geoff Murphy)
- 1973 Bush (Geoff Murphy)
- 1974 A State of Siege (Vincent Ward)

**Documentaries**

- 1969 Fafa Samos (Jim Siers)
- 1973 Fool on a Hill (George Harris)
- 1979 In Spring One Plants Alone (Vincent Ward)
- 1980 Jane: The Place and Paintings of Jane Evans (John Reid)
- 1980 Learning Fast (Gaylene Preston)
Six top marketing events you should know about.

The following marketing events should command your attention:

1. **MONTE CARLO TELEVISION FESTIVAL:**

   Monte Carlo, 7th - 15th February 1981.
   A market for television programs and feature films limited to 150 top sales organizations.
   AFC represented by Ray Atkinson.

2. **BERLIN FILM FESTIVAL:**

   An expanding film market for features, documentaries and short films.
   Entries close 12th January 1981.

3. **NAPTE (National Association of Television Programme Executives):**

   New York, 14th - 18th March 1981.
   A major gathering of TV programming executives.
   Program interest revolves around drama and entertainment series, childrens' series and drama, cartoons, specialized documentaries and feature film packages.
   AFC represented by Jim Henry.

4. **AFMA (American Film Market Association):**

   Los Angeles, 21st - 31st March 1981.
   The first event of its kind for feature film product from English-speaking countries.
   AFC represented by Jim Henry.

5. **MIP-TV (Marche International Programme du Television):**

   Cannes, 24th - 30th April 1981.
   The world's biggest television marketing event.
   The AFC will be providing full marketing facilities.

6. **CANNES FILM FESTIVAL MARKET:**

   Cannes, 14th - 27th May 1981.
   The world's largest feature film market conducted in conjunction with Festival International du Film.
   The AFC will be providing full marketing facilities.

Producers wishing to enter these events should contact the Marketing Branch of the AFC as soon as possible with full details of programs they would like to market.

Australian Film Commission,
8 West St, North Sydney, NSW 2060.
Tel: (02) 922 6855.
A new film with definitive answers to professional needs

Introducing the new Fujicolor Negative Film, crowning long years of development by meeting today's needs with tomorrow's technology.

- Living, natural skin tones and greens.
- Ultrafine-grain high-definition images.
- A reliable performer under difficult conditions.

Data: Fujicolor Negative Film 35mm type 8517, 16 mm type 8527

- Tungsten Type 3200K
- Exposure Index
  - Tungsten Lamps 100 (ASA equiv.)
  - Daylight 64 (ASA equiv.) (with Fuji Light Balancing Filter LBA-12 or Kodak Daylight Filter No. 85)
- Perforation Types
  - 35mm N-4.740mm (BH-1866)
  - 16mm 1R-7.605mm (1R-2994) and
- Packaging
  - 35mm 200 ft (61m), T
  - 16mm 1000 ft (302m)

NEW RELEASE!
HIGH SPEED NEGATIVE
FILM 250 ASA
AVAILBLE
16mm
35mm

Industrial Division

NAME: ............................................................................................................

ADDRESS:...........................................................................................................

Postcode: ...................................... Telephone: ........................................

Please send me more information on ☐ Fujicolor Negative Film
IS YOUR FILM A WORK OF ART?

The world's masterpieces are the result of creative flair, insight and mastery of a medium.

At Custom Video Australia, we are artists in our own medium—from correcting skin tones to even framing the picture.

So if your film is a work of creative art surely we should finish it for you... you'll love the reproduction.

CUSTOM VIDEO AUSTRALIA
Television Centre, Epping NSW Australia 2121
Telephone (02) 858 7545. Telex: AA 20250

It's the finishing touch that counts.